

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

PA 87-544

HB 5686

PA 544

1987

House 10741-10792

(52)

Senate 4981-4989, 5129-5130

(10)

Environment 517, 523, 539-541, 547,
551-552, 563-564, 574, 579, 585,
586-587, 593, 602, 609, 617, 620, 624-
626, 1268, 1273, 1277-1278, (1290-1292)
1298, 1300-1301, 1303-1306, 1320, 1323, 1340

Environment 1343-1344, 1346, 1550-1558,
1565-1572, 1573, 1574-1575, 1576,
1582-1590, 1590-1593, 1601-1614

(51)

113⁰⁸

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate
and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2014

H-478

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1987

VOL. 30
PART 29
10533-10898

dez

39

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

error of Calendar 907, Substitute for Senate Bill 179,
File 1001, which we just acted upon.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

The motion is for suspension of our rules for
immediate transmittal to the Governor or Calendar 907.
Is there objection? Is there objection? Seeing no
objection, the rules are suspended and the item is
transmitted to the Governor's office.

Clerk, please continue with the call of the Cal-
endar.

CLERK:

Page 5, Calendar 808, Substitute for House Bill
5686, AN ACT MANDATING RECYCLING IN MUNICIPALITIES,
Favorable Report of the Committee on Appropriations.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Mary Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Good morning, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of
the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of
the Bill.

dez

40

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark?

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Thank you. The Clerk has LCO 8426. The Clerk would please call and may I be allowed to summarize?

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

The Clerk has an amendment, LCO 8426, Designated House Amendment, Schedule "A". Will the Clerk please call.

CLERK:

8426, Designated House "A", offered by Representative Mushinsky, et al.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Is there objection to summarization? Seeing none, Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment is the text of House Bill 5233, the source reduction planning bill, which was voted unanimously by the Environment Committee but lost in the LCO computer before the file.

The amendment establishes a task force to study ways of packaging consumer goods to reduce solid waste.

dez

41

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

It also changes the existing municipal solid waste recycling task force to a permanent advisory council and adds 6 new members to deal with the packaging issue.

A business selling packaged goods...a business manufacturing packaged goods, four members of the General Assembly. They will report by February '88 to the committee.

We are also adding recycling industries to the solid waste management alternatives board and we are directing the Commissioner or DEP to utilize private recycling markets whenever feasible so that the state is not in direct competition with the existing recycling markets.

The old municipal solid waste task force now to become the council, will advise DEP on the implementation of the recycling plant. We've expanded the council with 6 members of the General Assembly, two recycling industries, environmental group and a business group.

Also, there are three expenditures from last year's municipal solid waste recycling trust fund to assist recycling on its way. There's an expenditure for ash utilization to see if we can do something with the ash from the Resource Recovery plants. There's another

dez

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

expenditure for marketing studies. If we can improve the marketing of the recyclables and finally, the 2½% of the fund to be spent on administration by DEP so that recycling is finally...efforts by the state are finally staffed.

In addition, there's language that places the Department of Administrative Services on the recycling council for the purpose of working with the council on state purchasing procedures. And we will be including a recommendation to the Environment Committee next year on a schedule of minimum purchase of recyclable materials by the State of Connecticut.

I move adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

Will you remark further on the amendment. If not, all those in favor of the amendment, please indicate by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

All those to the contrary nay. The amendment is

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

adopted.

House Amendment Schedule "A":

Strike section 8 in its entirety and insert the following lieu thereof:

"Sec. 8. (a) There is established a task force to study methods of packaging of consumer goods to reduce solid waste. In making its study, the task force shall consider the feasibility of plastics recycling and the imposition of a tax on the disposal of goods, by category, that are not recyclable.

(b) The task force shall consist of the members of the municipal solid waste recycling advisory council, established pursuant to section 22a-241 of the general statutes, as amended by section 10 of this act, and six members as follows: One member appointed by the president pro tempore of the senate who is a seller of packaged goods, one member appointed by the majority leader of the senate who is a manufacturer of packaged consumer goods and four members of the general assembly, one each appointed by the speaker of the house of representatives, the majority leader of the house of representatives, the minority leader of the senate and the minority leader of the house of representatives. The chairman of the municipal solid waste recycling advisory council shall be the chairman of the task force.

(c) The task force shall submit a report of its findings and recommendations to the general assembly on or before February 15, 1988.

Sec. 9. Section 22a-234 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

(a) There is established an advisory board for solid waste management alternatives. The board shall consist of six members as follows: A person expert in health risk analysis, a professional engineer familiar with resources recovery technology, one person experienced in environmental monitoring,

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

one person representing the council on environmental quality, one person representing an environmental group, one person representing a municipality where a resources recovery facility is located, [;] ONE PERSON REPRESENTING RECYCLING INDUSTRIES and the commissioner of health services or his designee. The members shall serve terms of three years and shall be appointed as follows: [Two] THREE by the governor, two by the speaker of the house of representatives and two by the president pro tempore of the senate. The appointment of the member representing the municipality where a resources recovery facility is located shall be approved by the chief elected official of such municipality. Each appointed member shall be entitled to reimbursement for reasonable and necessary traveling expenses incurred in the performance of his duties. The board shall elect a chairman from among its membership at the first meeting. The board shall meet at least once in each quarter of the calendar year and at such other times as the chairman deems necessary.

(b) The board shall report annually to the commissioners of environmental protection and health services on the status of the program regulating resources recovery facilities, including testing and sampling methodologies, standards achieved in the resources recovery industry, relevant research and testing programs and alternatives to resources recovery, including, but not limited to, source separation, recycling, innovative land disposal practices and bulky waste disposal alternatives. The board may make recommendations concerning criteria, testing methodologies and modifications to statutes and regulations. Notwithstanding the provisions of this section, the board shall immediately report to said commissioners any significant finding in resources recovery technology affecting public health.

(c) The board may receive funds from any source and expend such funds as may be necessary to carry out its duties. The board may seek funding and provide financial support to organizations for activities concerned with solid waste management.

Sec. 10. Section 22a-241 of the general

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

(a) There shall be established a municipal solid waste recycling program. The commissioner of environmental protection, in consultation and coordination with the [task force] ADVISORY COUNCIL established under subsection (c) of this section, shall develop a plan for such program. The plan shall (1) be consistent with the state-wide solid waste management plan adopted pursuant with the section 22a-228, (2) give priority in all parts of the plan to regional approaches to the recycling of solid waste, (3) provide for grants from the municipal solid waste recycling trust fund established under subsection (d) of this section to municipalities for purposes which may include but shall not be limited to (A) the acquisition or lease of land, easements, structures, machinery and equipment, for solid waste recycling facilities, (b) the planning, design, construction and improvements of solid waste recycling facilities, (C) the purchase or lease of collection equipment and materials for municipalities and homeowners to carry out municipal recycling programs and (D) the support and expansion of municipal solid waste recycling programs, (4) establish standards for municipalities which shall effect the maximum level of recycling and source separation, condition each grant to a municipality under subdivision (3) of this subsection on the adoption of such standards by the municipality and give priority in the making of such grants to municipalities which, on July 17, 1986, require residents and businesses to separate recyclables from solid waste, (5) provide for the development of intermediate centers for the processing of solid waste recyclables, giving priority to sites where waste-to-energy facilities are located or planned to be located, (6) provide for financial assistance from the municipal solid waste recycling trust fund for the development of such centers and (7) review existing contracts entered into by municipalities for the delivery of solid waste to waste-to-energy facilities and provide financial incentives to such municipalities for the coordination of such contracts with the municipal

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

solid waste recycling program.

(b) The commissioner of environmental protection, in consultation with such [task force] ADVISORY COUNCIL, shall submit the plan developed under subsection (a) of this section to the governor and the general assembly not later than January 1, 1987, and, if the general assembly adopts a resolution approving such plan, the commissioner shall implement the municipal solid waste recycling program not later than April 1, 1987, in accordance with the provisions of such plan, and the commissioner shall adopt regulations in accordance with the provisions of chapter 54 to carry out the purposes of such program. IN IMPLEMENTING SUCH PROGRAM THE COMMISSIONER SHALL UTILIZE PRIVATE RECYCLING MARKETS TO THE EXTENT FEASIBLE.

(c) There is established [a task force to assist in the development of the municipal solid waste recycling program. The task force] AN ADVISORY COUNCIL TO ADVISE THE COMMISSIONER OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ON IMPLEMENTATION OF THE MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE RECYCLING PROGRAM. THE ADVISORY COUNCIL shall consist of: The secretary of the office of policy and management, or his designee; the commissioner of economic development, or his designee; the chairman of the Connecticut resources recovery authority, or his designee; one person representing a municipality having a population of not more than ten thousand, one person representing a municipality having a population of more than fifty thousand but not more than one hundred thousand and one person representing a municipality having a population of more than one hundred thousand, one each of whom shall be appointed by the president pro tempore of the senate, the minority leader of the senate, the speaker of the house of representatives and the minority leader of the house of representatives; two members of the public, one of whom shall be appointed by the speaker of the house of representatives and one of whom shall be appointed by the president pro tempore of the senate; [and four] TWO PERSONS REPRESENTING RECYCLING INDUSTRIES, ONE OF WHOM SHALL BE APPOINTED BY THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND ONE BY THE MAJORITY LEADER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 27, 1987

ONE PERSON REPRESENTING AN ENVIRONMENTAL ORGANIZATION TO BE APPOINTED BY THE MINORITY LEADER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND ONE PERSON REPRESENTING BUSINESS AND INDUSTRY TO BE APPOINTED BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE, AND SIX members of the general assembly [, two of whom shall be appointed by the speaker of the house of representatives and two of whom shall be appointed by the president pro tempore of the senate] TO BE APPOINTED AS FOLLOWS: TWO BY THE SPEAKER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES, TWO BY THE PRESIDENT PRO TEMPORE OF THE SENATE, ONE BY THE MINORITY LEADER OF THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES AND ONE BY THE MINORITY LEADER OF THE SENATE. The members of the task force shall elect a chairman, who shall be one of the members appointed by the speaker of the house of representatives or by the president pro tempore of the senate.

(d) There is established a fund to be known as the "municipal solid waste recycling trust fund". The fund shall contain any moneys required by law to be deposited in the fund and shall be held separate and apart from all other moneys, funds and accounts. Investment earnings credited to the assets of said fund shall become part of the assets of said fund. Any balance remaining in said fund at the end of any fiscal year shall be carried forward in said fund for the fiscal year next succeeding.

(e) The commissioner of environmental protection may accept and receive on behalf of said fund any available federal, state or private funds. Any such funds shall be deposited in said fund.

(f) The proceeds of said fund shall be applied to the municipal solid waste recycling program established under subsection (a) of this section, provided (1) not more than fifty thousand dollars shall be allocated, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1987, to the commissioner of environmental protection for the implementation of such program; [and] (2) not more than one hundred thousand dollars shall be allocated for the expenses of the [task force] ADVISORY COUNCIL established under subsection (c) of this section, (3) NOT MORE THAN TWO AND ONE-HALF PERCENT SHALL BE ANNUALLY ALLOCATED TO THE DEPARTMENT OF EN-

aak

47

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

VIRONMENTAL PROTECTION FOR COSTS INCURRED IN THE ADMINISTRATION OF SUCH PROGRAM AND (4) NOT MORE THAN TWO HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS SHALL BE ALLOCATED TO THE COMMISSIONER OF ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION FOR THE FISCAL YEAR ENDING JUNE 30, 1988, AS FOLLOWS: ONE HUNDRED FIFTY THOUSAND DOLLARS SHALL BE EXPENDED FOR MARKETING STUDIES OF RECYCLED PRODUCTS AND ONE HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS SHALL BE EXPENDED FOR THE STUDY OF REUSE OR RECYCLING OF ASH FROM RESOURCES RECOVERY FACILITIES.

Sec. 11. The municipal solid waste recycling advisory council shall study state purchasing procedures. The commissioner of administrative services, or his designee, shall be a member of the council on matters pertaining to state purchasing procedures. Said advisory council shall submit on or before February 15, 1988, recommendations to the joint standing committee on the environment for a schedule of minimum purchases of recyclable material, including recommendations on a pricing advantage for recycled goods purchased under competitive bidding.

Sec. 12. Subsection (c) of section 2c-2b of the general statutes is amended by adding subdivision (13) as follows:

(NEW) (13) Municipal Solid Waste Recycling Advisory Council, established under section 22a-241 of the general statutes as amended by section 10 of this act.

Sec. 13. This act shall take effect from its passage, except that sections 1 to 7, inclusive, shall take effect October 1, 1987."

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further?

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The bill itself is a landmark piece of legislation. It is the most important piece from the Environment Committee

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

this year. In previous years recycling bills were not successful for two reasons. First because there was no State assistance on recycling funding and second because there was grassroots support for source separation. This year both the fiscal and political climate is different. The garbage is finally deep enough and citizens unhappy enough about disposal alternatives that they are finally willing the necessity for recycling. The pluses of this program that we are about to embark on are that certain materials that we wish to recycle are better not burned in resource recovery plants for plant efficiency. So it's actually good for the plants if we can remove them.

Another plus, we will be able to stretch the landfill space if we can reduce the solid waste stream. This bill fits neatly with the previously endorsed \$13 million for recycling grants that this House has already approved. The bill does give plenty of advance warning to municipalities and citizens and I'll just go through the deadlines in the bill.

By June 1, 1988, DEP must set forth its

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

strategy to recycle at least 25% of the state's solid waste. By next February, DEP will adopt a list of recycleable materials that the municipalities will recycle three months after the nearest IPC or Intermediate Processing Center or local center if they choose to do it locally is available.

Within 9 months of the DEP list municipalities must develop a strategy for recycling their listed items. They will be asked to choose either a local or regional option. If they do not choose either plan, the State can direct the recycleable items of the municipality to an IPC.

The teeth in the bill are, is the requirement that as of January 1, 1991, recycleable items will be prohibited from being landfilled or incinerated in the State of Connecticut. This is language borrowed from the State of Oregon. Recognizing that in a few towns, municipalities are bound by contract to produce a certain amount of waste, we are adding language that there will be no penalty against a municipality if the resource recovery contract commitment reduces the amount a municipality is able to recycle. This is a bill whose time has come and

aak

50

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

I hope that you will join the Environment Committee in support of the bill and also this summer, I hope that you go home to your towns and encourage them to come forth and seek grants from the \$13 million trust fund.

At this point I would like to yield to Representative Joyce for an Amendment and I'd also like to thank Representative David Anderson who is a major significant author of the recycling plan.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Joyce.

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk has an Amendment LCO 7292. Would he please call and read.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

The Clerk has Amendment LCO 7292, House "B". Will the Clerk please call and read.

CLERK:

LCO 7292 designated House "B" offered by Representative Joyce.

In line 90, strike out "resource" and insert "resources" in lieu thereof

In line 91, after "incineration" insert ", except as provided in section 7 of this act"

aak

51

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Joyce.

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

I move adoption of the Amendment, sir.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark?

REP. JOYCE: (25th)

In section 7 of the bill, in effect the towns are exempt who have a contract to deliver a certain amount of waste to a resource recovery plant each year and if they don't deliver that minimum, they are penalized, they have to pay for it anyway. Through an oversight, when the bill was drafted, section 6 says that the resource recovery plants cannot accept any recycleable waste. What this amendment does is say that in this case, the provisions of section 7 the resource recovery plants may accept this waste and by doing this we correct the dilemma. I urge adoption of the Amendment, sir.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "B". If not all those in favor of the....

aak

52

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

No, Representative Gelsi, no, all those in favor of the Amendment please indicate by saying Aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

All those to the contrary, Nay.

The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further?

Representative Gelsi.

REP. GELSI: (58th)

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask a couple question to the proponent of the bill.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Please frame your question.

REP. GELSI: (58th)

Madam, could you tell us or give us some ideas on what items would be recycleable by municipalities and held back from the regular garbage collection?

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you, the

aak

53

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

actual list will be drawn up by the DEP but I can guess what some of the items will be. They are items that are already currently marketable, such as scrap glass, scrap metals, corrugated cardboard, newspaper, waste oil.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Gelsi.

REP. GELSI: (58th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, in studying this bill did anybody figure on how many carts we are going to be hauling behind trash trucks to try and pick up the recycleable or how many more trucks we are going to have to put on to do this other than the normal trash pickup that would happen once a week?

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The committee did consider that and that is why the bill is accompanied by a \$13 million trust fund for grants to municipalities

aak

54

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

for additional racks for trucks, or even trucks if your municipality wishes to apply for the grants, it would be advisable.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Gelsi.

REP. GELSI: (58th)

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to thank the Chairman of the Environment Committee for her answers and I guess I have a problem with the mandate of the bill. There is nothing wrong with the \$13 million. I guess the municipalities that want to do it can go out and I don't know how many trash trucks we're going to buy but I think the new ones are running about \$180,000 close to \$200,000 for a two man trash truck so they can continue to move down the road. Our community went into paper recycling some 15 years ago. It's worked well for us, we tow a cart behind the trash truck, except in certain areas of towns you can't do that because the streets are too narrow so that paper ends up going into the trash and being burnt. I just have a problem that we are either going to have to double the amount of trucks that we put on the road and how are we going to do

aak

55

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

this? I know when we spoke about the previous bill they looked at New Jersey and they looked at Oregon and they looked at some of these other places that do it, but I know that New Jersey did it, I can tell you why. They were a little bit smarter than we were, they didn't go along with the bottle bill and deposits on it, so instead of going along with the bottle bill, they said, okay, we're going to recycle all of your glass. They don't care whether it's tomato juice, or beer, or wine or whatever it is, all the glass gets recycled. That doesn't happen in the State of Connecticut, so we're still leaving a bottle bill there, where our citizens are going to be harassed and taking junk back to the stores, yet we are going to have them recycle the other glass that they are now throwing away and we're going to eventually the municipalities are going to start when the \$13 million runs out are going to start picking up the cost for the State telling them to do it.

I think I realize the problems on having dumps in this State. Ours was one of the first ones that was closed down. Our tipping fees jumped by 200%

aak

56

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

the first year. We had to go to an outside dump. But we're paying recycling recovery, we're going to be paying \$25 a ton. I think if we are going to be doing recycling, the recycling should be done at the source rather than costing the community more money to do it on a local level, transport it all over heck and creation, and then still pay a \$25 tipping fee, absolutely does not make any sense to me and maybe what we should be looking at is Wisconsin which does the changing of it at the resource recovery plants. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further? Representative
LESCOE: (49th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, a question for the
proponent of the bill.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Please frame your question.

REP. LESCOE: (49th)

Mary, on, I'm in firm support of the re-
cycling plant. In Windham we presently have a
energy recover facility that is a model T that's
cost us over \$2.5 million in debts so far.

aak

57

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

\$600,000 to operate. We see no light at the end of the tunnel. We also have a landfill also in our town and as a Representative from Windham, I'm only concerned about future costs for a substation or a station for recycling in our area.

As you stated, we have \$13 million, money available, but my question to you is, would we be guaranteed money from the State as long as this runs or will municipalities such as mine have to take up the fixed costs in the future?

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The plan is for the State to subsidize the construction of the IPC's. That's the major difference between this year's bill and previous bills that have failed in the legislature. For the first time the State of Connecticut is funding the construction of the IPCs, so that is why Representative Gelsi's comments are not correct. It used to cost towns to recycle and that is why they

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

didn't do it. Now the State is picking up the cost of the IPCs because we didn't get our bill out of Finance Committee this year, we will proceed more slowly than planned, but we do have enough money to start with two IPCs and we will have to continue in the budget next year with the others.

So the town costs are basically just collection. You no longer are responsible for processing the recycleables because the State will pay for that end of it. That is why the OLR fiscal note on the bill itself say that this program will be a reduced cost, a savings to municipalities by reducing the tonnage with a high tip fee, your towns should see a savings, not a cost. Your particular Windham plant is a problem, mainly because it is undersized, you don't have, you no longer have the diaper plant buying the steam, you don't have anyone buying the energy supply and the plant is not able to generate enough electricity to sell to the grid to offset the cost. That's the root cause of your financial problems at that plant. It's really too small to be economically successful, particularly without a purchaser of your steam.

aak

59

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

REP. LESCOE: (49th)

Thank you.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on the bill?

Representative Farr.

REP. FARR: (19th)

Mr. Speaker, speaking briefly on behalf of the bill. I just want to share with the Chamber some of the experiences our community has had. I was one of the authors of West Hartford's mandatory recycling bill, which was the first one in the State. What we did in our community was mandated the recycling of newspapers. It has in fact been a model. It has worked extremely well. We have in our community another model which is the recycling of our leaves. We pick up our leaves in the streets and compost those leaves, they don't end up in the waste stream. We also as many communities do, recycle white goods, the refrigerators the stoves, etc.

The fact of the matter is, that when we try to deal with solid waste, we've gone from landfills, which we were concerned about because

aak

60

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

of ground water contaminations to energy recovery plants which we now find caused both air pollution and ground water problems. And there is no simple solution to waste management and waste disposal, except for recycling. Recycling has no environmental cost. I think this is an excellent bill. I would point out that there are going to be problems in terms of recycling. The biggest problem we're going to face is in our urbanized areas. Our experience in West Hartford is that it works very well in single family homes. You can in fact require newspaper recycling, you can in fact have people recycle bottles, etc. When you get into urbanized areas and you have dumpsters, it becomes much more difficult for recycling.

Our problem was that in apartment buildings. You can ask the landlord to tell his tenants to separate newspapers, but when somebody in the middle of the night throws a pile of newspapers into the dumpster, it's very difficult to figure out who did that and that's going to be one of our major problems, is recycling in our urbanized areas. That's why it hasn't been successful in the past and

aak

61

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

and it's going to be difficult to deal with. We have also been very successful in terms of commercial recycling. We've dealt with the large producers of corrugated. We've met with the various corrugated producers and had them recycle that. Again, the problem there is when you get into the small shops, we dealt with the owners of West Farms Mall and when they deal with 100 different shops, it's very difficult for them to police the 100 shops to make sure that they are in fact separating out the corrugated. There are going to be difficulties. I think this is an excellent first step. I think this is what we are going to have to do. It's going to take a lot of work and it's going to take more than simply a mandate. It's going to take a real effort on the part of each municipality to make recycling successful and I hope you'll all encourage your municipalities to participate in this.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further? Representative Anderson.

REP. ANDERSON: (45th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'd like to thank

aak

62

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

the Chairman of the Environment Committee for her kind remarks and thank the Environment Committee for its support. I'd just like to point out one very simply thing in terms of the avoided cost.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Anderson, just a moment please. The noise level is once again rising and the Chair would encourage members to give your attention to the speaker. Representative Anderson.

REP. ANDERSON: (45th)

I'd just like to point out the simply example of putting cans and bottles in the truck, paying a \$50, \$60 tipping fee to take them to an incinerator, putting them in the incinerator and they don't burn. Not only that, they clog up the grates, they lower the BTU value, they raise the cost of running the incinerator, then they come out the other end of incinerator and you put them back in another truck and you take them to a landfill. And these items will take up 50% of the volume in the landfill. Now that's just senseless. I think you'll agree. If you add to that the problems of public health, of putting some of these items in an incinerator, the

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

heavy metals, the dioxins and so forth, you just have to go the recycling route. There are many arguments for it. We talk about 25% reduction, that's by weight, but if you look at volume, you're talking up to 50% and 60% reduction and it's volume that uses up your landfill.

So, it's the avoided cost, in other words, if you are paying \$50.00 and you tell them to take them and you can take them to a center like Groton has for nothing or even pay \$10.00, the municipalities are going to save alot of money and this is the way we have to go and I hope that we all support this very important first step to follow the examples set by Rhode Island, by Massachusetts, by New Jersey and in fact, just last week in the very exciting with the marketing study that we have, we have been asked and invited by Rhode Island and Massachusetts to participate in a joint marketing study which is very important, because marketing is a regional problem and I'm very happy to see that we are moving forward, I strongly urge support of the bill and the Amendment.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on the bill?

Representative Fusco.

REP. FUSCO: (81st)

Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, first of all I'd like to commend Representatives Mushinsky and Anderson and the Environment Committee for bringing out such a balanced bill in this session of the legislature. In my Town of Southington we have been involved in recycling of paper and glass for a number of years now, part of it funded by the community and part of it funded by a pilot program which was established by this legislative body.

There have been the ups and downs of the recycling program in Southington and overall it's been a break even proposition at best, but we have reduced our volume and the paper and glass in the community is being recycled. When we got involved with the many town trash energy plant in Bristol, there was a concern locally, that we weren't going to be able to meet our tonage and that concern, I strongly thought would dwindle over the years as the population increased and the volume increased. You've got a good balanced bill here and I think it's about

aak

65

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

time and I thank the Environment Committee for their fine work.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will members please be seated. Staff and guests to the Well of the House. Far too many lights on the board right now. Everyone should reconsider how crucial your remarks are on this bill.

Representative Belden.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to join the other members, rising in support of this file as amended. It's a gigantic first step and I'm sure that the bill will have to be modified and changed and tweaked over the years as problems do in fact occur and Representative Joyce was certainly right on the mark and his amendment responded to one of the questions that I was going to ask and that was how were the towns going to handle their tonage commitments with the various programs that in effect. I hoping in future years, perhaps that can be contractual, can be worked out within the various resource recovery authorities and the various operators of the waste reduction facilities. Mr.

aak

66

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

Speaker, I do have a couple of very minor amendments I would like to offer. Would the Clerk please call LCO 7869. Call and read please.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

The Clerk has Amendment LCO 7869, House "C".
Would the Clerk please call and read.

CLERK:

LCO 7869 designated House "C" offered by
Representative Belden.

In line 24, after the period add the following: "In adopting such regulations, the commissioner shall consider the cost of recycling such items to municipalities versus the environmental impact if such items are not recycled."

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Belden.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark?

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Mr. Speaker, I believe that this Amendment might to some degree address Representative Gelsi's

aak

67

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

concerns and that is when the commissioner is adopting the regulations required under the File, that he will consider the return on investment theory and that is to take a look and say maybe there's no way we can recycle plastic combs, there's not enough of them, what comes out of the waste stream would not be significant from an environmental situation, so I believe it's a very simply Amendment Mr. Speaker, and I move for its passage.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "C"? Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think this Amendment is an insult to the DEP commissioner. The commissioner is not going to picking items that are not cost effective. The whole point of having the list as was done in Oregon, is to target those items that are either so toxic that they are a major problem that, for the ash, or they are so marketable that it would be a sin not to market them in volume. This is already going to done by the commissioner and while the language doesn't certainly hurt, it's

aak

68

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

a real slap in the face to the DEP commissioner and I would urge its rejection.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on the Amendment?

Representative Belden.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Mr. Speaker, this Amendment in no way is to insult any commissioner, DEP, present, past or future. We have an obligation over here to set policy and what we put in the law is what ends up in the regulations. And I think the File is, talks about regulations and whatnot and I think this is just to clarify the consideration that should be given as to whether or not the regulation should include that as part of criteria, to consider whether or not an item is in fact, can be effectively recycled. I don't think that it's certainly not intended to insult anybody and I would hope that any commissioner over in any of the agencies would not feel that us passing a law that delineates policy and what we would like to have in the regulations, is an insult, because I think that all of our commissioners should have a thicker skin than that.

aak

69

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

This is a very simple Amendment, it doesn't need extensive debate, but if anyone wants to add anything on this issue, Representative Casey.

REP. CASEY: (118th)

It is a very simple amendment and it comes down to statute or regulation. We have a very good regulation process, regulation review process a public hearing process on the regulations review. This concept can be incorporated in the regulation process. It's not needed in statute.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further. Representative Fusco.

REP. FUSCO: (81st)

Mr. Speaker, briefly in opposition to the Amendment. I believe that the Amendment is not needed simply because the commissioner already has the authority to do that as Representative Casey mentioned, the regulation process is there and if you are going to have an Amendment like this, this Amendment certainly does not go far enough in that

aak

70

House of Representatives Thursday, May 28, 1987

you should also take into consideration the damaging effect to our ground water aquifers for those items that are not cost effective to recycle, but if you multiply the cost of the damage that they do, they certainly would be cost effective. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, all those in favor of the Amendment, please indicate by saying Aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

All those to the contrary, Nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Nay.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

The Nays clearly have it. The Amendment is defeated. Will you remark further on the bill?

Representative Belden.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Mr. Speaker, I guess our message over across the way is you can put in anything you want in

aak

71

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

regulations or anything you don't want just leave out, because now there is no mandate for the commissioner of environmental protection to look at what he puts on the list and its relative impact on the municipalities at this state.

I'm amazed at some of the responses I just heard here from some of the members, we don't need it. We can all go home, we can let the commissioners run their own operations without anything. This was a very simply amendment, really was.

And I've heard the debate here many times. Those people over there are not doing what we told them to do. Well we're not going to tell them what to do here. We don't want to insult them and leave it up to them. And believe me when it comes back it there is something in the regulations dealing with this issue and somebody doesn't like it, let me tell you what's going to happen. The committee of regulation review is going to say it wasn't the intent of the legislature because it's not in the law and guess what, there was an Amendment offered and it was defeated. There will be no consideration of municipal costs here. Because now

aak

72

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

we put it on the record.

I realize it's getting near the end of the session and we're all getting tired and perhaps we're not all following as well as we ought to and that's the role of this Chamber, that's the role of this Chamber. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has another Amendment, LCO 8121. Call and read please.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

The Clerk has an Amendment LCO 8128, House Amendment Schedule "D". Will the Clerk please call.

CLERK:

LCO 8128 designated House "D" offered
by Representative Belden.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

I think just call. If you explain it it will be easier. Is there objection to summarization. Representative Belden.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Amendment merely strikes out the word materials as it is called out in the File. It strikes out the word items, excuse me and replaces it with the word

aak

73

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

materials. Mr. Speaker, I move adoption.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark?

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, very briefly. I think materials is more realistically covers the description of what we're trying to recycle rather than items. And that's essentially all the Amendment does. Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to note that this is one of the first Amendments hot off the press out of LCO since they had their little thing this morning. Just still a little warm on the bottom here and there.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Oh, come on, Representative Belden.

Is that an item or is that material Representative Belden. Will you remark further on House "D"? Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Mr. Speaker, I'm going to object to this Amendment and I hope my colleagues will reject it. The word item is better than the word material for a particular reason. Some of the recyclables that

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

we expect to appear on the list are things like car batteries, which have a heavy lead content. If you say material, I'm afraid you are going to miss some of the items that ought to be on the list.

Material would cover things like corrugated cardboard, it could be a generic term for the glass that we collect, but items would bring in a few more things and I think Representative Belden should leave the task forces words alone.

I would like to point out, I realize that you are worried about the towns, but I would like to point out that the task force on which Representative Anderson sat and chaired does have many municipal representatives and they have had their fingerprints all over this bill. One of the members is a municipality of not more than ten thousand, a very small town, one is a municipality more than ten thousand but not more than fifty. Another member is from a municipality more than fifty thousand but not more than one hundred and another member from a municipality with a population of more than one hundred thousand, so in other words, we have had input from every sized town and city on this task

aak

75

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

force in making their recommendations. And we are, in this bill we are making this group permanent so they will be permanent advisors to DEP and they will say to the commissioner this is a good thing to recycle, this is not a good thing to recycle, this is too much nuisance for us, this works out.

We have plenty of municipal input here and I do not feel that you have to increase it. I think it's working just fine. We have also added six members of the General Assembly and perhaps you can ask your Minority Leader to appoint you, Representative Belden as one of the six and you'll have even further input.

I'd ask my colleagues to reject this Amendment which just confuses the recyclables.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on House "D".

Representative Farr.

REP. FARR: (19th)

Mr. Speaker. I just point out to the Body my concern, and my name is on the Amendment too is the part of the Amendment that describes line 87, and I pointed this out in Committee. That what

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

the present bill says is that the resource recovery plant shall reject any item that is listed on the that's determined to be recyclable and I think the problem that I had there is that when we talk about any item is that our experience in my community has been that you never going to get a pure stream if you are dealing with an apartment building etc. that you are going to have people who are going to throw in bundle of newspaper into the dumpster and that if you have a law that says that they shall reject any I believe it says, no item required to be recycled, pursuant to the regulations, shall be knowingly accepted by a landfill for disposal or by a resource recovery facility for incineration and the concern that I had was that knowingly accepted means if you have newspaper as an item to be recycled, which I assume will be because it is the most easily recyclable one, that if a dumpster pulls up and its got a newspaper on the top, they can't accept it because under a literal reading of the law, because of the fact that they are not to accept any item.

Now I recognize that maybe good sense will prevail in our laws would not, but I would hope that

aak

77

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

perhaps our laws would be consisten with good sense.

As far as Representative Mushinsky's argument and I unfortunately heard it before, that other people's fingerprints are all over this and this is a compromised bill and it's a good bill and I agree with that, but then she goes one step further and says that we are in effect we ought not put our fingerprints on this and make and shape the bill because everybody else is in agreement. I think we have an obligation to do that. I do think she has she does make sense when she refers to item on line 21 the intent of this is not to prohibit the commissioner from identifying batteries as a material but instead to try to broaden slightly the definition of the term item to include material so that if a dumpster shows up and it has one newspaper, it doesn't get rejected, but instead it gets rejected if it has material in it which would be interpreted as something simply as one item. Thank you.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on House "D"? If not, all those in favor of the Amendment please indicate by saying Aye.

aak

78

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

All those to the contrary, No.

REPRESENTATIVES:

No.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

The Amendment is defeated.

Will you remark further on the bill. If not, will members please be seated. Staff and guests to the Well of the House. Representative Samowitz.

REP. SAMOWITZ: (129th)

On the bill itself. I have a question to the distinguished Chairman of the Environment Committee.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Please frame your question.

REP. SAMOWITZ: (129th)

I've heard him talk about this bill may ultimately lead to a system whereby somebody wants to throw out their garbage, may have to have one bag for paper, one bag for plastics and one bag for everything else. Is this something that may come as a result of this bill or is this just myth or

aak

79

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

what is this that we hear about this problem?

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: (85th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I should have explained more about how this will work. My apologies to the Chamber.

The State plan is for the households to have two canisters, one is for recyclables that are mixed together and one is for other garbage and the newspapers are bundled separately. We decided that it was probably impossible to train the citizens to separate every recyclable separately. So, all we are asking them to do is to learn the list of recyclables and put them in one cannister and the regular garbage in the other cannister. The recyclable cannister which is a different color is put out on the curb and picked up. The recyclables cannister goes to an intermediate process center or IPC and maybe five or seven towns would share one IPC. At the IPC the mixed recyclables are dumped

aak

80

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

on a conveyor belt and they are hand sorted by workers there into the paper, recyclable plastics the glass, the metals and so forth and then they are purely packaged up, each one separately and off to the manufacturer they go to be melted down or made into pulp or whatever is their destination.

So for your constituents purposes, you should let them know that they will by 1991 they will be asked to keep their recyclables separate from their regular garbage. They just need to do two sort and the grant will pay for extra collections and extra cannisters if you'd like to get two different cannisters for every house in Bridgeport, put your application in for the grant money.

Also I'd like to reassure Representative Farr, as I tried to do in the Appropriations Committee that in real life I don't foresee a load of trash being rejected at the gate because it has one bundle of newspapers in it. That is not what happens in Groton at the only existing IPC. But this language is in here because we really mean business. We don't want loads to continually come in in violation and that's why this language

aak

81

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

is here and once in a while citizens will make a mistake and I think the experience at Groton is that they look the other way and let it come in. But if it's a consistent pattern of abuse, we do want to be able to turn away the load and tell the collector that he has to get the message back to the constituents to sort their trash or he won't be able to dispose of it for them. And that is the only way we have of enforcing this recycling. When the hauler finds that he cannot his load because his patrons have not cooperated and that's really why that language has to remain there.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Samowitz.

REP. SAMOWITZ: (129th)

Thank you Representative Mushinsky for your forthright answers. I have a big problem with this concept over here. Two hundred years ago we wrote a Constitution and we wrote things that say let's go for pursuit of happiness and pursuit of happiness means to me that when you want to go and go out to a restaurant and get some fried chicken in a box that you can eat your fried chicken, you

aak

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

can take and out of the box you can take your fried chicken, you can take your cannisters of soda and after you are done with it you can dump it in one place. It doesn't mean to me having a hundred different places to dump it in. As Representative Farr points out, in many areas a system that has recyclables in one place is not going to work because it's difficult enough to have people put their garbage in one place, let alone three different or two different cannisters. Right now, Governor O'Neill down in Philadelphia where the Constitution is and the Constitution says and the Declaration of Independence says that the Government is supposed to make things for the pursuit of happiness. This, to me, is such an infringement on people's rights to do whatever they please. More mandates, more government and we ought to tell Governor O'Neill to take that Constitution and throw that away except I don't what cannister to put it in right now. Thank you.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further on the bill?

Representative Hoyer.

aak

83

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

REP. HOYE: (37th)

Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to say for the record that I come from a town, a shore town of about 15,000 population whose population doubles during the summertime and we have had mandatory recycling since 1974 and it has worked totally successful with absolutely no problems and I just called for a

Mr. Speaker, I just wanted to say for the record that I come from a town, a shore town of about 15,000 population whose population doubles during the summertime and we have had mandatory recycling since 1974. And it has worked totally successful with absolutely no problems and I just called for a point of information my first selectman, and in the month of April we recycled 104 tons of material that was taken out of our dump.

So we need the support of this bill, and please vote for it.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will you remark further? Representative Brown.

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, although I'm used to this Chamber and the legislative process, I've had the privilege since January of serving on the Recycling Task Force and I want to thank all the members of the task force and Representative Mushinsky, Representative Bertinuson, Representative Anderson, and all the citizens who persevered over the years to get this legislation to this House today. 20 years ago the policy of this

nd

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

state was, out of sight, out of mind. Throw it in the landfill, and we know what happens. And I'm proud to say that 20 years from now, people will look back at what we did, and say, they didn't believe in a throw away society, they believed in the conservation of our natural resources.

They believed in a future for all of us, and I think that's what this legislation is all about. The Constitution preserves our right to a clean environment, and that's what this legislation is all about. And to answer some of the considerations that were raised today, I think as policy makers we have to say where do we want to go and plan to get there, not to say, where are we today and how we can stay there. Thank you.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Representative Gordes.

REP. GORDES: (62nd)

Mr. Speaker, thank you. The honeymoon is over, and I don't mean mine, I mean Connecticut's honeymoon..

(applause)

I mean Connecticut and the nation's honeymoon with waste. Last week we heard Representative O'Neill tell us about life, liberty and property, and when we think about how

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

we've treated property in this country for 200 years, it's rather disgusting, we wore it out and then in manifest destiny, we moved West to wear out more land. Today I hear from my colleague about life, liberty and the pursuit of happiness meaning we can throw anything anywhere we want.

Well, those liberties are there. You know last year we celebrated the Statue of Liberty in a big way, and yet we do not have a statue of responsibility on the other coast, and I think it's time that we take that into account. The responsibility to take care of our waste through recycling.

In other types of things we have tempered those liberties, in 1954, in a Supreme Court decision, they found that no longer can somebody just decimate the land, that if they were going to clear cut trees, they had to replant, and they came out with a pact with the unborn, so that those people would also have resources for the future, and I think we ought to do the same thing. As far as the cost of Representative Belden's comb, we have to look at those costs.

Right now this country imports 38% of its energy

nd

87

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

from places that are none too friendly to us in some cases. Plastic combs have an energy input into the manufacturer, that number is going to go up to 60% by the early 90's. So what is the true cost of the comb? What is the true cost of recycling? The paper, we import about 1/3 of our paper in wood products.

What's the cost of our trade deficit, and these things must also be folded into it. In closing, in support of this bill, I would be remiss in not saying that people have said this is a first step. I consider the bottle bill to have been the first step, and I'm very proud to say that I represent the 62nd District, and it was Russell Post who also once represented this district.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Will members please be seated, staff and guests to the Well of the House. The Chair feels obliged to report we have put together a "go" list today that could conclude anywhere between 5 and 12 this evening. The oratorical exposition on this item has been impressive it's up to the Chamber to decide how necessary it is on the remaining 40 items before us today.

nd

88

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

Members please be seated, staff and guests to the Well of the House, the machine will be open.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is now voting by roll, members return to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is now voting by roll, members return to the Chamber immediately.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted and is your vote properly recorded? If all the members have voted and your vote is properly recorded, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. The Speaker in the affirmative. The Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5686, as amended by House Amendments "A" and "B":

Total number Voting	144
Necessary for Adoption	73
Those voting Yea	141
Those voting Nay	3
Those absent and not Voting	7

nd

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 28, 1987

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

The bill as amended is passed.

(applause)

Representative Ritter, for what purpose do you rise sir?

The Clerk please return to the Call of the Calendar. Oh, just a moment, are there announcements or points of personal privilege? Representative Patricia Dillon.

REP. DILLON: (92nd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, for the purposes of introduction.

SPEAKER STOLBERG:

We have some youngsters in the balcony, I would urge them to be seated and not hang over the rails, I'd hate to catch one of you down here. Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON: (92nd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, and members of the Chamber, today in the gallery we have some students from Delsi Leves 4th grade class at Edgewood School, and I understand also from Mrs. Chime's class in 1st grade at Edgewood School. Partly the special arrangements made by the Speaker as it was difficult for us to get a tour through the League of Women Voters, I'm proud to say that Edgewood

S-275

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS

1987

VOL. 30

PART 14

4816-5199

MONDAY
June 1, 1987

23
eg **4981**

Senator Barrows.

SENATOR BARROWS:

Can we have this Bill p.t.ed.

THE CHAIR:

The matter is p.t.ed.

THE CLERK:

Calendar No. 844, File 1033, Substitute for
H.B. 5686, AN ACT MANDATING RECYCLING IN MUNICIPALITIES.
As amended by House LCO Schedules "A" and "B". Favorable
report of the Committee on Appropriations.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meotti.

SENATOR MEOTTI:

Thank you Mr. President. I move acceptance of
the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of
the Bill in accordance with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark.

SENATOR MEOTTI:

Yes Mr. President. This Bill implements some of
the concepts in the area of mandatory recycling that
were developed by the task force set up last year by
the Legislature and refined and expanded by the

MONDAY
June 1, 1987

26
eg **4982**

Environment Committee this session.

It establishes a framework that is flexible both as to timing and as to the ability of towns to pursue options on a local or regional basis. It will also in accordance with the House LCO, provide funding for a necessary studies and staffing to implement this very important project.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks.

Senator Johnston.

SENATOR JOHNSTON:

Mr. President, as I read the amendment and the Bill together, there are two individuals that will represent recycling companies throughout the state. Private companies that will be on the advisory task force. But in the Bill itself where it talks about the Department of Environmental Protection to develop intermediate processing centers, my concern that those will be strictly government run.

We do have private industries out there that are in the business of recycling certain materials. And I ask for legislative intent in the record, I want to know if it is our intent to exclude those from any

MONDAY
June 1, 1987

27
eg

4983

plan that the DEP may develop as a result of this legislation.

SENATOR MEOTTI:

Through you Mr. President. A note, it is our intent that private recycling businesses should be blended into the state's program to the extent feasible. In fact, in the House LCO "A", that language is set forth on Lines 119 through 121 which states that "in implementing such program, the Commissioner shall utilize private recycling markets to the extent feasible."

We do not want to use the state's resources to duplicate existing private, sector capacities such as the recycling of paper, which is a fairly well-developed industry in the state, and other like recycling processors.

SENATOR JOHNSTON:

Thank you Mr. President. I had missed that. And I thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gunther.

SENATOR GUNTHER:

I rise to support the Bill. It is long overdue. Back when we put in CRRA, that was one of the deficiencies in that particular law was a disappointment to many

MONDAY
June 1, 1987

28 4984
eg

of us that we didn't include a mandatory recycling in that particular Bill at that time.

I think we would have been on board long before this. I think we have long ignored the fact that recycling is one of the major issues that we have to face up to. I know there are some people that I have talked with, said that oh this is overriding home rule. Well I can tell you for a long time there have been some communities in the State of Connecticut that have had these programs aboard.

It is time that we all got aboard. And I think this is a good approach to it. It gives the time table and within the next couple of years, recycling should be an entity in the State of Connecticut.

It is a good Bill and it should pass.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks.

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Thank you Mr. President. I wonder if I might just direct one question concerning an amendment. I don't know if there is a misprint in the file that we have.

MONDAY
June 1, 1987

29
eg

4985

THE CHAIR:

You may proceed.

SENATOR SMITH:

In Section 9 of House LCO Schedule "A". It says "there is establishing an advisory board for solid waste management alternative. The Board shall consist of six members as follows." And it would appear that there were eight.

Is that a technical revision that we need to make in this particular amendment, or is the file that we have incorrect?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meotti.

SENATOR MEOTTI:

Yes. Through you Mr. President. In the House LCO Line, if you are referring to Line. I would ask the Senator from the 8th District. Is that referring to the listing of six members in Line 44?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

Excuse me, through you Mr. President. I was looking at the file in the journal in the House and it

MONDAY
June 1, 1987

30 4986
eg

appears that that's where the inconsistency occurs.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meotti.

SENATOR MEOTTI:

Through you Mr. President. Just so I understand what we are talking about because I think he may be correct. We are talking about the membership on the advisory board for solid waste management alternatives?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Smith.

SENATOR SMITH:

That is correct.

Through you Mr. President I think we may require the actual membership, the amendment changed as the composition of the membership that lays it out in a serial fashion where it delineates the membership of the advisory board but does not change the initial language which specifies the total number of members on it.

If we can I would suggest that we correct that advisor's bill.

THE CHAIR:

Any objection?

MONDAY
June 1, 1987

3B
eg

4987

SENATOR MEOTTI:

I have no objection to doing that just so long that the record so indicates.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Further remarks. Senator Herbst.

SENATOR HERBST:

Thank you Mr. President. I rise to support this Bill because I think too, it is long and coming. Those of us who have served on the municipal level knows how valuable a program such as recycling can be, not only in terms of saving our landfill, but in terms of attempting to teach the public the importance of the situation we are facing with our landfills and with solid waste disposal.

I commend the Committee for bringing it forth. I know many municipalities are already involved but will continue to help. And I certainly hope that the Committee that is formed will go back to those municipalities that have already started these programs and get some ideas from them in order to adjudicate the situation in an easier manner.

THE CHAIR:

MONDAY
June 1, 1987

32 4988
eg

Further remarks.

Senator Maloney.

SENATOR MALONEY:

Thank you Mr. President. Through you to Senator Meotti, if you would allow a question sir.

THE CHAIR:

You may proceed.

SENATOR MALONEY:

Thank you. Senator, in reviewing the fiscal impact statement and in particular the municipal impact section thereof. I read that to say that in effect the best judgement available is an on balance and the bottom line, municipalities will not have additional financial burden. Is that a correct reading of the impact statement and your understanding of the Bill?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meotti.

SENATOR MEOTTI:

Yes. Through you, Mr. President. The theory behind the economic impact, financial impact of recycling municipalities is that recycling will pay for itself as a means of cost avoidance. We all know the tipping fees for delivery of a ton of solid waste to

MONDAY
June 1, 1987

33
eg

4989

a waste energy plant or a landfill to the extent landfills will exist in the next few years for this type of waste are escalating dramatically. And recycling which may in the years past have been non-economical because the costs were higher than what might have been the disposal cost per ton.

In the future it has become, it is very clear that the cost per ton for recycling should be less than the cost for disposal.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks. Senator Meotti.

SENATOR MEOTTI:

Mr. President. Let me just conclude. When taking into account, the income stream which can be generated from a recycling operation.

THE CHAIR:

Further remarks on the Bill. Senator Meotti.

SENATOR MEOTTI:

I ask that this be placed on the consent
calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

THE CLERK:

MONDAY
JUNE 1, 1987

173 5129
lc

SENATOR HARPER:

Thank you, Mr. President. The Appropriations Committee will meet tomorrow before the beginning of the first session, whichever chamber starts first. More than likely the House, to take up a Collective Bargaining Agreement.

THE CHAIR:

Will the clerk please now call the items placed on the consent calendar. And announcement for immediate roll call.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the chamber. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the chamber. Consent Calendar No. 1, Page 1, HS 105 Calendar No. 857, HB 7610 Calendar No. 772, Page 2, HB 7609 Calendar No. 835, Page 3, HB 5686 Calendar No. 844, Calendar No. HB 7648 Calendar No. 848, Page 4, HB 6417 Calendar No. 850, HB 7625 Calendar No. 852, Calendar HB 7083 No. 853, HB 7440 Calendar No. 855, Page 5, HB 6951 Calendar No. 856, HB 7188 Calendar No. 858, HB 7318 Calendar 859, Page 6, HB 7514 Calendar 860, HB 7596 Calendar No. 861, HB 5068 Calendar No. 862, Page 7, Calendar No. HB 5631 Calendar No. 867, HB 6652 Calendar No. 864, HB 7374 Calendar No. 504, SB 437 Page 8, SB 1209 Calendar No. 506, SB 97 Calendar No. 511, HB 6617 Calendar No. 557,

MONDAY
JUNE 1, 1987

174 5130
lc

Page 9, SB 889 and HB 7542 Calendar No. 817.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any corrections, additions, deletions?
If not, the machine is open. We're voting on the first
consent calendar. Senator Freedman.

SENATOR FREEDMAN:

The Calendar on Page 9 again. I think some numbers
were mentioned that we didn't have.

THE CLERK:

Page 9, Calendar No. 595, and Calendar No. 817.

SENATOR FREEDMAN:

Page 7.

THE CLERK:

867, 866, 504, and 864.

THE CHAIR:

I think HB 7374 Calendar No. 864 is on Page 6. It's the
right, the correct number. It was the matter that was
disputed before. Further corrections? If there be none,
the machine is open. Please cast your vote.

The machine is closed. Clerk, please tally the vote.

Result of the vote on the Consent Calendar:

33 Yea
0 Nay

The Consent Calendar is adopted. Senator O'Leary.

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

ENVIRONMENT
PART 2
375-726

1987

SR
96

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

KATIE FEIDELSON: (continued)

complex State-wide issues.

Bulky waste has been addressed by City Manager Driscoll; we support the purposes and intent of proposed Bill 5601, but we question the method of implementation. We think a State-wide approach is necessary.

As far as recycling is concerned, we support the recycling plan and the municipal solid waste recycling Task Force report which has worked in conjunction with the DEP. We would prefer their approach to the mandating approach to recycling an 5686, and we support a number of bills related to the Task Force's work as well as those that further its work and recommendations and extend the life of the Task Force.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you. Any questions?
Liz?

REP. BROWN: I appreciate the group that you work with sometimes its difficult, but in terms of from your vantage point, working with municipalities maybe you could shed some light on what is the best vehicle to site the intermediary processing centers? Do you see any - like through the regional planning agencies, or do you think you know - what we're affraid of is that what the gentleman over there said is that it would be a piecemeal approach and not a comprehensive thing. Any ideas on how to go about siting them so that they would be spread out and really do the job?

KATIE FEIDELSON: I would be presumptious for me to say that I could solve the land-fill or processing center siting, but I think that the State has to have a plan which provides for input by municipalities and I think that a process can be worked out. There are certainly precedence for siting, hazzadous waste facilities, for example. They're are precedents

JOEY CORCORAN: (continued)

Briefly on several other Bills the recycling task force deliberated at length on the issue of mandatory recycling. The public hearings we held indicated support for it in many instances, but ultimately the recommendations of the task force were to leave the options to the towns to decide how to achieve the goals set for them by the state and upon which grant dollars would be contingent.

So regarding House Bill 5686, I urge you to consider it in the context of the recycling plan. I fully support the Bills on composting and believe that adequate should be established at DEP for this purpose. Massachusetts is considering three or four staff just for composting, and has allocated ten million dollars for it.

New Jersey has a manual on composting for their municipalities. DEP too should be taking a leadership role in coordinating composting programs, and I feel that state money should not be allocated to individual composting projects before DEP's own plan is in place. Let's not perpetuate what we already realized with lake management, its best done in a comprehensive way.

Regarding 5020, 5204, 5232, 5233, 5498 and 5496. I recommend that a task force with the necessary funds be formed to perform marketing and packaging studies and tax incentives for recycling. This study could be funded out of the recycling trust fund.

Finally, regarding state procurement of recyclables, I support 5170 and 5313, and emphasize that paper procurement can be implemented in the immediate future. The state already has some experience and can look to Maryland as an excellent model. Representative Terry Bertinuson's Bill is especially to be commended in encouraging the state to look at the procurement of recyclables very broadly, not only on paper.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Do you have copies of your written testimony? You went through so many Bills that we having trouble keeping (interruption)

JOEY CORCORAN: I'm sorry, yes, I will submit it, its not in typed form right now.

118
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

JIM DOCKER: (continued)

only those trash-to-energy projects that are deemed necessary and no more.

Regarding House Bill 5205, which seeks to appropriate funds to DEP for staff to implement the recycling plan. This bill should also be favorably reported by the Committee. If recycling is to be given a fair opportunity to work, it is imperative that adequate resources be allocated by the State, with special emphasis given to helping the cities and towns implement their recycling programs.

House Bill 5205 calls for \$175,000 to be appropriated as the first step for implementation of recycling and the CRRA believes that DEP should have this additional staff for this purpose. Concerning House Bill 5235, we at CRRA consider the disposal of car batteries to be a more serious problem than those of household batteries, because of the lead content. We would therefore request that the Committee consider amending this bill to require a deposit on auto batteries in an effort to control their disposal within the waste stream which would keep them from our Resource Recovery Plants.

Thank you very much.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Thank you, Jim. It is my intention after the last two weeks of information on the batteries bill to amend it to car batteries. Any questions from the Committee? Thank you, Jim. Representative Hanchurek?

REPRESENTATIVE HANCHUREK: Thank you, Chairman Mushinsky, other Distinguished Members of the Committee. My name is Steve Hanchurek, and I am the State Representative from Branford. I am speaking on behalf of Committee Bill 5686, which is an act mandating recycling in municipalities. To sum up the statement of purpose:

119
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

REPRESENTATIVE HANCHUREK: (continued)

is to encourage alternatives to incineration by mandating municipal recycling of solid waste. I think that one of the things that I would like to relate to you is what has happened in my community when an incineration plant was proposed during this past year.

Because it became such a heated issue in the newspapers, the Local Board of Selectmen decided to have a straw poll which would be non-binding, and we had it on election day on November 4, 1986. While approximately 8,000 people voted in town and only about 5,000 people took part in the straw poll, we realized that overwhelmingly, people voted against an incinerator, and one of the other questions on the ballot was: would you be willing to recycle? And again, overwhelmingly, people decided that they would be willing to recycle.

Now, that was in one town, and if only a little bit over 50% of the people that came out to vote decided that they would be interested in taking part in this straw poll, but we can see that there are going to be some problems with people recycling. Not everyone is going to be willing to recycle, but I think ...what I would like to say today is that this State has to tell people that recycling is necessary in order to insure that the amount of trash that we are creating does not exceed the amount of landfill space which I understand that we are going to run out of by 1990 in the State of Connecticut.

Incineration plants, if Branford didn't want one, then it is conceivable that a lot of other communities are not going to want one. I know New Haven didn't want one, a year ago...two years ago, and you read about all these other towns that are not interested in having garbage-burning plants in their home town, then I think

120
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

REPRESENTATIVE HANCHUREK: (continued)

the only opportunity is to decrease the amount of garbage that is going into either the municipal landfill or a solid waste burning facility. So, because so many people are going to take a non-committal attitude until it comes down to their home town or their back yard, the State of Connecticut has to take a leadership role and tell them that recycling is the answer.

I think it is something that can be done and should be done. I would be happy to answer any questions on the results of the Branford poll or....I sat through about four or five Public Hearings on incineration and on recycling lasted well into the night. I would be glad to stay a few extra minutes to answer any of your questions.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Thank you. Any questions from the Committee? Thanks.

RERPESENTATIVE HANCHUREK: Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Now, we move on to the 6:30 Public list....and what we are going to do is have two mics open, one where Representative Hanchurek is which says Majority Leader on it, and the other one over here says Minority Leader, 122. Those two mics are open, so I will be calling names two at a time, and one person will go over there and the other person will go over there, and that will keep the speakers flowing. There is a five minute limit per speaker in order that everyone get a chance to speak, and that will be enforced by the egg-timer which is down here on Karen's desk. So, if you hear the timer go off, that means: wrap up your sentence.

If you have further comments than the five minutes, you can type them up and submit them, or hand write them and submit them and we can have them

126
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

JOHN FREEDMAN: (continued)

know what to do with the plastic liner, or they don't know what to do with the staple on the paper, or they simply don't know what to do on a home basis. We have a golden opportunity to put a little instruction on the thing that says: rip the wax paper liner out of this thing and throw the paperboard in the recyclable paper container. Really, you ought to put that on one of these bills, because it is a golden opportunity to get, not only greater participation at home, but you are going to get more uniform product of material at the intermediate processing facilities, and you will minimize the amount of wastage that...of materials that would otherwise be usable if people only knew enough how to do it.

So, I would encourage you to add that to one of the bills, and I....you know, you can pick the right one. And finally, in terms of the recycling, I would enjoin you to give your wholehearted and unconditional support to House Bill 5686, an act mandating recycling in municipalities. Clearly the time has come and clearly it is going to be necessary to do this, because there are going to be people who are going to fall into lazy habits if they are not required to do it.

If we are to really act in a responsible fashion, and really don't want waste-to-energy plants, then we must, must...absolutely take significant steps to see that everybody does it and that everybody does it right.

At the same time, there are a number of bills in this year's docket that I am not pleased....can I impinge a little bit on Marion's time?

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Well, she didn't bequeath it to you at the time. If you could just wrap it up, and maybe one of your following speakers could pick up the bills you didn't cover.

130
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

MIKE FERMANIS: (continued)

plan which the Department of Environmental Protection and the Connecticut Resource Recovery Authority has failed to design or to implement.

Lip service to recycling and actions toward incineration have been the result of these two departments' efforts. This legislation must have the effect of changing the preferable method of waste disposal from resource burning to resource reduction and reuse. The people of Connecticut have awakened, become educated about their alternatives to solve the problem, and have chosen waste resuction, source seperation and recycling as the safer and least costly methods. The Legislature has not approved legislation of this sort in the past, due to the lack of public interest and support. This is not the case now.

Now is the time, and this is the legislation.

The second group of bills is concerning faciliation and incentives for recycling. The lead off bill here is really Committee bill 5686, an act mandating recycling in the municipalities. Studies made throughout the United States, and indeed throughout the world, clearly demonstrate the effectiveness of mandatory recycling programs as compared to voluntary ones. If the realistic goal of 20% by weight, which equates to about 50% by volume, recommended by the Task Force is to be achieved, this legislation must be approved.

Recycling is the safest, cheapest and most malleable method of disposal that we know of, and may be quickly and inexpensively implementated compared to other alternatives. While this bill places a larger burden of responsibility and effort on the municipal public works departments, other legislation proposed this years mollifies the financial somewhat, and should be passed as well. If we are indeed facing a solid waste crisis, this

131
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

MIKE FERMANIS: (continued)

Committee should mobilize all the forces available to meet the challenge.

There are towns in Connecticut today which have reduced the amount of waste landfilled by 60% through a program of voluntary source separation, recycling and waste stream reduction. This success is a potent argument that recycling pays through avoided landfill and incineration costs and protects the environment. The people here today are asking that you ensure the passage of this and related bills to protect their health and to save them money. If you are truly interested in reducing our dependence on landfills, you cannot say no to this legislation.

The last category is waste-stream reduction. The most important bill is probably House Bill 5233.... I request your passage of this bill also.

Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Thank you. Any questions from the Members of the Committee? You should know that you are the first one today to testify in favor of 5233. There was a long list of objecters to that bill.

MIKE FERMANIS: Well, Madame Chairman, I will tell you the truth. I am not surprised at that, largely because there are a number of manufacturers, not just in the United States, but in other places, that believe that they have a God-given right to pollute our towns, and will say just about anything before a Committee of this sort to prove it.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Thank you. The next speaker is John Hamilton here to be followed by Jim Wright at that mic.

145
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

VIN MAROTTOLI: (continued)

this battery. I don't know what our life would be like without some of the technical innovations that we have enjoyed in the past 50 years, but I am just trying to think what it is going to be like fifty years from now, too.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Well, you can always trade it in for a solar calculator.

VIN MAROTTOLI: Or use an abacus.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Thank you. Our next speaker is Gregory McCartney over here and then on this mic, Janus Underwood.

GREGORY MC CARTHY: My name is Gregory McCarthy and I am from Branford, Connecticut. I have three quick points that I would like to make.

HB 5686
I would like to speak in favor of the moratorium on future building of incinerators and I would also like to speak in favor of the mandatory recycling in municipalities. What I would like to point out, though, is that in our experience in our town in fighting the proposed construction of a town incinerator, we were often told that burning garbage is just a temporary solution, and that ultimately we would all agree that recycling is what is necessary. But it seems to me that especially the overproduction of capacity for burning, we are creating real disincentives for recycling. It is going to be very, very difficult to get the town leadership in Branford or in any other town interested in recycling, when we are committed already to so many tons of garbage being burned in a particular incinerator.

I don't think that incineration and recycling are things that can co-exist very well. I think that recyclingincineration is antithetical to recycling.

146
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

GREGORY MC CARTHY: (continued)

My second two points are related, and they also come from this same experience. Discussing the garbage production of the citizens, the slick industry consultant that was brought in to tell us what plant to buy made it...made us feel very badly about all the garbage that we are producing, that: well, it is your problem, you are producing all this garbage. And we would say things like: well, how about if we reduce the packaging? How about it if we put surcharges on things that can't be recycled? How about that?

And he said: well, you can't possibly do that; you have got a huge industry fighting that, and I believe that that is probably the case. Seeing that that is the case, that is really why I came here tonight: to tell you that the citizens do not want this packaging material. I do not want my garbage filled up with....if I buy 10 nails, they come wrapped up in plastic and cardboard packing instead of just a simple....taking them out of a bucket in the store like we used to do. I think this is excessive and I think that we have had enough of it.

A meal in a fast food restaurant could probably save a gallon of oil in the amount of plastic that you end up throwing away.

My last point concerns cost and again, this is relevant to, I think, bill 5233...what really is the cost of a product? When we go to the store and buy some products, we are probably paying for the product, but when we buy some items, we are making a downpayment on the purchase. The rest of the purchase is being subsidized by our landfill, in disposal, by environment, by increased health costs for the pollution of our ground water. What cost is involved say... in the depletion of ozone due to the careless disposal of fluorocarbons? How do we measure

155
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

BOB HARRINGTON: (continued)

House Bill 5017
 House Bill 5019
 House Bill 5202
 House Bill 5209
 House Bill 5496
 House Bill 5497
 House Bill 7201
 House Bill 7202
 Proposed Senate Bill 857
 House Bill 5170
 House Bill 5204
 House Bill 5313
 House Bill 5498
 House Bill 5686
 House Bill 5721 and
 Senate Bill 845

In addition,

House Bill 5020
 House Bill 5232
 House Bill 5233
 House Bill 5234
 House Bill 5313
 House Bill 7200

I might add that these endorsements were not made lightly. These were made over the period of the past 5-6 months, and in addition, there are some bills that are weaker than others that you are considering this year. We would prefer you to go...to make the extra step. The people of Connecticut will thank you for it.

Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Thank you. Now we need Vivian Orłowski over here and Bob Dyjack on that mic.

VIVIAN ORŁOWSKI: I agree with everything the previous speaker said, concerning the list, and

160
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

BOB DYACK: (continued)

opposition to Senate Bill 637, which is an act concerning expansion of the WERF plant in Willimantic. The incinerator doesn't work very well. I think everyone knows it. It has cost the town 1.6 million dollars, and there is only one way that they can ever recoup the cost, and that is to raise their tonnage fee to \$53 a ton, and that is really going to hurt the municipalities. There are absolutely no air compliance or emission controls on that plant, and there has not been since 1981. That is right on a public water supply from the Willimantic Water Department. The ash from that incinerator is being dumped on the land right on the water course.

I want to speak in support of what the CCAG has and what we have all supported and we hope that everyone will support, and that is House Bill 7201, House Bill 7202, House Bill 5686, Senate Bill 851, 5721, 570, 845, 523, 5234, excuse me and 5235. And House Bill 7214, 5233, and 5020.

Okay, I want to speak....I was going to speak on some legislation in this hearing tonight concerning enforcement. There seems to be a problem with enforcement. We only have three Enforcement Officers in the whole State of Connecticut in the Department of Environmental Protection. I would like to ask a question of anyone on this Committee if they know of the position of 5318, submitted by Representative Lyons from the 146th District.

It was an act to appropriate more funds for the Department of Environmental Protection for more enforcement officers.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: They are in the....No, we didn't raise that seperately because there is a substantial increase in the Governor's Budget for DEO inspectors. In fact, Vinnie...where is

175
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

GORDON JENKINS: (continued)

or lead, but they are also disposal problems, and all should have a deposit representing ...to pay for the cost of that disposal.

Finally, I wanted to speak in favor of 5686, mandating recycling. I think you should add, since the technology exists right now for the recycling of waste-paper, dried paper, cardboard, bottles and cans, that municipalities be mandated to make provision for recycling most of these materials right now. I think that would get things going quickly.

I would like to speak in favor of 5721, the grants to municipalities.

Ok....it is really important. I was stunned to discover that incinerators are being subsidized. I think it is absurd if we don't go ahead and start putting money into recycling plants, which 5721 would do....on at least an equal basis.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Gordon, they are not.... at the present time, they are not subsidized. That is not correct. There are....

GORDON JENKINS: That is what the material on bill says....

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: No, there are bills in to ask for a subsidy, but at the present time, they are not. Windham is not yet; they have asked for money to clean up the emissions. The air pollution equipment is being bailed out by the State so that you people won't suffer, but the....

GORDON JENKINS: Ok, I am taking that information off of the copy of the preliminary bill itself which gave...which said that the incineration was being subsidized by a 25% support of the

176
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

GORDON JENKINS: (continued)

tipping fee. Now, my source of information was the copy for 5721 itself. All I am saying is that I support that bill because recycling materials must also be subsidized at at least the same level.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Thank you. Next we will have Kris Cieplak to be followed by Bob Carey over here. Thank you, Kris.

KRIS CIEPLAK: Good evening, my name is Kris Cieplak; I am grass root organizer for the...

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Kris, please....the mic isn't picking you up, Speak up.

KRIS CIEPLAK: it isn't? Ok....better?

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Yes.

KRIS CIEPLAK: Good evening. My name is Kris Cieplak; I am the grass root organizer for Concerned Citizens for Clean Air. I am from Ansonia, Connecticut. I do support the bill 5017, a firm no to 6083.

I would like to speak on bill 5686. This bill mandates that each municipality make provisions for the recycling of solid waste generated within its boundaries. The intent of the bill is to encourage alternatives to incineration and landfilling. The bill does not include a goal in percentage of waste to be recycled. This bill, to me, means nothing unless the State of Connecticut....I am sorry....the State...oh, that is correct, the State of Connecticut mandates mandatory recycling.

For me, for instance, in my community, to try to implement a recycling program would fail. It has to start here. The crisis originally started here. Four months ago, I started to learn

177
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

KRIS CIRPLAK: (continued)

about resource recovery, and I am angered by it, because the State of Connecticut knew about this and went ahead filling up the landfills, leaching water, leaching....polluting the water ways. Now, we have a crisis, so now we have to solve it.

Well, gentlemen and ladies, you can solve it by making recycling mandatory. A few of us started... people would be angry with us, but when the State does it, just like the Seat Belt, we will go along with it.

I can't speak as eloquently as the ones before me. I came with no prepared speech. I feel that the CRRA and the DEP, if they can't do their job, they should be dissolved and a new organization picked and the people in this room who have spoken before me be on it, plus with....when it comes to election time, I think they should all run for office, and I think they will all get elected.

There are others here to speak, and I am sorry that I have to speak in this tone of voice. It is just that we do have a crisis and people seem to think that it is only someone's problem and not everyone's. That air out there is God's gift to us; we have ruined our waterways, let's not ruin the air. It belongs to you as well as to me. The future of our generation, you have to start preserving it right now, right here.

It is hard for me to go on, because I am speaking emotionally right now. That isn't the way I intended. It's just that it has been a long day. I am sure that you have all listened to garbage. I am sick and tired of it, because I have been living with this, learning about this for the last four months. I think I had better end right now.

Thank you.

183
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: (continued)

went to the latest conference on this, and we can tell you more about it after the hearing, but we would like to keep moving.

BOB CAREY: Well, let me just say this...

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: We'll talk to you after... on the ash.

BOB CAREY: Well, you keep asking me questions, but you get the last word. I should get the last word.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: No, I am just clarifying on two of the bills....you misunderstood the bill and I wanted you to get the actual effect of the bill.

BOB CAREY: Well, thank you. I would like you to get the fact that I am totally opposed to this whole toxic ash thing. Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Thank you. Our next speaker is Nancy Cebik and then on this mic, Jane Prokop.

NANCY CEBIK: I would like to give my time to Dennis McGavrin who has to leave early.

DENNIS MC GAVRIN: My name is Dennis McGavrin, speaking on behalf of the Waterbury Citizen Action Group. I have a general statement in support of House Bills 5601, 5599, 7201 and 5686. In the spirit of your earlier comments, I would also like to mention support for House Bills 851, 845, 5020, 5233, 5235 and 7214.

As Bob mentioned, Waterbury is planning to build a 360 ton per day incinerator. The estimated cost for the plant, if all goes well, is 50-60 million dollars. It goes without saying that all will not go well, so the final

192
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

BRUCE GUNDERSON: (continued)

to become enacted.

5232

5234

5235

5018

5019

5686

5721

5170

6083

7201

7202

7214

and Senate Bill 845.

Bills I am against: 7200, 866, 5020, and Senate Bill 851.

All these bills that I am against include the words "money to study." Most of these studies have already been done; most of these things have already been studied and implemented in other states in this country and around the world. Let's just follow their examples.

Thank you.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Thank you. Geno Zandri, Jr. to be followed by Vin Avallone on that mic.

GENO ZANDRI: Hello, my name is Geno Zandri, and I represent People against Garbarge Burning, which is a group that was formed in Wallingford and basically the reason that this group was formed in Wallingford, because our citizens in our town were forced with an incinerator....an incinerator was forced upon them. And I say forced upon them because our state and local officials really didn't give the citizens of Wallingford any say at all in whether or not they wanted an incinerator to be put in the boundaries of their town. I

198
abs

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Thank you. Next speaker is Florence Pawlikowski, although I see Bob there at the mic.

BOB MAC DONALD: Florence is not going to speak. She has laryngitis. Is that okay that I switch with her? I am going to leave right after this.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Well, Richard Borer is ahead of you actually. We will call him and then you, since Florence is not here.

BOB MAC DONALD: Florence is here, but she can't speak.

REPRESENTATIVE MUSHINSKY: Oh, you can't speak? You have laryngitis? So, you will speak for her... in her place then? Okay.

BOB MAC DONALD: Okay, first I want to thank the Environmental Committee for having this hearing. There is a lot of bills here, there is a lot that I am not happy with, but I guess we need them. First of all, I would like to speak on HB 7201, the moratorium. I think it is very important. We got to take a look at...keep out-of-state garbage out of Connecticut, and the moratorium will control out-of-state garbage. We have got to keep these incinerators small.

Secondly, I am in favor of bill 7202, 5686, 5170, 845, 5234, 5235, 5233, 5020. I think that it very important that the Energy Committee Bill get raised and that a lot of attention get put on this, because right now there is approximately 40 co-generation permits being applied for, and the people on the Environment Committee should be aware of this.

This is a scary, sickening situation. Can you imagine 40 big co-generation plants in the State of Connecticut with the air pollution we already have? I am in favor of bill 5721, 5232, 7214, 5231, and 847. I am strongly against bill

206

jsl

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

MS. LARKIN: (continued)

I support House Bill 7201, 7202, 5686, 5235, House Bill 5232, 5231, Senate Bill 845 and 847. I don't like the numbers, but I strongly oppose the bills that give CRRA more staff and more bonding.

I have a concern that I want the Environment Committee to make sure some really strong recycling bills get passed. I want us to go beyond task forces and consultants and studies. I think we all know that recycling is technically feasible, the technology is there, in most cases it's cheaper than burning or landfilling.

The continual obstacle to getting recycling going is political will. And the lack of political will is related to a belief that people aren't going to recycle.

I think people will recycle. In New Haven, a study done five years ago by a consultant firm, found out that the vast majority of New Haven citizens were willing to source separate their trash, they were willing to recycle. This was before any education was done.

Education is what's missing in all of these bills. We need to make sure there's some hired staff that are out there educating the people of Connecticut about recycling. There are a lot of citizens who are working very hard to educate people about recycling, but it's about time that some state money is put into this. We need more than a halftime person talking about recycling in Connecticut.

In particular, I'd like to insert some education into two particular bills that have been introduced. House Bill 5020 is about packaging, doing a study of packaging and the feasibility of having more biodegradable packaging. Rather than do a study, I'd like to see a person hired to start educating people to choose products that are better for the environment. This would go a lot further in the state than having a study as to the feasibility.

MR. DUESING: (continued)

I support 5235, 5313, 5421, 5496, 5497, the composting facilities, I think it's important they not be too big. Basically, what we want to do is get the organic matter back into the soil, spread as widely as we can over Connecticut, to encourage our lawns to grow well, our trees, our forests to grow well, to combat the effects of acid rain, and to encourage the growth of food and farms, and if those facilities are too big, we run the risk of them being uncontrollable, a large amount of stuff being contaminated by an accident, and making it too hard for people to get access to it, to use it.

Also, if we make enough compost, maybe we can save the natural gas that goes to make fertilizer, and we don't need a natural gas pipeline in Connecticut, which is 50 feet from my house proposed.

I support 5498, 5686, I support 5749, the language in instructing the experiment station to look at composting seems a little specific. They should include maybe small scale home composting, which is sort of the least, the most energy efficient way, if everybody takes care of their own waste when they can, it makes much more sense than hauling it somewhere else and then hauling it back.

And I support 7202. We should remember that there are reasons for recycling and waste reduction besides the problems with incinerators, and the general good thing about recycling, leaves basically, besides keeping us cool in the summer, one of their purposes is to fertilize our soil. When we burn leaves, which are inevitably in the solid waste stream, we're adding carbon dioxide to the atmosphere which will increase the greenhouse effect. When we compost leaves, we're putting the carbon back in the soil, which is absolutely essential to get fertile soil, and maybe postponing the flooding of New Haven by a little bit, and the coastline in Greenwich.

Also, it seems that in the making of styrofoam packaging in fast food restaurants, chlorofluorocarbons are used in the foaming process, which may

213

jsl

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

REP. MUSHINSKY: Just give us the numbers.

MR. LYTE: Okay. All the bills I support is 5204, 5231,
5232, 5233, 5234, 5235, 5317, 5496, 5497, 5498, 5601,
5859, 5599, (tape skip) 5057, and 56 (tape skip),
Bill 637 (tape skip) 850, 85

(tape skip)

FRANK DANIELSKI: My name's Frank Ansonia, and I teach school in Ansonia, and really, I should be home in Ansonia with my wife putting the five kids to sleep, but, speaking for the many families in Ansonia and the state, there's a very real... (tape skip) incinerator will come in Ansonia. And they plan to burn at least 400 tons of garbage, 24 hours a day, 7 days a week, 365 days a year.

And I have been too busy earning a living and raising a family to really get into the details of this, but I see that as a very real threat to the health of my family. Okay, and I wanted to voice my opinion on that today, and I want to support House Bill 5686, mandating recycling, because I think towns such as mine which are not as affluent as other towns, I think, if these incinerators do come into Connecticut, the less affluent towns will be getting the majority of the incinerators, and I'm fearful of that.

What I do want to thank you and the Senate too is, thank you for trying to make education more equal throughout the state, so that the kids in Greenwich and the kids in Ansonia could have more of an equal opportunity to get ahead. I'm a product of Connecticut, I went to U. Conn., my sister went to Southern, I have brothers, three of us are teachers, one of us is a doctor, and another one of us is an engineer, and we're all products of the Connecticut system, and Connecticut's been good to us, but I see this incineration as a threat, a very real threat to my family, and to the kids and to the people of Connecticut, so I support House Bill 5686, because if you mandate recycling, maybe a town like Ansonia will look into it.

CASS. 10

214
351

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

MR. DANIELSKI: (continued)

Now, can I use the rest of my time, because I know Chris was a little emotional, but she is the mother of six kids, and the grandmother of five more. Can she take the rest of my time, because she's really researched this more than me. I'm really speaking with emotions, she really has more information. Is that possible?

REP. MUSHINSKY: Sure.

MR. DANIELSKI: Chris.

REP. MUSHINSKY: No, it won't pick up, there are only two mikes that are hooked up to that recorder.

CHRIS CREPAK: I would like to say that the State of Connecticut is proposing a 25% goal. The State of New York is proposing 50%. So we ought to try for that, okay, that bill that Frank just read off doesn't have a goal on that.

I did hear Rhode Island has mandatory recycling. I want to add one more thing, and that is, how did I become involved in this? I read about it, I went to the Board of Aldermen, I've never done anything like this before in my life to go in front of people, and I asked them, what did you do about, when you were studying about this resource recovery plant? You picked one, all right, what did you do about the health part of it?

The 15 people on the board, none of them had done anything. I couldn't believe that, so then I started to do the research, and I've been doing it for four months. As far as public hearings, I'm going to tell you, Ansonia had one, not too good. Derby had one, not too good. Finally, I with a few other people, had to put one together at our own expense, \$2000, some of the people didn't even bother coming! I don't want to mention names here, but it seems tonight I'm attacking, and I really am not a person like that. It's just that I'm getting angry because the power a few people have over our lives, well, this is one thing no one's going to get away with,

215
jsl

ENVIRONMENT

February 20, 1987

MS. CREPAK: (continued)

because this air is your air also, so think about it.

REP. MUSHINSKY: If there are no other speakers, we have no more on the signup sheet, but if there are any, anybody that wasn't listed that. Go ahead, John. The Committee members, however, are permitted to leave. They've been here since 1:00 and their minds are fried. Please let me just make an announcement. The meeting on Monday at 3:00 is cancelled, okay, you got that, Monday at 3:00 is cancelled, be here at 6:00 for leghold traps, though, 6:00.

JOHN HAMILTON: I'd like to address this to you, Mary, in particular. You've been at this a long time, and I have, too, the recycling, and it's really exciting to see this many people here tonight about recycling, and you know very well that it's all because of the fear of incineration that these people are here.

Now, Mary, if you were just to say one simple talk, and say there's a lot of concern about dioxin in the scientific community, there's a lot of financial uncertainty around these plants, Mary, if you were to say that, those facts, you'd have 5,000 people here tonight, because you'd be in a situation where landfills are known to be hazardous. If you, Mary, yourself, just admit that these plants aren't safe, they aren't totally safe, there's problems with them, the economic problems with them. If you just say that, then you're going to have 5,000 people here supporting recycling because no one's going to want one anywhere in the state, so as a strategy, let's, why not just acknowledge the facts from the American Medical Association, from these other plants that have failed, and I'm just, I've mentioned that to you before, and I just wanted to say it again.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you. Eugene, are you going to? You can leave it with Nancy and put your name and address on it, so we get it for the record. That concludes the hearing, thank you.

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

ENVIRONMENT
PART 4
1039-1347

1987

REP. IRELAND: (continued)

programs, but I feel that if we are going to start programs which will help many of our lakes which need help desperately right away, that we should increase the funding request to at least \$6 million.

I am also submitting testimony this evening in support of this legislation from my Planning and Zoning Commission, my Conservation Commission, and the Ridgefield League of Women Voters. In addition to that, I would like to say that testimony will be entered on Proposed Bills 847, 5017, 5020, 5204, 5209, 5232, 5233, 5317, 5498, 5686, 6554, 6589, and 7201, from my Conservation Commission in support of those bills, and the clerks will have copies of this testimony.

That's all I have to say, but I urge you very strongly to support this legislation. Any questions?

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you. If you're really serious about the \$6 million, be sure to talk to Janet Polinsky.

REP. IRELAND: Well, being on the Appropriations Committee, I'm glad Janet is not in the room tonight.

REP. MUSHINSKY: She would probably eat you. We've been joined by Rep. Tom Luby, who is from Meriden. Next speaker, Sen. Jim Maloney, from Danbury.

SEN. MALONEY: Good evening, Chairman Mushinsky and members of the Environment Committee. I'm here to speak specifically in support of Bill 6589. I, there's not time to address many of the other bills that you have on the agenda, many, many of them are worthy, and I'll leave my comments, however, to the Clean Lakes Bill.

Connecticut is a most attractive place to live, and I think that's because of a unique combination of our urban centers, our small towns, our economic vitality, our environment, our seashore, our hills, shore, fields, streams, and lakes.

Lakes are special, however. They provide special joys, in the summer, boating, fishing and swimming, in the

March 6, 1987

REP. GALBRAITH: (continued)

recycling programs. My town has begin monthly curbside pickups of newspapers. We want to do more, but we need the technical assistance that HB 5205 would give us.

HB 5686 would mandate recycling in Connecticut. In Camden County, New Jersey, mandatory recycling has reduced the tonnage by 25% in one year. Every ton recycled represents \$40 to \$50 saved in transportation fees, but please don't give our towns a mandate we can't fulfill. A mandate without money won't work. The result will be that recycling will fail, and then it will be abandoned.

It can work, and it can save taxpayers' money. If recycling is made mandatory in Connecticut, it must include technical assistance and funding to towns so that it can be successful.

HB 7202 represents a commitment by the State to include recycling in its overall approach to resolving the solid waste problem, and HB 6546 would give user towns a voice on the Board of CRRA.

I also support HB 6589, the lake management bill, but with reservations. As proposed, only lakes on the DEP priority list would be eligible for funding to clean them. None of the 5 lakes in my district would be eligible for funds, and that means it would be years before they would ever be cleaned.

Some of the lakes are private lakes whose associations are spending thousands of dollars for money and treatment. The availability of low interest loans to private lake associations would be helpful, and there are people from my district who will be testifying on this bill later on in the evening.

I hope that your Committee will move forward with these proposals, and give Connecticut a cost effective and environmentally sound mechanisms to deal with the disposal of solid wastes. Thank you. HB 6589

REP. MUSHINSKY: I wanted to ask a question. Why would

12
jsl

ENVIRONMENT

March 6, 1987

REP. DEL BIANCO: (continued)

area in my district, I would not, I couldn't complain about it. It's our trash. But what really kills me about this, it's not my trash. Let them go buy land in Fairfield County. You know what? They can't touch land in Fairfield County, they'll never be able to touch land in Fairfield County, and Waterbury and towns where the land is somewhat cheaper, will become hosts to bulky waste dumps, and you can't let that happen. It needs to be done on a regional level, let Fairfield County dump in Fairfield County.

(applause)

That's my CRRA little stint there.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Okay, I just have to ask members of the audience please not to applaud, because when we allow that, the hearing goes on till midnight, so please cooperate.

REP. DEL BIANCO: You've got to let them clap a little bit.

REP. MUSHINSKY: I know they love you, Doreen, but just the same.

REP. DEL BIANCO: Well, sometimes. House Bill 5686, an act mandating recycling in municipalities. There was a big article in the newspaper today, not only about the Waterbury public hearing, but about Waterbury and its wanting to build a trash-to-energy plant. And the part that struck me, in all the comments that the mayor made and the objections he seemed to have, was that Bristol was going to make a ton of money if they accepted Waterbury's garbage.

You know what this trash-to-energy plant mania has turned into making people wealthy, and making towns make a lot of money, and so nobody wants to recycle. Nobody wants to look at other alternatives. We need to make recycling equal. Equal with trash-to-energy plants. We need to make it just as exciting to towns. I mean, I would love to see Waterbury take on a project of being the regional recycling authority, like for this area, instead of the regional trash authority

13
jsl

ENVIRONMENT

March 6, 1987

REP. DEL BIANCO: (continued)

for this area, but we've got to make it attractive to towns. I think 5686, which would mandate recycling, House Bill 7201, which would examine the need for resource recovery plants, and House Bill 7202, which would put recycling really on an equal footing with trash-to-energy plants, would help with the problem in Waterbury.

I would urge you to adopt these 1, 2, 3, 4, 5 pieces of legislation, and once again, let me thank the Committee for coming to Waterbury.

REP. MUSHINSKY: You feed us, we'll come any time. And I want to ask your help on the recycling. The reason the bills, this Committee's written recycling bills before. They never go anywhere before because they're considered to be too harsh on the public to get them to do this recycling in their home. If we actually pass the mandatory bill, we're going to need every legislator's help on this. It's going to be a sales jobs to members of our towns, so I'm counting on you to help us.

REP. DEL BIANCO: You know, Waterbury at one time had a recycling program.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Yeah, but it's gone, and you don't do curbside, do you?

REP. DEL BIANCO: No.

REP. MUSHINSKY: We have to do that whole education project all over again, and it's going to be work.

REP. DEL BIANCO: We're ready.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Okay.

REP. DEL BIANCO: I will tell, if the people, at least the people in my district have a choice between recycling or having a trash-to-energy plant in their backyard, they're going with recycling.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Okay. That concludes the public officials'

MR. BAUER (continued):

lake and that's where we lost our lake depth.

REP. LUBY: All right, do you know, can you tell me, do you know how the lake depth has changed over the past 20 years or 30 years.

MR. BAUER: We're losing approximately 3-4 inches a year. Seventy percent of that is from road sand and the rest of it's coming from the rest of construction that's going on. There's not much construction any more, the damage has already been done.

REP. LUBY: All right, I can tell you that's a pretty typical problem with a lot of recreational lakes. I know, in my own district, there's a lake known as Lake Besic which has an identical problem. It has the hillside and everything and the community that has an outmoded septic system, it's a difficult problem to solve.

MR. BAUER: Well this is why I mentioned that I think the 3 million dollars is much too small, at least it's a beginning, but it's much too small to approach all of the different recreational lakes that are in the state.

REP. LUBY: I'm afraid if you really talk about doing it, doing them all in 10 years, it's something akin to the transportation funds, that we have for the highways. Thank you very much.

REP. MUCHINSKY: Thank you Mr. Bauer.

MR. BAUER: Thank you.

REP. MUCHINSKY: Next James Pettit, followed by Barbara Bastenbeck.

(HB 5686)

MR. PETTIT: Good evening ladies and gentlemen. My name is James Pettit. I live at 65 Edgewood Avenue and I have lived there for 31 years. And what the newspapers sometime call it the Southend. Over the past 3 or 4 years, I have attended many meetings, public hearing and neighborhood meetings to discuss the

MR. PETTIT (continued):

proposed trash to energy plant. I know that many of the same people here tonight, out of concern for the health and welfare of their families and their neighborhoods and the City of Waterbury, have attended many of these same meetings and alot of them have attended alot more meetings too. Indeed at every single hearing that I have attended, as a representative of the Washington Park Community Club, the vast majority of the people in attendance at these hearings were adamently opposed to this proposal of building a garbage burning plant in the City of Waterbury.

We heard from Phil Financee, he's the President of the Waterville Community Club at a public hearing, he stated how the people in Waterville didn't want it built in their neighborhood. We heard James Barry and Robert Foley from the Gilmartin School District tell how the residents of that area are really concerned and they don't want it built in the south-end. We heard from Mike Folchey, chairman of the Brookland Council say at several hearings that the people of Brookland Community are against it. Ed Stasiskis of Nichols Drive on many occasions, voiced a concern of residents of that area on what effects this plant will have on the environment and indeed what the building of this garbage building plant will do to lower the properly values of the homes located in that area.

I think everybody's in agreement, the City of Waterbury has a very serious garbage disposal problem. What we all don't agree on, is the method of solving this problem. There has to be a viable alternative rather than building this garbage burning facility which it appears, no one wants built in their neighborhood. It has become crystal clear, from the citizens from all neighborhoods in Waterbury, that they don't want a garbage burning facility built in Waterbury, period. It think it is incumbent upon Mayor Joseph SantaPietro, who as Chief Executive Officer of the City of Waterbury, should come up with a viable alternative. I think it's his duty to do so. He should present these alternatives to the citizens, for their consideration, and let the

27
dez

ENVIRONMENT

March 6, 1987

MR. PETTIT (continued):

voters decide. I asked all the respect the will of the people, the majority of the people spoke out against building a plant in Waterbury and once again I have to say, we don't want a garbage burning facility built in Waterbury, period. Thank you very much.

(applause)

REP. MUSHINSKY: Please refrain from applauding. You will have to come up with some, says here you have 103,266 people at 1980 and they're all making 5 lbs of trash a day, so if you don't want to build that, be sure and come up with something else. That's alot of garbage.

MR. PETTIT: Well I think it's the Mayor's duty to come up with another alternative. People don't want it.

REP. MUCHINSKY: Barbara Bastenbeck, followed by Flo Zailckas.

MS. BASTENBECK: Thank you, good evening. My name is Barbara Bastenbeck, and I represent the Lake Plymouth Community Association, and I would like to speak in favor of Bill #6589 with a reservation. Our association is state chartered tax district, that we formed to band home owners together to work together to improve the quality of our lake waters. Our lake is very very small, it's about 42 acres in all, but it has over 240 homes that have been built up around the area. Since 1970 we have been working very very hard to hold beautification in abance. We've collecticut assessments from every homeowner on the lake, to be able to have a management study done, to have core samples analysed from the lake bottom, and to apply copper sulfata and herbicides to control algee and weed problems. This bill would help us with the resources significant enough to do the one thing that our lake needs despirately, and that's a complete dredging.

We feel that the bill deserves our support, but we feel that the determination of the priorities, namely

33
jsl

ENVIRONMENT

March 6, 1987

MR. ZAILCKAS: (continued)

barrels to remove the trash there.

We got a satisfactory response, but it's not something that I feel is going to solve the problem. Obviously, it's not street sweepings alone that is causing the problem, and I think part of what the local landowners envisage is having a committee organized that can go and take the further steps necessary.

At this point, it's been totally because of local initiative that any studies were done whatsoever. Obviously, it's a problem that's being recognized all over the state. I know that Quassapoag is having similar problems, and the group there has organized and gotten some studies done and had an evaluation of the septic systems around the lake done, and so they are able to see more readily what other actions can be taken.

At this point, it's entirely on local initiative without any backup, any financing to even have those studies prepared.

SEN. MUSHINSKY: Thank you. Sen. Tim Upson, followed by Katherine Senzamici.

SEN. UPSON: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman. Very quickly, the concerns of a lot of the Waterbury people are fairness, notice, proper procedures, proper appraisal procedures, and especially the quality of the people running CCRA. Now, some of these are not before you tonight, but those are some of the criticisms we had.

As far as the bills that you have before us, HB 5686 I do support a mandatory act recycling in municipalities. We have not tried this in the state. It has worked in some of the small towns, for example, Woodbury and some of the small towns where there is a mandatory recycling program.

I do think the large cities should also be forced to do that to see if the experiment works. In that regard,

35
jsl

ENVIRONMENT

March 6, 1987

REP. MUSHINSKY: (continued)

true that there is a lot of open space, there are very, very few GC zones, which are suitable for either landfill or waste energy plant site, and there are not as many sites as you might think, looking at a map. You have to see, I don't know if Dave brought it with him tonight, but you'd have to see the groundwater map to see that there are very few condemned groundwater zones that are suitable.

SEN. UPSON: Well, you wouldn't be using the one in the south end of town.

REP. MUSHINSKY: And that's really the reason why the override powers are necessary.

SEN. UPSON: There has to be some override power.

REP. MUSHINSKY: There are only a handful of sites that can be safely used without polluting the drinking water of the state, and obviously not all these people that have a GC zone are willing to take the site, so it's either the state has to be tougher or we have to sacrifice the drinking water, and that's the tough decision we have to make.

SEN. UPSON: And it's not an easy one. And yet, all of us in this room are going to have to share in that decision. Thank you.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Rep. Brown.

REP. BROWN: Sen. Upson, in looking at the Windham plant and the four that are under construction, the four trash-to-energy plants that are under construction, and by the DEP plan, that would accommodate 60% of the solid waste. Do you feel that Waterbury could possibly hook into an existing, say, Bristol plant, or a projected Ansonia plant?

HB5686

SEN. UPSON: Well, of course, you're also assuming with the 60 or the 65%, that the mandatory recycling is also going to have a reduction.

REP. BROWN: Definitely.

SEN. UPSON: That, I feel, first of all, I feel mandatory recycling is going to take a long time to have the public do, and I don't think anything's going to be done overnight, and I cannot speak for Waterbury. I don't know if the Bristol plant can take our, what is it they say, five pounds a day?

REP. BROWN: Say Naugatuck. Naugatuck opted to go to the mid-Connecticut one.

REP. MUSHINSKY: You're making 500,000 pounds of trash a day here. That's a heck of a lot of trash to get rid of.

SEN. UPSON: Waterbury's got a special problem, and we have to come to grips with it. Now to say we don't have it, now that's just not correct.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you, Senator. Katherine Senzamici followed by Domenic Senzamici. Or maybe it's the other way around.

DOMENIC SENZAMICI: My wife says for me to do the speaking. Chairman, representatives of the State, I'm here to talk about Bill 6032. When I moved into the neighborhood, I noticed there was quite a few, like a little dump back there. But even with that little dump, when I looked at that lake, it was beautiful.

Now, I used to see the bottom of the lake. Now I see weeds. We do need a little help there, and I would say it's up to the state to do it, because there's more than one house there, it's quite a nice little lake, and people get their fishing from Park Road, go into the lake.

And I don't want to make it a long speech, you know what we need. It's up to you. And I want to thank you.

REP. MUSHINSKY: I want to ask you a question. Does your lake have a lake authority?

38
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 6, 1987

MS. ZAILCKAS: (continued)

was going to be destroyed, and his fish and wildlife were going to be gone. Several nights later, he went over to his uncle's backyard, and they were fishing. He was in an extremely happy mood, and his uncle asked him: How come you are so happy, Bobby. He said: Tomorrow, everybody will be happy.

The next morning, Bobby committed suicide at the dam. In the suicide note, amongst other things, he also put in to bury him at the dam. In his mind, he was under the impression that a grave could not be moved. My window looks out on Tracy's Pond. I see many Bobby's out there through the years, young, old, in their boats, in my backyard, ice-fishing.....I hope that somehow, even though our lake is small and it may not be as accessible, you know...to other people...but it means something to us. I hope somehow, you will be able to help us save our pond for future Bobby's.

Thank you.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you. Dennis McGavron followed by Marge De Leo.

DENNIS MC GAVRAN: Good evening, Representative Mushinsky and other Members of the Committee. My name is Dennie Mc Gavran, 27 Hewlett Street, Waterbury, Connecticut, speaking for the Waterbury Citizen Action Group.

I am speaking in support of House Bills number 7201 and 5686. I will just start out with a comment concerning whether or not people in Waterbury are willing to recycle, and just mention my own personal situation. In our kitchen, we have 2 garbage cans, one that we fill up with re-cyclable bottles and cans and the other we fill up with the ordinary garbage. In addition, I tell my kids...they don't always do it...but I

MR. MC GAVRAN: (continued)

tell them to take the newspapers down to the basement and tie them up and every few months, we haul them off to the local paper recycler, and they pick up two or three or four dollars extra spending money that way. So, Waterbury has recycled in the past, and I am sure that they are willing to recycle again in the future.

At the Public Hearing held by this Committee in Hartford on February 20, I spoke about Waterbury's plan to build an incinerator. This evening, I would like to expand upon what has happened in Waterbury and what some people would like to have happen in the future. It is my belief that the situation in Waterbury and elsewhere provides convincing evidence that the Legislature must act immediately to stop the construction of new incinerators and to begin state-wide recycling.

Whenever anyone discusses the problem of waste disposal, a sense of urgency is always expressed. We are told that something must be done immediately if not sooner, because we are running out of landfill space and existing landfills are polluting the environment. Until recently, however, Waterbury has not acted with any great sense of urgency. The City seemed more concerned with the maxim: Haste makes waste. Over a period of ten years or more, many studies were conducted, proposals were made, debated and rejected or simply forgotten. However, nothing much was done to solve the problem of waste disposal in Waterbury.

It would be probably be possible to engage in an endless and futile debate about why this happened, however, it seems clear...if only on the basis of hindsight...Waterbury is better off, because no solution to the problem was attempted. If Waterbury had tried to do anything about waste disposal, it certainly would have built an incinerator. This is so, because incineration was the only solution anyone was proposing to

40
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 6, 1987

MR. MC GAVRAN: (continued)

waste disposal problems. If, five or ten years ago, Waterbury had built an incinerator, the Mayor would not now be talking about building our first modern, advanced technology, trouble-free, 60 million dollar incinerator that would solve all of our problems. He would be talking about building our second modern, advanced technology, trouble-free, 60 million dollar incinerator that would solve all of our problems.

Based upon the Bridgeport experience, the first incinerator would have gone belly-up in a polluted sea of red ink. Unfortunately, our current Mayor does not believe that Haste makes Waste. Instead, he is making haste to build a modern, advanced technology, trouble-free, 60 million dollar incinerator that will solve all our problems. The fact that no one has yet been able to build one of these things does not seem to bother him in the least. Not even the Connecticut Resource Recovery Authority with its professional staff and apparently unlimited financial resources has built a successful incinerator.

So, what did our Mayor do? He created a Waterbury Regional Resource Recovery Authority with no budget, no staff, and a volunteer Board of Directors. We are supposed to believe that WRRRA can do what the CRRRA has not yet been able to do. As incredible as this sounds, there is not much to stop it from trying. The ordinance creating the WRRRA gave it virtually all the authority it needs to plan, finance and build an incinerator. It is not clear how anyone can stop it; anyone, that is, except the Legislature.

Why should the Legislature want to stop the construction of an incinerator in Waterbury or elsewhere for that matter? The first thing to realize is that we are not talking about small projects. At 60 million dollars, an incinerator would be the single largest project ever undertaken

41
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 6, 1987

MR. MC GAVRAN: (continued)

by Waterbury. If it should not operate in an acceptable manner, it would represent a financial blow to Waterbury and its taxpayers so severe that many years would be required to recover.

Why might the incinerator fail to operate in an acceptable manner? The simple answer is: none have. Why should an incinerator in Waterbury be any different? Furthermore, I am optimistic that the definition of "acceptable" is certainly going to change. Sooner or later, the Legislature will change its mind about acceptable levels of toxins that can be emitted from an incinerator. Sooner or later, the Legislature will decide the ground and water pollution caused by the ash is unacceptable. Sooner or later, the Legislature will decide Connecticut should not burn garbage from other states. And, sooner or later, the Legislature will mandate recycling.

It is essential these decisions be made sooner rather than later. If, because of inaction on your part this year, Waterbury and other towns proceed too far with their plans to build incinerators, it will be difficult if not impossible for them to turn back. The State could end up with many incinerators that are unsafe to operate, produce toxic ash and are not even needed because of recycling.

It is not in the best interest of the State of Connecticut to have its cities and towns spending hundreds of millions of dollars on unsafe and unneeded incinerators. It is in the best interest of the State of Connecticut to reduce its volume of waste by recycling. Unfortunately, unenlightened local officials do not always understand this. Therefore, the Legislature must immediately put a stop to the construction of new incinerators and it must immediately institute mandatory recycling.

Thank you.

55
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 6, 1987

MR. COLUCCI: (continued)

help for that situation up there, it would be a great help to the City.

Many people from this area enjoy many happy hours up there over the years, and you hate to lose that. Also, I support 6589. I think it is an investment in the future of this State. You will get the money back in more tourism coming in, and it is needed. It would add to the quality of life in Connecticut for the future: very important.

Okay, I am here to support House Bill 5686, mandating recycling in municipalities. I support the bill whole-heartedly, but I think that when you mandate and there is a cost, you are going to have to come up with the money to the cities. It is important.

Also, I think that you should have an education program prior to this going into effect. I think we should put a time limit on all cities to get into the recycling program. I think you should give them a carrot of something if they do get into the program, and I will just use GTB and the formula you use...you know...when...the more you put into education, the better the funds coming into the city. Something to that effect. I don;t mean that type of a formula, but you have to give them a carrot to do it.

It is the first step in getting rid of some of our problems that we have.

Secondly, I support House Bill 7201. I think if six plants can do the job, why build 19 or 20? I think it is important; I think that we should look at the utilities to see if they have any abandoned electric-producing generating stations. Maybe you can utilize them. It would be a central location, and maybe you could deliver there....a bigger location. There is a few

58
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 6, 1987

MR. SANTORO: (continued)

years ago.

The Timex Corporation facility which is serviced by wells had an awful draught one summer, and would have had to shut down except for the fact that they were able to tap into Tracey's Pond and use that water to run their cooling systems of which they need quite a bit of. Of course, that facility is now operated by Data-Com, and as you know, one of the main things that industry finds receptive in Connecticut is the ample water supply.

So, I hope that your Committee will report favorably on HB number 6032 for the preservation of Tracey's Pond. It is available to the public although, I will admit that there are litterbugs that really make a mess of the place there. I think...if you people put in money...I am sure the City would have to reciprocate and police it a whole lot better.

Thank you very much.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you. Edward Sabes? I am not sure that I am pronouncing it...It is 61 Anawan. Okay. Isabelle Santoro. Okay...that is your spouse. Okay. Richard Argenta followed by Paul...looks like Matlonis....Okay, Richard is not here. Is Paul? Ed Staskauskas? Liz, how do I pronounce this? Okay.

EDWARD STASKAUSKAS: It is get even time. Our names together sound like a double play combination. My name is Ed Staskauskas, I reside at 207 Nichols Drive in Waterbury, the street that the CRRRA violated arbitrarily and capriciously. I am here tonight to speak for Bills 5686, 7201 5599, and we are opposed to 6803.

I hope my remarks will leave to that. Representative Del Bianco told you about my area within

TOM CARUSELLO: (continued)

if we could recycle tin cans in 1942, then we should be able to do it better with aluminum today in 1987. Aluminum, glass and paper can all be recycled, and just as Connecticut once lead this nation to a constitution, we can lead this nation in recycling. Recycling can become a new growth industry both for the City of Waterbury and for the State of Connecticut, that if done right, it can eliminate the need for the only recycling done here in this State which is the bottle bill which is a form of recycling which apparently you know.

REP. MUSHINSKY: I was the lobbyist for it. It took six years to pass it by the way. These returnable type of measures are extremely difficult to pass because you have to take on the packaging lobby; the Committee met them all last month on the 20th. They were talking to us about how terrible these bills were.

TOM CARUSELLO: Well, if we do recycle, we may be able to eliminate having to bring your bottles back if you know that if you throw them in the garbage, they're going to be recycled. But thank you for the bottle bill.

But let us not look at burning of garbage as a new technology, burning of trash is as old as man himself. Certainly, we cannot allow any more trash burning in either this City or the State. Recycling can and must be established for both environmental and economic reasons. If it takes the State to plant the recycling seed with additional money, then so be it. The time is short, the job immense; I and the members of ANTI and most of the people who spoke here on these bills tonight support bill 5686 and 7201. Thank you very much.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you. Remember that except the Task Force that worked on recycling goals which set the goal of 25% for the State of Connecticut concluded that 75% of our current trash is not recyclable at this time. So, we are probably going to have to live

DAVID BOZUTTO: (continued)

to speak briefly to a couple of others as the hour is late.

Committee Bill Number 5017 which I believe is a revision of the original statutory section of Connecticut General Statute, Section 22A-227. I believe it repeals that statute and provides for some significant change in the statute, in particular the change that I am most concerned about is the section that reads: the plan should be revised at intervals of not less than five years, notwithstanding the provisions of this section of recycling component to the plan may be submitted on or before January 1, 1988.

Waterbury introduced its Resource Recovery Authority Bill or plan to DEP on the last day of 1986 and fell under the bill as it currently exists. My understanding of the current bill that is being proposed, the one that I find problematic, is that it would keep us from making any significant changes in that plan as it currently exists. It is my concern that that not be so structured. There are possibilities of changing that plan currently - you've heard this evening many opponents of a trash to energy plant in Waterbury. The Waterbury Resource Recovery Authority has at least discussed the possibility of looking into other options, including recycling, but possibly looking at the Bristol plant as an option. I believe that this bill would preclude us from doing that, and I would not like to see that happen.

I am also here this evening to speak in favor of - and briefly because I think everything has already been said - House Bill number 5686 and House Bill number 7201. I think that recycling is an absolutely essential component of any plan to eliminate waste. We have to, however, make that plan a total plan; as you mentioned, the prior speaker, one of the essential elements is reducing the amount of input coming into the waste train that is not recyclable. I think that's essential that that packaging material be addressed at some point in the future.

DAVID BOZZUTO: (continued)

Another point is - an essential element in recycling bill - is the other end, the spot market end. If you end up with 169 towns with 169 competing units on the spot market, it's going to be chaos. The state has to give us some aid in channelling what it is we're recycling, whether it be the glass or the newspaper or the metal, we cannot be competing with each other. There has to be some planned ability of some planned way to go from Waterbury's recycled material back out into the waste stream without having it pile up in Waterbury, while we're competing

.....

REP. MUSHINKSY: You may not be aware of it because it may not be on this list of bills, but the 13 million is going to be given out preferentially, preferences are the town has a mandatory ordinance or has a series of escalating quotas, can meet recyclable goals. Also that the town is part of a regional plan. Part of the grant money or perhaps bonding money if we pass the bonding bill, will be used to set up intermediate processing centers such as the one in Groton. The recyclables from maybe five or six towns would all go to this one place, and they are hand sorted by color of glass, type of metal, newspaper corrugated and packaged up in large volume pure recyclable product for the manufacturers to use. This is all modelled after that one operation in Groton which the Committee is going to tour next Saturday. So, we have though about that and you will not be 169 competing against each other; you will be regional waste shed recyclables, and they are pretty much going to match to waste sheds for waste energy plants.

DAVID BOZZUTO: I am glad to hear that.

REP. MUSHINSKY: What you have got to do though, at the City level, is you have to pass an ordinance requiring your citizens to separate their trash. They put it out on the curb, the State will give you money for the trucks and the collection mechanism, but you have to do the political conversion of your towns people.

81

sr

ENVIRONMENT

March 6, 1987

CHARLIE KURKER: (continued)

by (SPEAKER NOT NEAR MICROPHONE - inaudible)

whatever state plan is now adopt . . .

DAVID BOZZUTO: My concern is the language of the proposed bill, the one that I specified seems to by statute preclude any changes in a plan that's submitted prior to '87 for a period of five years.

CHARLIE KURKER: I don't know . . .

DAVID BOZZUTO: That the reading of that statute.

CHARLIE KURKER: (inaudible)

HB 5686

DAVID BOZZUTO: It is not just the issue of recycling that I am concerned about; the Waterbury plan provides for a Waterbury waste to energy plant. If it is decided by the Waterbury Resource Recovery Authority not to build in Waterbury, but rather to truck to Bristol, or some place else, I am concerned that that is in fact precluded by this proposed . . .

REP. MUSHINSKY: . . . I don't think so, but let me just get an opinion from our attorney here. This - it says not less than five years. That means that they can do it sooner doesn't? So you could do it every six months or one year, if you want.

REP. BROWN: I have have one more question. Right now, and I just received the information about the grant availability, is there - you keep going away David; get back here! Right now, do we have a mechanism that the Region can automatically come together or do we have to form these regions for recycling, because as Mary said, the first priority is going to be given to regions, but where are these regions? I mean are they there?

CHARLIE KURKER: There are some regional authorities that have been established . . . (inaudible)
In some cases, they have already been established.
So the answer is yes. There are regional authorities

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

ENVIRONMENT
PART 5
1348-1660

1987

4

abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

SEN. MEOTTI: Thank you, Commissioner. Are there any questions? Thank you, sir. Lois Hager.

LOIS HAGER: I would like to comment on Committee Bill 5686, An Act Concerning Recycling. Basically, we approve of this effort to encourage recycling in the State. I do have some technical things that I would like to point out with this bill.

First of all, section 1 essentially seeks to accomplish what we hope we have already accomplished with the finalized recycling plan, which you should receive shortly. That plan sets the goal of 20-25% and it outlines a strategy for accomplishing that kind of waste reduction through an overall recycling program, which will...in fact...include composting.

The second section may present some problems. This section suggests that the DEP will identify certain items that will be required to be recycled by 1988. We will identify them by 1988, and they will be required to be recycled by 1989. Again, I think that the intent of that is excellent. I would just say that the items to be recycled will have to be chosen very carefully to ensure that alternate means of disposal or handling are available and practical.

For example, without the availability of intermediate processing centers, State-wide requirements to recycle container glass and cans would result in serious hardship. It is also possible that some portion of the recyclable materials may move through a landfill, transfer station or resource recovery facility before being marketed, particularly if an intermediate processing center is co-sited for instance, with a resource recovery authority... I mean, resource recovery facility.

Therefore, we would recommend the following change to that particular section:

"On or after October 1989, no

5

abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MS. HAGER: (continued)

landfill, resources recovery facility or transfer station may accept from a municipality that has an intermediate processing center of other appropriate recycling facility available to service it, as determined by the Commissioner of Environmental Protection, any of the recyclable items identified by the Commissioner of Environmental Protection except for the purposes of recycling them."

This would allow us to use the transfer stations to handle some of the recyclable material and to take it to another place for marketing.

The third section, I think may be premature, in terms of the tipping fee subsidy. I know the intent is to give the same kind of incentive that was given to municipalities to participate in energy recovery. First, we are very much hoping that tipping fees will not be required at intermediate processing centers.

Because the State will be funding 100% of the capital cost as well as portions of the education and information programs necessary to initiate the operation, the cost will be quite different than those associated with the resource recovery facilities. Secondly, we hope that the revenue from the marketed materials will be sufficient to make the centers self-sufficient, so that tipping fees will not be required. If tipping fees were required in the early years to help pay operating costs before participation has increased sufficiently, we think that that tipping fee would be very minimal... a few dollars.

Therefore, to take a percentage of a few dollars probably won't be very significant for the municipality

6
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MS. HAGER: (continued)

in terms of the reimbursement.

Secondly, we think that the major benefit for municipalities will be because they are avoiding tipping fees at other facilities, and the small amount of money that you would be giving them as a percentage of a very small tipping fee on an intermediate processing center wouldn't mean much to each individual municipality, but it could be a larger amount for the State as a whole.

If you decide that... We also are going to have the demonstration projects which will give us that information on this whole situation about the economics of the IPC's, so we would be able to determine after a year or two whether we might need such a subsidy, which I think...at this point...is unlikely.

If you should decide that you need an incentive for municipalities to come to such facilities, we would recommend a flat rate incentive for tons recycled through the intermediate processing center. This would be far more equitable. For instance, a dollar a ton. It would mean...if you do it on a percentage basis, the least efficient intermediate processing centers are going to benefit. If you do it on a dollar per town, every municipality should have a more equitable return on their effort.

I did a little cost study to see what this might cost the State, but the assumptions are very broad. We don't...we have only one operating facility. If the Southeast project is the only one that is operating and if it is recycling 10% of the material in that area, with a population of 250,000 people, in the first year, it would cost the State, at a dollar per ton reimbursement: \$20,000.

In the second year, it would cost...for that facility: \$30,000. If either the Bridgeport or the New Haven plant were operating in the following year with a

7

abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MS. HAGER: (continued)

population base of 600,000 and they were recycling 8% in the first year, the total amount that you would be reimbursing to the Groton area and to either the New Haven or the Bridgeport area would be \$68,000, approximately, so it is not a lot of money, and it might provide an incentive. We just don't think that it is necessary at this point. We would like to have the economics demonstrated through the Demonstration Program first.

I know it is not on your agenda, but I would like to make a brief comment on another bill which is terribly important to the recycling program, and that is 5233, An Act Concerning Source Reduction Planning. That involves staffing and a market study, which are critical to getting this whole recycling program off the ground. It also deals with increasing the number of people on the Recycling Task Force, which has been very, very important in helping the process along.

Thank you very much. I would be happy to answer any questions.

SEN. MEOTTI: Thank you. Are there questions from the Members of the Committee? Representative Joyce?

REP. JOYCE: Representative Joyce from the 25th District. I am just wondering what provision is made, what provision are you suggesting for the towns that are faced with providing a minimum quantity to the resource recovery plants? If they are going to have to recycle 25% by October 1, 1989, what about the quotas that they have to meet at the recycling center...the resource recovery plants?

MS. HAGER: We don't think that any municipality will be able to recycle 25% of its waste just through the intermediate processing center. We think it will be a program with many components, including composting and waste reduction. So...

8

abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

REP. JOYCE: You mean...by that date...the Resource Recovery Plants, as I understand it, will not be able to accept these things that are listed in the regulations. I presume that newspapers, bottles and cans...

MS. HAGER: That is why we suggested the wording be changed to say that they cannot accept it unless there is...if there is no other facility available to recycle...

REP. JOYCE: What if there is a facility?

MS. HAGER: That is why we are suggesting the wording change. We don't think it is appropriate to require that, unless you have an alternate available.

REP. JOYCE: But, you are... I mean.. you are saying that the wording says that is there is a facility available. Supposing that there isn't a facility available, would they still have to make that quota at the Resource Recovery Plant?

MS. HAGER: I think...I don't this is act...

REP. JOYCE: Isn't that a dilemma for you?

MS. HAGER: This act doesn't say 25%; it says certain materials,...

REP. JOYCE: Can't be accepted.

MS. HAGER: ...aiming for a goal of 25% for the plan of the whole.

REP. JOYCE: But these materials can't be accepted at the Resource Recovery Plants after October 1, 1989?

MS. HAGER: If there is an alternate available, yes.

REP. JOYCE: Yes, but when and if there isn't an alternative available...source, what then?

SEN. MEOTTI: They would still have to meet a quota.

CMR. ANDERSON: Representative Joyce, I think the whole approach to recycling has put a different dimension on resource recovery also. It has made it truly resource recovery by pulling those things out of the waste stream.

The contracts that CRRA has signed lately have had a variable amount,...in other words, they can adjust that amount as recycling gets more and more prevalent or becomes available. I think, whether it is done through law or just through a negotiation of CRRA, that the same thing is going to have to be done for those that have signed up for a hard future, simply because...you know... there are enough towns that are willing to come in that could make up that difference.

So, I think this is something that isn't yet figured out, because we don't know how much we will be pulling out or when the resource...the recycling plants will be on line, but I think that is something that just has to be monitored and adjusted as it goes.

REP. JOYCE: I think, though, that many of us would feel uneasy about voting for it unless we had some....some commitments of what it is going to be... CRRA isn't the only game in town, either. We have a place in Bristol which requires a minimum amount of garbage. ...

CMR. ANDERSON: And I think that what can be done there also, Representative Joyce, is that they could bring in another town to make up that difference. There are enough towns that are available right now that before were unwilling to join a resource recovery operation that are willing to go in now. They have a waiting list for mid-Connecticut, and I am sure that if Bristol does not have one, I could recommend a couple of towns that would love to get in.

10
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

CMR. ANDERSON: (continued)

So, in other words, the capacity...even with pulling that out...I don't believe that it would effect the capacity that we will have in resource recovery.

SEN. MEOTTI: John and Lois, I think...just to ask for a moment to follow up on a bit of what Representative Joyce was talking about: the issue of whether or not recycling would harm municipalities that have entered into contractual agreements, commitments with waste to energy plants is discussed at length, I believe, in the Report of the Task Force.

CMR. ANDERSON: Right.

SEN. MEOTTI: And it does...you know...it does recognize the existence of the issue and talks about some of the factors in this and what the generation of solid waste on the local level is...and explores that at some length. I think Committee Members that are interested in that issue...that the report besides what it deals with in all the rest...does shed some light on that issue, and you ought to take a look at it...hence, to resolve in my mind...the concern about competition with these contractual commitments.

Representative Anderson?

REP. ANDERSON: Thank you... Representative David Anderson. Would you just elaborate just very briefly on the staffing in the other bill that mentioned, just so that we have that information in terms of implementing the plan?

CMR. ANDERSON: I am sorry, Representative Anderson, somebody handed me something and I was reading it. Would you repeat that?

REP. ANDERSON: Yes...well, I think that we have all agreed that when the plan is approved, as it

11
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

REP. ANDERSON: (continued)

hopefully will be very shortly, that it probably ...we should immediately take some of the 10 million for staffing this year, for the implementation of the plan. Could you elaborate a little on that, and tell us what you think we ought to do?

CMR. ANDERSON: We are putting together the need for personnel. There was one bill that has been in the Environment Committee asking for personnel, but that has been not submitted as a budget option, so we are meeting with OPM. In some form, we are going to have to put those people on in order to get out in front right now with education and follow up. So, that is being dealt with. Exactly how we are going to do it, I am not sure.

It would be much easier if you passed that bill.

SEN. MEOTTI: Representative... Are you finished?

REP. ANDERSON: Yes.

SEN. MEOTTI: Representative Brown?

REP. BROWN: Representative Brown, 74th District. Could you tell the Committee at this point how the response has been to applying for the Demonstration Project?

MS. HAGER: We had about 25 people in a Workshop, Representative, representing almost every area of the State. We don't think that every area will be applying. We are expecting through the Demonstration Project to get three, probably three applications for Demonstration Funding.

But, I was very encouraged that although people knew on other portions of the State that they were not ready for the quick time frame of the demonstration project, that they are ready and

12
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MS. HAGER: (continued)

interested in the ten million dollars, and I think that is another argument why we need to get staffing...staffed up, so that we can begin to disburse those funds and get recycling off the ground and to have it help us within five years.

So,...

REP. BROWN: So, just for my own clarification, the dates in this projected bill here would be for three demonstration projects? You think that by October of 1989, we would have three demonstration projects that would be on line?

MS. HAGER: I think...we would hope that by the winter of 1988 we would have two on-line and have the third ready to go.

REP. BROWN: Thank you.

SEN. MEOTTI: Are there any other questions? Thank you. The next person on the list is Robert Jones.

ROBERT JONES: Mr. Chairman...

SEN. MEOTTI: Good morning.

MR. JONES: Ladies and gentlemen of the Committee, my name is Robert Jones, I am the Director of the Bureau of Fisheries in the Department of Environmental Protection. I have been asked to provide the Department's comments on Raised Committee Bill 7540, An Act Requiring Expenditure of Certain Federal Funds for Open Space Acquisition.

I thank the Committee for the opportunity to make this comment, and if I may, I will summarize the printed information that has been provided. The Department of Environmental Protection strongly opposes Raised Committee Bill 7540, since it constitutes a serious infringement on our ability to manage the fisheries and wildlife resources

19
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. HIBBARD: (continued)

the Recreation and Natural Heritage Trust Fund. We also recognize that this is a subject of legislative determination, but we underline the need to have the fund of sufficient amount to carry out an active program and assure that funding is provided on a continuing basis.

I would also say that the Department of Environmental Protection needs to be sufficiently staffed to carry out the program. At this time, the Board feels that ...strongly...that as an absolute minimum...one position be added to the Office of Land Acquisition and Property Management of the DEP, and that this position be that of a Principle Environmental Analyst.

This person would have the responsibility of coordinating the Recreation and Natural Heritage Trust Program with the Board, municipalities, and private cooperating entities. We believe that House Bill 6080 could be used as a vehicle to accomplish this.

I am appreciative on behalf of the Board to have this opportunity to present our side. If there are any questions, I would be more than happy to answer them.

SEN. MEOTTI: Are there any questions from the Members of the Committee? Thank you, John. Dave Bozzutto?

DAVE BOZZUTTO: Mr. Chairman, Ladies and Gentleman of the Committee, my name is David Bozzutto, I am from Waterbury, Connecticut. I am a Member of the Board of Aldermen in Waterbury and a Member of the Waterbury Regional Resource Recovery Authority. Thank you for the opportunity to address you this morning. I am here to support House Bill number 5686 as it is currently amended.

I believe that the City of Waterbury is ready,

20
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. BOZZUTTO: (continued)

willing and able to adopt a recycling program. Our consultant estimates that Waterbury generates approximately 250 tons per day in its waste stream. We, like all other Connecticut communities, are planning how to dispose of our trash and...after our landfill space is exhausted. The life expectancy of our landfill currently is estimated to be approximately three years. We know that the most environmentally sound process currently available to us is recycling.

We wish recycling were an absolute answer, but we know it is not. However, we know it is also a very significant part of the answer. We also know that the State's 169 towns and cities cannot develop 169 different plans. That would be counterproductive. It is important and we support the regional concept. It is important to develop the regional centers to avoid competition between communities and important so that once the recycling process begins, 169 communities are not competing with one another for the...what we call the spot market...the recyclable material.

We need State direction and State financial support, and I hope that the direction will come from the Department of Environmental Protection and not as stated in the bill...from Connecticut Resource Recovery Authority. I think the Members of the Committee well know Waterbury's experiences and feelings about the Connecticut Resource Recovery Authority.

Waterbury knows how to source separate. We did it for several years until our old incinerator was closed down. When I was growing up in Waterbury, we always had one trash barrel which wore a red stripe. All bottles and cans were deposited into that trash receptable and every couple of weeks, there was separate pick up for that red-striped receptable.

21
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. BOZZUTTO: (continued)

The citizens of Waterbury have an experience in source separation, if not exactly in recycling.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Environment Committee, if waste management is not the single most important issue in the State of Connecticut today, it is certainly one of the most important issues that faces our State and clearly our cities. We need your help; we need your direction. We actively seek your support and your input and your aid in putting together a resource recycling system in Western Connecticut and in the City of Waterbury.

I would like to...the opportunity to present to you further written testimony at a subsequent time, and I would like some time to do that. If any Members of the Committee have any questions, I would be happy to answer them....about Waterbury's position....

SEN. MEOTTI: Thank you. Are there any questions from Members of the Committee? None. Thank you very much.

MR. BOZZUTTO: Thank you.

SEN. MEOTTI: We are going to move to the public list. I would ask you, again...since we did hold an extensive hearing on general solid waste issues a few weeks back...please summarize your positions. Please don't repeat arguments of facts which have already been shared with us by other members, particularly from a group that you are a part of... and to remind you what Confucius once said when he was Chairing a Committee in...many years ago...that:

"A strong argument need not be repeated and a weak argument is not strengthened by repetition."

(laughter)

22
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

SEN. MEOTTI: (continued)

With that warning, we would like to ask John Freedman to begin the Public Portion.

JOHN FREEDMAN: Good morning, my name is John Freedman. I live in Preston, Connecticut. I am the Co-Chairman of Citizens for Alternatives to Incineration of Refuse, and I am also Co-Chair of CCAG's Solid Waste Committee. I am here today to talk about Committee Bill 5686. I do not have written copies of testimony I am going to provide, but what I do have is a lot of backup, technical information, and I do have one copy that I can pass along. I trust that somebody can find a copier. There is about 30 or 40 pages here.

Regarding section 1, my personal feeling is that it is a good idea...I like the idea of having the mandate to recycle, and I think that I can even live with the idea that we are shooting for 1990. I think you have got your sights set too low.

What is recyclable in the waste stream? What percentage is really recyclable? I went to the trouble of looking at DEP's own literature and came up with the calculations, and that is why I am going to provide you with this supporting information, okay? But, if you look at just papers, recyclable papers, bottles and cans.... and you do it at the rate of a 75% participation rate... which I think most people agree is a reasonably achievable number to expect on a mandatory program certainly...you are looking at 34.6% weight reduction in the waste stream. Yet, here the State is setting a 25% goal including composting.

Now, here is another non-multiple choice question. How much of the waste stream is food waste and how much of the waste stream is yard waste? What are those components represent? It turns out that yard waste, according to...and I am only talking about the stuff that you would bury... I am excluding bulky waste which don't get buried

23
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. FREEDMAN: (continued)

...they are sitting up on top of land someplace, ok? So, these numbers are adjusted to account for what the percentage is of what you would normally bury at a landfill.

It turns out that yard waste represents about 22.9% of what you would normally bury. Well, that is a crime, because yard waste is certainly easy to compost. You don't even need an in-vessel digester to compost yard waste. You merely lay the stuff up in wind rows, wet it and turn it occasionally like they are doing in Berkley, California, and you come out with some very nice looking compost. People can do it in their back yards in the more rural communities.

But, certainly on a regional basis, if it was linked up with an IPC, it offers an opportunity to get way, way higher than the State has set for a goal. If you additionally wanted to expend some effort to develop the technology for composting food waste, you are looking at another 20% above and beyond that.

So, I guess the punchline is...I am not going to go with all the gory details of this, but the punchline of these three exhibits that I am going to pass along to you are: in the first one, we took a look at the breakdown of what the waste stream is in Southeastern Connecticut, that is already committed to a resource recovery facility. In Part B of that supporting analysis, we looked at what would be the impact if we pulled the papers, bottles and cans out of the waste stream at the rate of 75% participation.

What would it mean in terms of BTU value of the fuel? One of the arguments that I am concerned about is...is there going to be a draw...(inaudible) if these things are next to a resource recovery facility? I think that they are working in

24
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. FREEDMAN: (continued)

opposition to one another because there would be a significant drop in the BTU value of that treatment.

Then, part C, which is the one that I think you will find the most interesting, goes into all kinds of ...alternatives of what the volume reduction is forded. I will tell you something: if the volume reduction is coming out of the Resource Recovery Facilities compared to the alternatives that are in here is not all that favorable. In fact, there is one alternative that we developed in looking at the southeastern project that is equivalent in volume reduction and landfill extension to the Southeastern Connecticut Project, and there is another alternative that does even better, and it doesn't involve any burning at all.

I will leave that a mystery, because I want you to read all this testimony. Okay...so my basic comment is: I like the idea of mandatory recycling in here and I strongly support that idea. I would like you to go back before you finalize this number and take another look at the figures that I am providing to you, because I really think that the goal of 25%, particularly with the goal of implementing it by 1990...is really a little bit too low. It is a goal that came out of the Solid Waste Recycling Task Force, but I think that a lot of that decision to use that as a goal came from looking at other people who were supposed experts on the subject saying: that is the best you can ever hope for.

What I am asking you to do is look at what you have available and set that as a goal. If you fall short of that mark, that is something else. But, that really ought to be the goal...the best that we can do.

Okay, section 2...I like the concept that after

25
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. FREEDMAN: (continued)

October 1, 1989, that we are not going to put recyclable materials in a landfill, resource recovery facility or transfer station, and I think I agree with Lois Hager about ...you know.. possibly using the latitude for transfer stations to use...almost like a satellite center for recyclables, so that may need to be modified to that extent.

I don't know that you don't have to somehow combine this with....

SEN. MEOTTI: I am going to have to ask you to sum up as quickly as possible.

MR. FREEDMAN: Okay...I didn't know that you had stated a time limit.

SEN. MEOTTI: We are going to try to enforce a flexible one.

MR. FREEDMAN: Okay...what I would like you to do is to consider the impact on plant sizing. I think that somehow you have to tie in the goal of the size of what we are aiming for in recycling with the size of the plants, okay? And I don't see that those two things are tied together, but what we are going to wind up with is a lot of plants in the State. I know that 7201 is on your agenda today.

I endorse the idea of subsidizing towns going to the intermediate processing centers, but I would make a suggestion. Ms. Hager had suggested a flat rate reimbursement would be better. I will run another idea by you. How about if we subsidize it to the same extent that that waste that would normally go to waste to energy plants...if you are paying 25% of the tipping fee, give them 25% of the tipping fee that they would have paid if that material had gone to the waste to energy

26
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. FREEDMAN: (continued)

plant. Make it an equal proposition. Don't make it a pittance. If you are going to subsidize bringing stuff to the waste to energy plant, it seems to me that what you ought to be doing is paying people ...to encourage people not to bring it to the waste to energy plant, but to bring it over to the IPC. It makes more sense, and I think that you have to make it significant enough for them to do so.

The last comment I had about it was that I think that the grants for the intermediate processing centers ought to be contingent upon to what degree they have a total recycling program. Particularly the ones that I am concerned about are the ones that are linked up with the Resource Recovery Facilities, because of my comments about fuel value of paper, ok? And I think that ITC's that are set up to recycle paper should be given even more dispensation or more consideration for grants than ones that do not, because I think that there is an inherent value in recycling that paper...that I think is demonstratable even in the DEP literature to do so.

I think that is about all that I have to say. I have some other comments about 5233, but I will hold off on those and let someone else speak to those.

SEN. MEOTTI: Thank you very much. Are there any questions from the Members of the Committee? Thank you. Les Corey? Les is not here. Mike Fermanis.

For your information, generally five minutes is the rule that we all attempt to use. However, as I indicated earlier, we will be flexible in enforcing that sooner than that is the testimony does become unduly repetitious.

27
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MIKE FERMANIS: Good morning. My name is Mike Fermanis; I am the Co-Chairman of the Citizens for Alternatives to the Incineration of Refuse and the Chairman of the Eastern Connecticut's Citizens Action Group.

The legislation being considered today is a welcome step in the right direction. The Members of this Committee which support Committee Bill 5686 and the related bills concerning source reduction and financial incentives are to be congratulated on their hard work and farsightedness. You have done a good job in tackling a difficult problem.

The consolidation of a number of bills into an omnibus bill has produced a coherent piece of legislation, CAIR and ECCAG applaud Senate Bill 5686 and will work to see that it receives the support of their Legislators and the public.

You have already seen the favor predecessor bills have received in prior public hearings. That same state-wide support exists for this bill. There are a number of provisions in this bill which must be retained if the legislation is to remain meaningful and supportable by your constituents. They are:

- The 25% minimum recycling mandate
- The deadline of October 1990
- The requirement that the generator cannot present...the processor of the waste be responsible for separation and recycling, and
- The prohibition concerning the acceptability of recyclable items after October of 1989.

We also recognize that the incinerator promoters have managed to incorporate the substance of nefarious Senate Bill number 123 to further

28
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. FERMANI: (continued)

subsidize incineration above the unconscionable amount already afforded it through consumer electric rates.....(inaudible...) Waterbury bill.

The proponents of incineration are again seeking to promote it on the one hand and yet obscure its cost from the users. Section 2 of this bill, regarding increased subsidies for incineration during the first two years of the operation is scandalous. Further money to support incineration is.....

SEN. MEOTTI: Mr. Fermani, are you testifying to the bills that are before the Committee today?

MR. FERMANI: Yes...5686?

SEN. MEOTTI: Section 2 subsidized...there is no provision for subsidizing incineration in the bills before us today.

MR. FERMANI: Yes, there is.

SEN. MEOTTI: That is the ITC...recycling subsidization

MR. FERMANI: That is correct.

SEN. MEOTTI: It is in the same section as the provisions that are in Senate Bill 123 to mandate incineration so I think that if you could stick to the recycling elements, it would be beneficial to the Committee.

MR. FERMANI: All right. I am sorry. I was misled. I was under the impression that this applied to both.

SEN. MEOTTI: No, we have already...the Committee has already acted favorably on a bill that has gone to Appropriations for subsidies for incineration. That bill is out of this Committee.

29
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. FERMANI: But there is some overlap between these two?

SEN. MEOTTI: Merely for consistency sake...for consistency alone. Provisions of 5686 only address recycling. Provisions and the subsidy for recycling. That is the issue before the Committee today.

MR. FERMANI: Raised Committee Bill 7201 was considered by the groups that I represent as a necessary component of an intelligent waste management initiative, but it is not included and it does not appear in this bill. They must be included either here or seperately...in the seperate Bill 7201.

With the encouragement of the Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority and the Department of Environmental Protection, facilities that are already sized and in some cases already being built without recycling in mind. For instance, in New London County, the proposed facility has less than 450 tons a day of waste committed and is requesting Siting Council Approval for a 600 tons per day plant, for which the users will be libale for a 52 million dollar bond. Two additional facilities are in the planning for the same region, bringing the possible total capacity to over 1500 tons per day.

In addition, three private companies propose to construct smaller.... (inaudible: coughing) incinerators to take advantage of the Waterbury bill subsidy.

Regardless of your feelings towards incineration, it is apparent that something is seriously wrong. Financial committments of enormous magnitude coupled with put or pay municipal contracts will ensure that the current uncoordinated stampede toward incineration will be irreversible unless you act now. Therefore, if recycling is to be

30
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. FERMANI: (continued)

successful, this bill must be modified to limit the capacity of regional incinerators to the amount of waste available less the 25% recycling. A similar limit should be placed on the combined capacity of all such facilities in the State.

I understand that that is included in House Bill 7201 ? Or Committee Bill 7201?

REP. MUSHINSKY: We are reporting on that today.

MR. FERMANI: Okay, good. This lack of capacity planning and unrestricted subsidization is the reason why companies and individuals have come to Connecticut from literally around the world looking for something to burn.

The DEP solid waste management plan fails to mention any such limitation and yet gives lip service to... (coughing)... Since the DEP has failed to implement an integrated solid waste management plan, the Members of this Committee along with Task Forces such as the Recycling Task Force and others created in Committee Bill 5233 must lead them down the proper path.

We will continue to look to you, our Representatives, to ensure that Connecticut finds an intelligent, responsible way to dispose of our waste for the next 20 years. We thank you for generally taking the high road in this regard and enlist your wholehearted support for Committee Bill 5686.

Thank you.

SEN. MEOTTI: Are there any questions from Members of the Committee? Thank you very much. Les Corey?

LES COREY: Sorry, I stepped out a moment ago. Senator Meotti, Representative Mushinsky and

36
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

REP. MUSHINSKY: (continued)

since Jan had already kicked us out of the office with that sum in mind.

MR. COREY: Yes.

REP. MUSHINSKY: This will probably be rewritten as a Finance Bill, so anyone who is interested in the bill, if you would spread the word that probably...

MR. COREY: It is going to end up in Finance.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Yes...going into Finance and that is the bill that will need to be lobbied.

MR. COREY: We will. Thank you.

SEN. MEOTTI: Diane Blackman?

DIANE BLACKMAN: Good morning, Committee Members. My name is Diane Blackman, and I am speaking on behalf of the Connecticut Chapter of the Sierra Club, with a membership of a little more than 6,100 across the State. The following statement is to endorse Bill 5686, An Act Concerning Recycling.

Landfills in municipalities are quickly reaching their capacities; some are already overburdened. Prospects for new locations for landfills or extensions of present sites are very limited. Some of these areas could have had their lifetime prolonged if the solid waste being poured into them had been reduced.

The strategy by the State to recycle 25% of solid waste by 1990 will help to achieve this. Also, by identifying recyclable materials and requiring their recycling, we will be putting to best use those materials, along with decreasing the need to create new ones...and therefore decreasing the consumption of our natural resources.

The municipalities, however, need a stimulus to

37
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MS. BLACKMAN: (continued)

follow through on the recycling program. Grants or financial assistance from the State where all other requirements are met would be incentive to follow through on this much needed program.

The Connecticut Chapter strongly urges you to support this bill to help alleviate the solid waste problem which will only worsen. Recycling is a start.

Thank you.

SEN. MEOTTI: Thank you.. Are there any questions?
Thank you, Diane. Katie Feidelson?

KATIE FEIDELSON: My name is Katherine Feidelson and I am from the Connecticut Conference for Municipalities. I want to speak on Proposed Bill 5686. I have already communicated to the Committee CCM's endorsement of the report of the Municipal Solid Waste Recycling Task Force.

The extent that this bill conforms to that plan and will help implement that plan, we are for it. The most difficult problem is in lines 27 and 28. The DEP amendment which Lois Hager suggested will help... but even there...that amendment is based on existence of workable IPC's or other recycling centers. So, we would consider this only with such an amendment, but...even there...we suggest that you really go slow and look at it carefully.

It is not clear... you know...whether IPC's will be developed. Municipalities have been stung before, expecting...you know...a regional or a state-wide facility to be provided. As Representative Joyce pointed out, some municipalities... even if they have an IPC...may have problems in disposing of recyclable items.

As far as the subsidy is concerned, it would be a good incentive, but here again...we really don't

38
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MS. FEIDELSON: (continued)

know yet enough about the market, or what the tipping fees may have to be, what the operational costs of the IPC's may be. Certain assumptions are being made.

What we would like to stress is that it is most important to get the plan going, and we ask that all steps be taken to assure that the Task Force is continued, that they work with DEP to oversee the development of the plan, and that DEP has appropriate staff to make the plan work. The work of the Task Force has been negotiated and discussed. They have been influential and practical municipal representatives on that Task Force, and that is why we are supporting...very strongly... the Task Force Plan.

SEN. MEOTTI: Thank you. Any questions?

REP. MUSHINSKY: Yes, does that mean that you don't like our deadline in the bill and that you would prefer the one in the Task Force?

MS. FEIDELSON: That is correct.

REP. MUSHINSKY: You don't think you can make a four year deadline?

MS. FEIDELSON: I think we are concerned that if you have a Task Force where you have been working over a long period of time...you have State officials, municipal representatives on that Task Force... We wonder: why change the deadline that they think will work.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Do you know that New Jersey is going to have to do it in two years? The same deadline? The same goal? I don't think that they are necessarily any smarter than we are.

MS. FEIDELSON: Well...you know...I think any deadline is arbitrary...so...you know...it can be four

39
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MS. FEIDELSON: (continued)

year, five years... I am not sure that it makes that much difference. But it seems to me that... One problem in looking at these bills is that you have a whole series of bills and Task Force Reports, and I think it is very difficult to try and coordinate the different things that are going through the Committee and the report. We just want to make sure that it is coordinated... that the left hand knows what the right hand is doing.

REP. BROWN: I have a few...

SEN. MEOTTI: Representative Brown?

REP. BROWN: As you know, I am definitely in favor. If I had my way, recycling would have been yesterday, but...in working with different municipalities, Katie, do you rally see a good faith effort on a lot of the municipalities to jump in and really be creative in meeting these deadlines?

MS. FEIDELSON: We have had a lot of interest at CCM in recycling. We get numerous requests for information about how other cities and towns are recycling. We have a whole recycling kit, and practically every publication...or large publication, we try to include something about recycling. So, we are really trying to encourage it.

REP. BROWN: To your knowledge, how many cities that you represent have ordinance pertaining to recycling at this point?

MS. FEIDELSON: I am not sure. I could get that for you.

REP. BROWN: I would appreciate that. Thank you.

SEN. MEOTTI: Any other questions? Thank you, Katie. Khis Cieplak?

40
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

KRIS CIEPLAK: Good morning, Committee Members. I am going to cut some of this short. I am glad what just went ...because I will start with that.

A strong committment for a long term solution lies in reducing the amount of waste that we produce, thereby minimizing and hopefully eliminating the need for dumps and incinerators. Recycling, reusing, remanufacturing and reducing our solid waste in the household is the approach to the problem that will save money and will save the environment. Groups and individuals throughout the State of Connecticut are working together to have Connecticut adopt a comprehensive solid waste disposal plan that would include a state-wide mandatory recycling program.

A state-wide public education campaign is needed which would incorporate schools and the media. Recycling is being done in many communities throughout the United States. Rhode Island has legislated mandatory recycling and has implemented a program called "OSCAR" to bring attention to this issue. New York State proposes a goal of 50% waste reduction through recycling. East Hampton, Long Island hopes to achieve a 70% goal.

Connecticut should pursue obtaining information from these states and communities and resume a leadership role in the environment movement. Leadership is what my community is looking for, leadership from the state level, leadership on how to implement a recycling program. Mandaory recycling can put an end to the building of any more incinerators, thus safeguarding our environment. Information on new technology of non-incineration is developing.

I would like ...before I present this...I would like to make a comment here. People in my community would like to do recycling, however, we have a Board. We have political factions that are not getting along in my town...or in my valley, okay?

41
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

REP. MUSHINSKY: What town? What town are you from?

MS. CIEPLAK: Ansonia, Connecticut. And so...if one proposes something, the other one is not going to go along with it, all right? So, we have a big problem. We don't have an incinerator at this town, at this time, okay? We have been refused by the CRRA to go into the Bridgeport plant.

I personally would like... what I would like to do and there are other concerned citizens from my area... We would like to do recycling. We would like to do it to eliminate as much as possible from it. We don't have anyone to show us, to lead us. If I, as Mrs. Cieplak, tell people what to do, I am sure that I will have a lot of enemies.

So, I feel that the State is going to have to do this, because in the first place...the State got us into this crisis stage. I feel the way I do about this, because the citizens had to put on a forum last fall...to get the experts, okay? Otherwise, we just got consultants and it was too one-sided. A citizens' forum was taped, and then...so I would like the Committee, at its convenience...because it seems that I was here once before and it seems that many seats were empty as it is today.

So, perhaps, with a tape...watching...or having dinner someplace...somewhere...someplace...

(laughter)

watch this.... In the meantime, Dr. Paul Congret of St Laurence County has also made a videotape of recycling in Germany, and I would like the Committee to see it. It is an alternative to incineration.

REP. MUCHINSKY: You know that in Germany, they heavily rely on mass burn, don't you?

MS. CIEPLAK: In Germany, yes...however, in Germany

42
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MS. CIEPLAK: (continued)

now, they are closing the gap.

REP. MUSHINSKY: That is where the technology come from.

MS. CIEPLAK: I know the State of Connecticut is following old stuff; they are now having new things developed.

REP. MUSHINSKY: But they are...they are still using mass burn extensively. I mean, you should not be misled by Dr. Conet that they have switched over to recycling. That is not correct. They are doing both, just as the State of Connecticut would do.

MS. CIEPLAK: They are doing both at this time. However, they are now changing to non-incineration, and hopefully that will work, so that they can eliminate the others.

SEN. MEOTTI: Are there other questions from the Committee for Ms. Cieplak? Representative Gilbert?

REP. GILBERT: Yes..Representative Gilbert. I don't take exception to it, but I think your remark concerning the State got us into this.... A lot of municipalities get themselves into a situation where they have to go to the State, and then when the State comes back to them and helps them out or gives them an answer, then they find out that they don't like it. But, they have already out the pressure on the State to do it that way. So...you know...your theory of saying that the State got us into it... If the municipalities would take a little bit more energy and a little bit more enthusiasm towards correcting problems, they wouldn't have to go to the State and end up in the situation they are in now.

MS. CIEPLAK: All right. For me to learn about Resource Recovery, I went through some books that I have in my own home. I finally discovered it in the

43
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MS. CIEPLAK: (continued)

Science Annual, 1974, and that is where I started to learn about this. So, it was already planned many years ago for this Resource Recovery type of consideration.

Also,...in a very small town...you spoke about recycling. There are... Many years have gone by. The priority seems to me to lie..has been with the incineration part, not with the technology of recycling. Even today, I believe ...what is it: 750 million dollars is in incineration and 13 million for recycling? The State could have started this many, many years ago.

Now, you are going to tell me that they tried. I don't know how. I mean...how did you try? Did you have...

REP. MUSHINSKY: We have legislation in this Committee for years and years that would have put money into recycling and into paper purchasing by the State and things like that. We could not get any of those bills funded by the Appropriations Committee, because...until last year, until these plants were proposed for particular sites, which aggravated the people that lived in those sites, there was no public support up here for recycling legislation. It was considered a hardship, and it was considered not a high priority for funding

This Committee has been... This Committee, for years...even before I was here and I have been here four terms now...has been writing recycling legislation.

SEN. MEOTTI: Thank you. Are there any other questions from Members of the Committee?

MS. CIEPLAK: Ok...I would like to...

SEN. MEOTTI: Would you leave those tapes?

44
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MS. CIEPLAK: I would like to give them to someone and Representative Brown will probably....

SEN. MEOTTI: Thank you very much, Mrs. Cieplak. Bruce Gunderson? Is there a Bruce Gunderson here?

BRUCE GUNDERSON: My name is Bruce Gunderson, and I am from Ansonia, Connecticut. I represent Concerned Citizens for Clean Air in Ansonia and the Valley and the Valley Citizens' Action Group. I would like to comment...members present that worked on recycling Bill number 5686. I would just like to make a few suggestions to modify it.

Before I do this, however, I just want to ask for support on another bill that the Environment Committee is looking at: Bill number 5233, An Act Concerning Source Reduction Planning. Some communities have achieved up to 25% reduction in their solid waste by source reduction and by minimizing programs.

Another bill I hope this Committee will vote favorably on later is Bill number 7201, concerning a need be shown before a Resource Recovery Facility be permitted....so that recyclable materials and burn materials won't compete with each other.

Now, concerning recycling bill number 5686, section 3, line 38...in that area...regarding how much grant money should go to incinerators and how much to recycling IPC's... Since this is the Environment Committee, and since recycling is environmentally more favorable than burning, more incentives and money should be made available for recycling.

Some things that I think are missing from the bill and should be included, and I urge you to include them :

- One is enforcement of mandatory recycling. This needs to be addressed. For example, in Minnesota, one county requires towns to recycle by a certain date. If this is not done, the county is going to

45
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. GUNDERSON: (continued)

step in and do it themselves, and they are going to bill the town for it.

-Another is: more details requiring composting. Figures of approximately 10% of solid waste is compostable. The State should follow existing programs that are set up in Greenwich, Connecticut and around the country and the world.

- There is a need for household hazardous waste and batteries to be collected in or disposed of at State IPC's. A separate area of these facilities should be included.

- There is a need for money to be made available for advertising and educating the public about the solid waste problems in our state, and the need for recycling and minimizing waste. Mac Donald's wouldn't be as big as it is now if they did not advertize day in and day out, and that is going to be very much needed here for the recycling program to get off in the State and stay going.

- And lastly, there is a need for money to be made available to Ed Hafner's company regarding recycling of plastic. I only know Ed from a telephone conversation I had with him a couple of years ago when I was... I have been saving my plastic and I was looking for someplace to put it. I called him and he said: hold on to it. We will get it sooner or later, and we will be able to recycle it.

His persistence, and I see him here tonight... his persistence to recycled plastic deserves to get off the ground with state aid. Besides plastic...plastic would be one of the bigger polluters coming out of trash incinerators.

One final comment...to Mary Mushinsky, Representative Mary Mushinsky...regarding this Committee looking for public support on recycling years ago. I have

46
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. GUNDERSON: (continued)

been writing letter to my Congressman; I have been coming here for years, been calling and writing to the DEP regarding recycling for over 10 years now, and... they have only talked about it.

They have handed out literature; they have produced literature, and I guess they helped to set up a program in Groton years ago. But, far more is needed by them and by Legislators to get things passed.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Our bills have to be funded in Appropriations, as you may know...the bills after they leave here, go to the Money Committees...if we are killed in the Money Committees...that is the end of the bill.

MR. GUNDERSON: Yes.

REP. MUSHINSKY: So, that is really the lobbying to fund any of these innovation things has to be done in the Money Committee.

SEN. MEOTTI: Are there any questions?

REP. FLEMING: Just one.

SEN. MEOTTI: Representative Fleming?

REP. FLEMING: Not to disagree with you, Mary, but... once things get over to the Money Committee...it is not just, as you well know...bills from the Environment Committee that are competing. There are bills from the Human Services Committee and the people that come in...and I have been on that Committee since I have been in the Legislature. The people that come in from Human Services don't really give a damn about some of the issues in the environment, and they don't consider them a priority.

So, perhaps what some of the Committee should do

47
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

REP. FLEMING: (continued)

is to take a look at what they send over to Appropriations, and only send over what they feel is most important, rather than send everthing over. That happens continually on the Appropriations Committee.

SEN. MEOTTI: Okay...are there any questions for Mr. Gunderson?

(laughter)

I thank you very much, sir. Bob Crook.

BOB CROOK: Mr. Chairman, my name is Bob Crook. I am Executive Director for the Connecticut Sportsman's Alliance; I am testifying in opposition to R.C.B. 7540, requiring the expenditure of certain fed-
eral funds for Open Space acquisition.

Let me say from the onset that PR...Pitman-Robertson and Dingle-Johnson are the most important source of things...to the sportsmen of the State. We pay a 10 or an 11% surcharge on all hunting equipment, archery equipment, some boating equipment...

(TAPE 3 STOPS...SOME SKIPPING IN THE LAST FEW SENTENCES... TESTIMONY CONTINUES ON CASSETTE 4)

BOB CROOK: (continued)

... a significant amount of people who are paying into these funds, and there is a significant amount of money coming into the State.

We support the intent of the bill, however, you know...for open space acquisiton...however, the bill poses really significant problems with fishery and wildlife...three major problems stand out.

55
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MS. CORCORAN: (continued)

open space diminishes, that is a diminishment of the population affiliated woodpeckers and with the bald eagle population that is directly related. A loss of deciduous forest represents a loss of habitat for red-eyed vireos and black throated warblers, and although some species may seem insignificant...bog turtles and salamanders... they represent very important indicators of the quality of our environment.

So, I would urge you to act in support of the 25 million bonding proposal for the Recreation and Natural Heritage Trust Fund. In addition, we ask your support for the amendments offered by the Nature Conservancy.

Beyond your commitment as Environment Committee Members, we urge you to actively participate in the establishment of this reliable source of funding, not just in this Committee, but in persuading your fellow Legislators that this is an important initiative.

You have heard what other states are doing, so I won't repeat that, but...I will just leave it at that, as I also would like to speak to bill, Proposed Substitute Bill 5686. As a Member of the Recycling Task Force, I ask you to consider making this bill reflect the regional solid waste recycling plan in the following areas:

- To ensure the success of state-wide recycling in reality as opposed to in theory.... I suggest the ... I suggest following the five year phase-in time schedule in the plan, and would therefore ask you to consider the October 1989 date accordingly. It is important that the flow of recyclables proceed in an orderly manner concurrent with the development of facilities and markets.

- Secondly, we understand from consultants working in the field as well as town officials currently

MS. CORCORAN: (continued)

working to achieve the maximum recycling possible that 25% is a reasonable but challenging waste reduction and recycling goal to meet. However, a provision could be added in the bill, allowing this bill to be evaluated and adjusted upward if documented information, experience and technology indicates that this is possible.

Going beyond the language of the bill and the recycling plan, I would like to suggest consideration be given to the adoption of regulations which will define enforcement measures to ensure that recycling goals are met by a certain date.

- Thirdly, I suggest that section 3 of the bill reflect the plan's stated intent: that DEP provide 100% of the capital cost of the IPC's and administer other portions of the recycling trust fund for feasibility, design and regional program grants to municipalities, as noted on page 69 and 73 of the plan.

On page 66 of the plan, it is indicated that DEP provide technical assistance to municipalities. I believe this is important to include in this bill, however, I would suggest strengthening the language to ensure that DEP's mandates emphasize the agency's role in taking the initiative and helping to ensure that towns are given all the assistance they require to organize regional recycling efforts. CRRRA may provide this assistance in some cases, but where they are not...DEP should be actively involved in advising towns and taking the time to provide the necessary resources and expertise.

In addition, I recommend the inclusion of DEP's educational role in promoting recycling within this bill. On page 75 of the plan, DEP has outlined a need for 8 staff positions, whether in this bill or in 5233. I hope you will give serious

57
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MS. CORCORAN: (continued)

consideration to giving DEP authority to tap into the Recycling Trust Fund for immediate staff needs, with the understanding that these will become line items in next year's DEP budget.

It is perhaps more appropriate in 5233 to provide for the continuation of the Task Force, which I believe has played a useful role in advising the DEP, and I understand that language is also needed to provide for the carry-over of the current Task Force funds.

SEN. MEOTTI: Are there any questions from Members of the Committee?

REP. MUSHINSKY: I just want to...for your clarification and my clarification, is David Anderson here today?

MS. CORCORAN: Yes.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Okay. Can you tell us if that is in the E-Cert, the last two pieces that Audobon recommended? Are they in the E-Cert bill?

REP. ANDERSON: No, the E-Cert bill will simply say that the General Assembly approves the plan for implementation. That is all we can really say in it.

REP. MUSHINSKY: There is no staff relief in there?

REP. ANDERSON: I have checked and it has been determined since the original statute said the DEP would have \$50,000...that that is a conclusive statement that we can only change by another statute.

] REP. MUSHINSKY: Okay.

REP. ANDERSON: That we cannot do this by including

58
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

REP. ANDERSON: (continued)

it on page 75 as we hoped we could, so we will have to go this other route, I think.

Okay?

REP. MUSHINSKY: Okay... thank you.

SEN. MEOTTI: Thank you, Joey.

MS. CORCORAN: Thank you.

SEN. MEOTTI: Vivian Orlowski? Janis Underwood?
John Hamilton? Marge DeLeo? Jim Docker?

JIM DOCKER: Good morning, Senator Meotti, Representative Mushinsky. My name is Jim Docker and I am the Special Assistant to the President of the Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority.

I am speaking today regarding Substitute Committee Bill 5686. The CRRA supports the intent of this legislation, but we are concerned that the time limit in this of the February 1, 1988 and the October 1, 1989 deadlines may lead to banning items with nowhere else to out them, similar to the situations in our cities and towns are now facing with junk cars, for example.

Also, with resource recovery plants coming on line in 1988 across the State, determination as to what we can and cannot accept should probably wait until initial data is gathered on clear processing capability and ash composition, so that we can remove those items which we know have the most environmental impact.

We would like the opportunity to further review these fine lines with the Committee in light of the anticipated schedules for commercial operations of resource recovery plants. We endorse recycling as policy to the extent practicable with full

59
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. DOCKER: (continued)

consideration for the unique waste disposal options and needs which exist in the state's 169 cities and towns.

The CRRA in its role as the implementors of the state's solid waste management plan sees itself with a unique opportunity to help Connecticut institute a realistic workable recycling and source separation plan. Whether this assistance comes in the form of financing its intermediate processing centers or facilitates or coordinating a range of recycling programs in conjunction with our resource recovery plants, we stand ready to help.

Thank you.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you. Any questions? Ed Hafner?

ED HAFNER: Good morning, Senator Meotti, Representative Mushinsky, and Members of the Environment Committee. I appreciate this opportunity to comment on House Bill 5686. My name is Ed Hafner; I am a resident of Woodbridge and President of Hafner Industries, a company which I founded in Wallingford, Connecticut in 1970.

It has been totally dedicated to the recycling of waste, scrap plastics and the technologies related thereto, as well as the petrochemical wastes that are generated thereby. Doing so for plastics...that is a recycling of them as materials, recovers their inherent heat of combustion which is 6500 to about 20,000 BTU's per pound. While at the same time wasting about...if you burn them, that is...you waste about 75% of their energy, the balance being the process energy that is spent to convert the petrochemical feed stock to a usable plastic that is so ubiquitous in commerce today.

60
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. HAFNER: (continued)

Obviously, if you landfill the plastic, you waste everything, so burning does recover the energy but wastes the other part...that other 75%. In fact, if we implement totally the waste plastics, recycling of the waste plastics in the waste stream on a national basis, the savings that it would prove to society would exceed 20 billion dollars a year. That is made up of avoided costs, avoided imports of oil, etc.

In fact, I have been advocating 5 B's...that you should not:

- _ You should not ban them.
- You should not burn them.
- _ You should not bury them.
- You should not biodegrade them.
- You should not boycott them.

Because everyone of those has adverse societal impacts. It makes a heck of a lot more sense to recycle them.

Let me just say that prior to 1970, I spent 20 years in an industrial career as a technocrat with the Dupont Company and Uniroyal Chemical, during which I spoke for the plastics' industry in the international standardization of plastics to facilitate their international trade, as a manufacturing chemist association representative. Having since declared my dedication and commitment to the recycling of speci...with specific concentration on the plastics fraction of municipal solid waste and industrial solid waste stream, I must hasten to add the public as well as private perceptions about the difficulty or the non-recyclability has to date intimidated most recycling advocates from including them in their

61
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. HAFNER: (continued)

recycling concepts.

This need not and must not be the case, much more so now because of the consideration of the mandated legislation...hopefully that will aid the availability of the waste treat stock which could be recycled by technologies which we hope to demonstrate as a result of the activity that is going on now.

Without some form of mandatory legislation, however, I seriously doubt that any, and I repeat... any recycling program, plastics or otherwise, will succeed, no matter how much you spend to educate the public. It will be too easy to continue our wasteful and now increasingly expensive post disposal...past disposal habits.

Actually, the success of the program will be directly related to how strong the mandated language applies. The weaker it is, the poorer the response will be. All of those mandatoru phrases ought to have cost, penalty, reward, incentive, disincentive features, which I am sure in the bill...and I haven't seen it in its present form. These will produce meaningful and varying degrees of cost-effective alternatives to outright disposal. Cases in point are already legion, right here in Southeastern Connecticut, New Jersey, New Hampshire, Toronto, Canda....California, Orgeon, Massachusetts and so forth.

We may not be the best, the first...but we can be outstanding, if our deliberations are directed to take advantage of those problems that have been overcome in the political process to date. With respect to the plastic's waste, which is my area of expertise, helpful elements that would improve the suseptability and prospect of recycling of plastic is to avoid those cases where I believe in the waste contracts that are being committed to the various incinerators...there should be

62
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. HAFNER: (continued)

adequate provision made to remove the plastic trash so that it can in fact be recycled.

Source separation is vital, because the more heterogeneous the material is, the more costly it is to separate. But, let me also quickly add that the higher the cost of disposal, tipping charges and so forth, as an offset against the cost of recovery, the more attractive the economics become for plastic recycling. And after aluminum, plastics is the most valuable part of the waste stream.

Lastly, I have spoken before the Municipal Waste Task Force and a most telling act that would help plastics recycling would be to require the labeling of plastics containers by type... the heterogeneity of plastics in the waste stream and in plastics containers could be avoided by simply requiring \$100 per mold cost, put the labels in the mold that makes the bottle or the container... anyone then, literally... could turn that thing over and sort it by type... It cuts the cost in half for recovery.

I would be happy to answer any questions.
Thank you.

SEN. MEOTTI: Thank you. Representative Anderson?

REP. ANDERSON: One quick question. At a conference down in New York, there was a seminar on plastics and one of the statements made was that almost on a daily basis, the plastics industry is expanding the complexity of the polymers and that this is in fact making this situation much more difficult as time goes on. What do you foresee and what does your technology... can it handle multi-polymer plastics? I mean... what do you do... you can label simple plastics, but what do you do with these combinations?

MR. HAFNER: It is almost a self-serving prophecy, and I am not saying that they are doing it, because there are reasons to create this type of material. If the plastics are a single type, your milk bottles are high density polyethylene. Your soda bottles are pet....your health care products are PBC and that is where my focus is. Incidentally, my process was developed in a facility in Wallingford....a long time ago.

Those are relatively easy to handle. However, when you make a composite structure, which is called a laminate, to obtain various properties in the article that is going to be used to prevent gas from escaping or light coming in or whatever... those are made up of as many as 6, 7 or 8 different materials that are just fused and melted together. It is very, very difficult and if you are going to exclude any kind of plastics, and I say this as a member of the Plastics Industry. I am a professional member of SPI.....that the most difficult, ultimately the most difficult item to get out of the waste stream will be the composite material....co-extruded material and so forth.

About the only thing you are going to be able to do with those is probably burn for pure value, at least the way I see it today. I think you might...somewhere down the road...separate them with a variety of techniques. You can assume that that is fuel value.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Yes, two questions. Whose plastics are you recycling now? Which companies are you recycling now and in what...?

MR. HAFNER: We are not...we are in a demonstration mode. We do limited amount of test and evaluation for major companies and I can tell you that we have done work for American Mills. We have done work for Stouffer Chemical...we have done work for several others that I could mention, but we are not...we do not have a

64
abs

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. HAFNER: (continued)

commercial facility. It is a demonstration facility. However, the engineering has already been done for the plant and the design is already available and we know what the capital cost will be. The limitation has been that we have been unable to demonstrate the technology on a scale adequate to get the financing to do it. And, we hope to be able to do that as a result of some of the activity that is going on now.

Burns and Rowe were intimately involved with the design of the process.

SEN. MEOTTI: Who are Burns and Rowe?

MR. HAFNER: Architects and engineers that are very much involved in the energy field: nuclear and fossil fuel energy field, and chemical process field.

REP. ANDERSON: Just in regard to that bill, you know we do have that oil overcharge money for innovative projects. Are you still,...you know... considering...?

MR. HAFNER: Well, I heard that it was tied up in some sort of bureaucratic process,... I am not sure what it is.

(laughter)

REP. ANDERSON: How strange.

MR. HAFNER: I must say that I was an EPA grantee some years ago to demonstrate...to show that the value of the recovered products, compared to virgin, and we had an EPA grant then. We ran through similar problems at that time, so... it is understandable. Everybody is doing their job.

(laughter)

65
cjp

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

SEN. MEOTTI: Are there a handful plastics that make up the bulk of the packaging market out there, as...

Mr. HAFNER: Packaging is the largest plastics market there is in that construction,

SEN. MEOTTI: In the automotive and about...

MR. HAFNER: Yes I would say there are three. High density polyethylene probably makes up about 2/3 of it. An area with no problems etc. About 20 to 25% of your pet serve bottles.

SEN. MEOTTI: What is Pet?

MR. HAFNER: Pet is polyethylene to a family. When you say PBC it is probably 10, 15%. But let me hasten to add that Pet, got the soda market at 25% because of the demise of the PBC industry when it ran into the (inaudible) problem. And I was ordered in my process development that we were all set to go with a plant with a revenue bond authorization by the State of Connecticut and it was stopped dead in the water because everyone thought that was the end of the PBC industry. Today, PBC is probably the cleanest plastic out there. Because of that problem at that time they, the producers have cleaned it up and even though PBC tends to be the exscape goat for all those that want to get it out of the incinerator, because you get about 6/10 of a pound of hydrochloric acid for every pound of PBC you burn. That is where we focus, that would be the core of our plastic recycling facility, and then these others would be satellite to that.

SEN. MEOTTI: What are the common uses of PBC today?

MR. HAFNER: Today?

SEN. MEOTTI: In packaging, is....

MR. HAFNER: The containers are usually salad oils, vegetable oils, personal care products. This insallation on this wire is PBC. Wall covering, flooring, PBC records, phonograph records. It is about 20%, 20 to 25% of the plastic market is PBC, it is about 8½ billion pounds a year. It is as much as there was when I began, PBC alone makes up as much as all plastic did a few years ago.

66
cjp

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

REP. MUSHINSKY: Piping for construction is all PBC isn't it.

MR. HAFNER: What?

REP. MUSHINSKY: Piping for construction.

MR. HAFNER: Yes, piping and siding, windows, I think you will see in the future that very few windows will be fabricated out of, from wood. They will all be PBC because they last forever.

SEN. MEOTTI: What are the bubble pads, the things you normally see in the hardware sections or whatever, that type of packaging and the quantity of paper?

MR. HAFNER: That, some of that is PBC. The clear part of that sheet wrapping and that sort of thing that is PBC.

SEN. MEOTTI: Thank you, are there any other questions? Representative Brown.

REP. BROWN: This is very enlightening, thank you for coming today. Do you know what percentage of the plastic, I don't know, from your studies or from your work, are in our waste stream in the State of Connecticut?

MR. HAFNER: I have written a paper and delivered to it. I have no idea. I'm sorry, in which that kind of information is available and it varies anywhere from I would say, the numbers others use, 4 to 8%. In point of fact, I think it is approaching 10%, and by the end of this decade you will see all most 10% plastics in the waste stream for one thing, your cars are going to be more and more involved with plastics. And I have exclusive technology for the recycling of the polyerathane portion, which is your flexible plastic bumper, the padded dash, the interior apolstery, the fenders, the fenders don't dent like metal does. That is only the beginning and, you know, I have been involved with the plastics industry, literally from its inception, as you can tell. And it is really, it is unfortunate that it becomes victimized by those people who for there own reasons, and understandable, think they ought to be taken out of the taken of the waste stream. In point of fact, if you recycle them, everybody is happy because they will be the most valuable ingredient in the waste stream and reduce everyone's taxes by reducing the

67
cjp

ENVIRONMENT

March 27, 1987

MR. HAFNER: (continued)

disposal costs. When implemented commercially.

SEN. MEOTTI: Thank you Mr. Hafner. Richard Miller.

MR. MILLER: Good morning, I agree with Representative Brown, that was enlightening testimony. It also points out that it, how complex this issue really is though. My name is Richard Miller, and I am the staff attorney for CBIA. I am here this morning to comment regarding Committee Bill 5686. While it is our understanding the Committee is considering substitute language. We would still like to express our concerns regarding the provisions of the bill before us today.

Section 1 requires DEP to develop a recycling strategy with a 25% target by 1990. While the DEP is clearly the appropriate lead agency for the purpose of developing in as many such strategies. CBIA would suggest that the DEP coordinate with an advisory group. The most logical group to serve in an advisory capacity would be the Task Force, Recycling Task Force. The Task Force has all ready done much of the planning, their input would be valuable, it is a proven working group. It would be a waste of resources not to include them in the implementation process.

Our concern with Section 2 is that while there is certainly ambitious, it is also premature. First requires the DEP to list items it must be recycled out for February 1988. Second, Section 2 prohibits any landfill, incinerator, or transfer stations from accepted recyclable items after October 1989.

It is great to set goals, but these are legislative mandates. And we all know the distinction between mandates and prohibitions and goals.

Before legislature can mandate the people of Connecticut to do these things. It must first develop the ways and means necessary for them to comply. It must first plan and construct an immediate processing centers. Fund and administer regional and municipal finance assistance programs to encourage the development of IPC's and municipal recycling programs. Expand our household hazardous waste disposal date program. And

MR. MILLER: (continued)

encourage local and regional comp posting. We also have Committee Bill 5233 which is be reconsidered by this Committee. And there are certain task force and study groups that have to be completed during the interim of that, if that legislation is approved.

This Committe can make unprecedented progress in the subject of recycling. Without the need to include unattainable mandates and arbitrary prohibition. Thank you.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Any questions from the Committee. Thanks. Are there any other witnesses who have not signed on the sign up sheet that would like to testify? If not, the hearing will be closed. We will take a ten minute break and then come back for the Committee meeting.