

Legislative History for Connecticut Act  
PA 91-293

<b>Act Number:</b>	<b>91-293</b>	
<b>Bill Number:</b>	HB 6416	
<b>House Pages:</b>	5279-5292, 6853-6856, 6892-6898	<b>25</b>
<b>Senate Pages:</b>	2830-2832, 2837-2838	<b>5</b>
<b>Committee:</b>	Environment: 890-891-896, 904-907, 909-910, (918-920), 926-927, 929-932, 946-947, 978-979, 984-988	<b>23</b>
		<b>Page Total: 53</b>

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

Connecticut State Library  
Compiled 2012

H-599

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS  
1991

VOL. 34  
PART 14  
5070-5460

tcc

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 15, 1991

Will you remark further on the resolution?

REP. MORDASKY: (52nd)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Mordasky of the 52nd.

REP. MORDASKY: (52nd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the nomination for Mortimer Gelston. I too know him as a dairy farmer and I would go back about 30 years when we served on the Board of Directors of the Consolidated Milk Producers on the Yankee Milk Board and I think he'll be a very, very capable chairman for the Siting Council. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Further remarks on the resolution? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Opposed nay.

The ayes have it.

The resolution is adopted.

CLERK:

Page 5, Calendar 457, Substitute for House Bill 6416, AN ACT CONCERNING PERMITS FOR MIXED MUNICIPAL

tcc

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 15, 1991

## SOLID WASTE COMPOSTING FACILITIES.

Favorable Report of the Committee on Environment.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Brown of the 74th.

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question is on passage. Will you remark?

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Yes, the bill before us -- oh, I'm sorry. I'd like to yield to Representative Rogg.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Rogg, do you accept the yield?

REP. ROGG: (67th)

Mr. Speaker, may I please be excused from this item.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Rogg would like to be excused for a possible conflict. The Journal will note, sir.

Representative Brown.

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The bill would put MSW composting under Connecticut Certificate of Need

tcc

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 15, 1991

dealing with municipal solid waste and I would ask the Clerk to call and may I be allowed to summarize LCO6344.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The Clerk please call LCO6344, designated House Schedule "A".

CLERK:

LCO6344, House "A", offered by Representative Krawiecki, et al.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question is on summarization. Is there objection? Representative Brown.

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment deletes 174 through 179 in their entirety which is a duplication of the definition of municipal solid waste. It's just a technical amendment. I move adoption.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark? Will you remark? If not, all those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

tcc

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 15, 1991

Opposed nay.

The ayes have it.

The amendment is adopted and ruled technical.

\*\*\*\*\*

House Amendment Schedule "A":

Delete lines 174 through 179 in their entirety.

\*\*\*\*\*

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Clerk please call and may I be allowed to summarize LCO No. 6063.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The Clerk please call LCO6063, designated House Schedule "B".

CLERK:

LCO6063, offered by Representative Anderson,  
designated House "B".

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question is on summarization. Is there objection? Representative Brown.

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This -- there's three different items in this amendment. The first one tries

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 15, 1991

to clarify that the municipal waste going to an MSW composting facility shall not be counted twice in terms of the total tonnage in the Connecticut Solid Waste Plan. The second, in line 211, clarifies again that we are testing for contaminants to determine the classification and the last one clarifies that the classification will be on the end product of the process to clarify the intent.

I move adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark? If not, all those in favor of House "B" signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Opposed nay.

The ayes have it.

The amendment is adopted and ruled technical.

\*\*\*\*\*

House Amendment Schedule "B":

In line 143, after "pertinent" insert "AND SHALL INSURE THAT NO WASTE IS ACCOUNTED FOR MORE THAN ONCE AS A RESULT OF TRANSFER FROM ONE VEHICLE OR FACILITY TO ANOTHER OR FOR ANY OTHER REASON."

In line 211, after "product" insert "and shall include testing criteria for such contaminants"

In line 226, strike the period and insert ", unless the class II compost meets the maximum allowable

tcc

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 15, 1991

contaminant levels established for class I compost, as determined by testing criteria established pursuant to section 4 of this act."

\*\*\*\*\*

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Would the Clerk please call LCO6810 and may I be allowed to summarize.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The Clerk please call LCO6810, designated House Schedule "C".

CLERK:

LCO6810, House "C", offered by Representative Mushinsky.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question is on summarization. Is there objection? Representative Brown.

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This amendment adds, tries to establish a method for financing the Recycling Trust Fund and it puts a 40 cent tip fee on the resource recovery that will go into the Recycling Trust Fund and the second part of the amendment also talks about where the money will go and how the money will be allocated and it also in Section 8 changes the date to August 31,

tcc

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 15, 1991

1991 for the annual reporting.

I move adoption.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark?

Representative Belden.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Belden, just a moment please.

(Gavel) Ladies and gentlemen, please. Thank you,

Representative Belden.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, to the lady bringing out the amendment. Could you share fiscal note information with us on this amendment?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Brown.

REP. BROWN: (74th)

There is no fiscal note in the sense of an additional cost to the State of Connecticut. What we are trying to do is raise money to be put in the Recycling Trust Fund so there is no fiscal impact.

I'm sorry, Representative Belden. That was the information on the other amendment. The fiscal note says this amendment delays and reduces the dollar per

tcc

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 15, 1991

ton assessment to a 40 cent per ton assessment beginning July 1, 1992 until July 30, 1994.

The amendment also provides that funds generated in excess of \$600,000 be distributed to municipalities, regional organizations, etc. for competitive grants for recycling-related purposes. In addition, the amendment delays the reporting requirement by two months which we talked about.

The state impact, there's some revenue loss, the Municipal Solid Waste Recycling Trust Fund and the municipal impact, reduction and delay of cost and revenue gain.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Belden, you still have the floor.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would assume if this amendment were to pass that this bill would be referred to the Finance Committee and I guess the problem I have the Finance Committee under our rules can only make certain changes after the legislation gets there and the changes they can make won't correct any damage potentially that may be done by this amendment, do I'm kind of in a quandary here.

I guess just one more question to the lady.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

tcc

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 15, 1991

Proceed, Representative.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

If this amendment were not to pass, what serious damage would we do to our situation, our current situation?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Brown.

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, we're talking about damage control rather than damage --. We do have funds to finance the recycling staff in the DEP for this fiscal year coming. This is to try to look ahead and get money for the staff in the Recycling Department.

This is an agreement between CCM and Resource Recovery that we've all agreed to.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Thank you.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further? Representative Anderson.

REP. ANDERSON: (45th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For a point of clarification and intent I'd like --.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

(Gavel) This Chamber is in debate over an issue. I really don't want to ask people to leave, but while

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 15, 1991

we're in the process, it would be appreciated if the noise could be kept down. Thank you. Representative Anderson.

REP. ANDERSON: (45th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In connection with the language for LCO6063, which we've passed as an amendment, I would assume the commissioner need only account for the waste that is processed and recycled and does not need final disposal at either a landfill or resource recovery facility in Connecticut.

Otherwise this language could artificially reduce the total tonnage of solid waste in Connecticut that needs a long term disposal solution.

Therefore, for the purpose of legislative intent, I would like the concurrence of the chairlady or the vice chairlady, that this language means that the commissioner accounts only for the waste that does not need to be disposed of elsewhere. I guess I should have waited until we passed this amendment.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further remarks on the amendment? If not, all those in favor of House "C", signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

tcc

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 15, 1991

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Opposed nay.

The ayes have it.

The amendment is adopted and ruled technical.

\*\*\*\*\*

House Amendment Schedule "C":

After line 243, insert the following and renumber the remaining section according:

"Sec. 6. Section 22a-234a of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

(a) [On] BEGINNING ON and after July 1, [1991] 1992, AND ENDING ON JUNE 30, 1994, there shall be paid to the commissioner of revenue services by the owner of any resources recovery facility or mixed municipal solid waste landfill [one dollar] FORTY CENTS per ton of solid waste processed at the facility or disposed of at the landfill.

(b) Each owner of a facility or landfill subject to the assessment as provided by this section shall submit a return quarterly to the commissioner of revenue services, applicable with respect to the calendar quarter beginning July 1, [1991] 1992, and each calendar quarter thereafter, ENDING ON JUNE 30, 1994, on or before the last day of the month immediately following the end of each such calendar quarter, on a form prescribed by the commissioner, together with payment of the quarterly assessment determined and payable in accordance with the provisions of subsection (a) of this section.

(c) Whenever such assessment is not paid when due, a penalty of ten per cent of the amount due or fifty dollars, whichever is greater, shall be added to the amount due and such penalty shall immediately accrue, and thereafter such assessment shall bear interest at the rate of one and one-half per cent per month until the same is paid. The commissioner of revenue services shall cause copies of a form prescribed for submitting returns as required under this section to be distributed throughout the state. Failure to receive such form shall not be construed to relieve anyone subject to assessment under this section from the obligations of submitting a return, together with payment of such assessment within the time required.

(d) Any person or municipality delivering solid waste to a facility or landfill whose owner is subject to the assessment imposed by subsection (a) shall reimburse the owner for any assessment paid for the solid waste delivered by such person or municipality. The assessment shall be a debt from the person or municipality responsible for paying such assessment to the owner.

(e) Any revenue collected under the provisions of this section shall be deposited in the municipal solid waste recycling trust fund established under section 22a-241.

Sec. 7. Subsection (f) of section 22a-241 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

(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; (2) not more than one hundred eighty-three thousand dollars shall be allocated for the expenses of the advisory council established under subsection (c) of this section; (3) not more than [four hundred fifty] SIX HUNDRED thousand dollars shall be annually allocated to the department of environmental protection for costs incurred in the administration of such program; (4) not more than four hundred thousand dollars shall be allocated to the commissioner of environmental protection as follows: One hundred fifty thousand dollars shall be expended for marketing studies and market development of recycled products, two hundred thousand dollars shall be expended for the study of reuse or recycling of ash from resources recovery facilities and fifty thousand dollars shall be expended for the study required pursuant to section 17 of public act 88-231\*; (5) not more than fifty thousand dollars shall be allocated to the department of economic development for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1989, for development of a plan required under section 32-1e and (6) not more than one million dollars shall be allocated to the department of environmental protection for public education on waste reduction and for recovered materials market development, including but not limited to, costs incurred for recycled product promotion, technical assistance to recycling industries, recovered materials export assistance and for administrative costs. Funds allocated to the commissioner under subdivision (6) may

be expended for any contract entered into pursuant to said subdivision (6) with the commissioner of economic development for development of the recovered materials market. ANY FUNDS DEPOSITED IN THE FUND PURSUANT TO SECTION 22a-234a WHICH EXCEED THE SIX HUNDRED THOUSAND DOLLARS ALLOCATED TO THE DEPARTMENT UNDER SUBDIVISION (3) OF THIS SUBSECTION SHALL BE DISTRIBUTED TO MUNICIPALITIES, REGIONAL ORGANIZATIONS REPRESENTING MUNICIPALITIES, OR AGENCIES OR POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS OF THE STATE REPRESENTING MUNICIPALITIES FOR COMPETITIVE GRANTS FOR RECYCLING RELATED PURPOSES.

Sec. 8. Subsection (h) of section 22a-220 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof:

(h) On or before [July 1, 1991] AUGUST 31, 1991, and annually thereafter, each municipality, or its designated regional agent, shall provide a report to the commissioner of environmental protection describing the measures taken during the preceding year to meet its obligations under this section. The commissioner shall provide each municipality with a form for such report by [March 1, 1991] JUNE 1, 1991. Such form may be amended from time to time. Such report shall include, but not be limited to (1) a description of the efforts made by the municipality to promote recycling, (2) a description of its efforts to ensure compliance with separation requirements, (3) the amount of each recyclable item contained in its solid waste stream which has been delivered to a recycling facility as reported to the municipality or its designated regional agent by the owner or operator of a recycling facility pursuant to section 22a-208e or by a scrap metal processor pursuant to section 22a-208f, and (4) the amount of solid waste generated within its boundaries which has been delivered to a resources recovery facility or solid waste facility for disposal as reported to the municipality or its designated regional agent by the owner or operator of the resources recovery facility or solid waste facility pursuant to section 22a-208e."

\*\*\*\*\*

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Frankel.

REP. FRANKEL: (121st)

tcc

House of Representatives

Wednesday, May 15, 1991

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With the passage of the last amendment, it would appear that this item should be reviewed by the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding, and accordingly, I move that this item be so referred.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Is there objection to referral? Seeing none, the item is referred to Finance.

REP. FRANKEL: (121st)

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Frankel.

REP. FRANKEL: (121st)

Mr. Speaker, this time I would move for the Suspension of our Rules for the immediate consideration of House Resolution Number 38, bearing LCO Number 6070, A RESOLUTION RAISING A COMMITTEE TO INFORM THE SENATE THAT THE HOUSE IS ORGANIZED AND READY TO MEET IN JOINT CONVENTION.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question before the Chamber is Suspension of the Rules. Is there objection? Seeing none, the rules are suspended.

REP. FRANKEL: (121st)

Mr. Speaker.

H-603

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS  
1991

VOL. 34  
PART 18  
6655-7067

tcc

199

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 23, 1991

would ask that this item be passed temporarily.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Is there objection? Seeing none, so ordered.

CLERK:

Page 20, Calendar 457, Substitute for House Bill 6416, AN ACT CONCERNING PERMITS FOR MIXED MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE COMPOSTING FACILITIES. (As amended by House Amendment Schedules "A", "B" and "C").

Favorable Report of the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding.

The committee recommends passage with House "A", "B" and "C".

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Brown of the 74th. Representative Rogg of the 67th.

REP. ROGG: (67th)

Mr. Speaker, may I be excused from the Hall due to a possible conflict of interest?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The Journal will note, sir. Representative Burnham of the 147th.

REP. BURNHAM: (147th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. May I be excused for the potential conflict of interest?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

tcc

200

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 23, 1991

The Journal will note, sir. Representative Brown of the 74th.

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill as amended by Amendments "A", "B" and "C".

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question is on passage. Will you remark, ma'am?

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The bill before us puts MSW composting under the state certificate of need dealing with municipal solid waste and I would like yield to Representative Rell for a friendly amendment.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Rell, do you accept the yield?

REP. RELL: (107th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, thank you, I do. The Clerk has amendment LC05006. Would the Clerk please call and read.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The Clerk please call and read LC05006, designated House Schedule "D".

CLERK:

LC05006, House "D", offered by Representative Rell.

tcc

201

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 23, 1991

In line 193, strike "January 1, 1993" and insert in lieu thereof "July 1, 1992"

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The amendment is in your possession, madam.

REP. RELL: (107th)

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark?

REP. RELL: (107th)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, Members of the Chamber, what this amendment does is simply say to the Department of Environmental Protection that the regulations should be drafted by July 1, 1992 rather than January 1, 1993. We do find that there are other states that have this type of regulations on the book. It's certainly not too difficult to handle, and again, I think it can be done. I move for passage.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

Representative Brown.

REP. BROWN: (74th)

I think it's a timely amendment and I would urge support of it.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Further remarks? If not, all those in favor

tcc

202

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 23, 1991

signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Opposed nay.

The ayes have it.

The amendment is adopted and ruled technical.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

Representative Brown. Representative Pelto.

REP. PELTO: (54th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Once again, I rise while copies are being made of an amendment and therefore I would ask that this item be passed temporarily.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Is there objection? Seeing none, it's so ordered.

CLERK:

Page 24, Calendar 474, House Bill 5539, AN ACT CONCERNING THE COMPOSITION OF THE STATE ALCOHOL AND DRUG ABUSE COMMISSION. (As amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A").

Favorable Report of the Committee on Government Administration and Elections.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Fritz of the 90th.

REP. FRITZ: (90th)

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 23, 1991

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

Representative Schlesinger casts his vote in the negative.

The Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 877, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A", in concurrence with the Senate.

Total Number Voting	142
Necessary for Passage	72
Those voting Yea	88
Those voting Nay	54
Those absent and not Voting	9

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

The bill as amended is passed.

CLERK:

Page 20, Calendar 457, Substitute for House Bill 6416, AN ACT CONCERNING PERMITS FOR MIXED MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE COMPOSTING FACILITIES. (As amended by House Amendments "A", "B", "C" and "D" adopted earlier today).

Favorable Report of the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding.

The committee recommends passage with "A", "B", "C".

REP. BROWN: (74th)

tcc

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 23, 1991

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable --.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

Representative Brown of the 74th.

REP. BROWN: (74th)

I'm glad you know my name. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's --.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

Yes, Barbara.

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Favorable Report and passage of the bill as amended by "A", "B", "C" and "D".

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

The question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report as amended. Will you remark, madam?

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Would the Clerk please call and I be allowed to summarize LCO No. 7137.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

The Clerk has in his possession amendment LCO7137, designated House Amendment Schedule "E". Will the Clerk please call the amendment.

CLERK:

LCO7137, House "E", offered by Representative

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 23, 1991

Mushinsky, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

The lady has sought leave of the Chamber to summarize. Is there objection? Is there objection? Hearing none, please proceed, madam.

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment is a technical amendment that tries to make sure that we understand the MSW composting does not include wastes that are required to be recycled pursuant to Section 22a-241b of the General Statutes or the items that have been designated to be recycled. We want to make sure that the recyclable materials are source separated before they go into a facility which we require for research recovery as well as landfills.

I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

The question is on adoption of House Schedule -- Amendment "E". Will you remark? Will you remark? Representative Anderson of the 45th.

REP. ANDERSON: (45th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this amendment. I think it's important that it clarifies that the mixed solid waste does conform to the state policy on recycling and I recommend support of the

tcc

241

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 23, 1991

amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

The question is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "E". Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, I shall try your minds. Those in favor of House Amendment Schedule "E" please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

Opposed nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Nay.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

The ayes have it.

The amendment is adopted and ruled technical.

\*\*\*\*\*

House Amendment Schedule "E":

In line 10, after "streams" insert "provided such wastes shall not include any material required to be recycled pursuant to section 22a-241b of the general statutes"

\*\*\*\*\*

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

Representative Brown.

REP. BROWN: (74th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The bill before us as amended requires that this new technology that is coming to the State of Connecticut will come under the certificate of need and we want to make sure that it addresses only the needs of the solid waste stream in the State of Connecticut, so it would have to get a permit and indeed there be verified that it is needed for our garbage in the State of Connecticut.

It also allows for a pilot program to be initiated to introduce this technology to indeed see if this technology is something the State of Connecticut wants to move towards especially since resource recovery plants are very expensive and their lifespan is less than 20 years and we don't want to be faced with in 20 years the same problem we were faced with recently, not really having a viable alternative to disposal of our solid waste.

It also requires that the DEP establish regulations for the material that is produced in the MSW composting facility and they will establish regulations for Class I and Class II compost and for its use and to make sure that this material is something that is a marketable product. We are trying to make sure that all hazardous material is removed, source separated,

tcc

243

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 23, 1991

before the material goes into the facility.

I think it's a good bill and it fits nicely into what we have been trying to do as a state, promoting recycling and source reduction and making sure that for the long term we have good disposal methods for our solid waste.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further? Representative Piscopo of the 76th.

REP. PISCOPO: (76th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO6283. Would the Clerk please call and I be allowed to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

The Clerk has an amendment, LCO6283, designated  
House Amendment Schedule "F". Will the Clerk please call the amendment. Representative Piscopo, the Clerk is not in possession of the amendment.

REP. PISCOPO: (76th)

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I'll withdraw.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

The gentleman has withdrawn the amendment. Is there objection? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further? If not, staff

tcc

House of Representatives

Thursday, May 23, 1991

and guests please come to the well of the House.  
Members take their seats. The machine will be opened.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call. Members to the Chamber. The House is voting by roll call. Members to the Chamber please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

Have all members voted? Please check the roll call machine to see that your vote is properly cast. The machine will be locked. The Clerk please take a tally.

The Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 6416, as amended by House Amendment Schedules "A", "B", "C", "D" and "E".

Total Number Voting	140
Necessary for Passage	71
Those voting Yea	140
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not Voting	11

DEPUTY SPEAKER MARKHAM:

The bill as amended is passed.

CLERK:

Page 18, Calendar 374, Substitute for House Bill No. 6097, AN ACT CONCERNING MEMBERSHIP ON THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF TRANSIT DISTRICTS. (As amended by House

S-321

CONNECTICUT  
GEN. ASSEMBLY  
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS  
1991

VOL. 34  
PART 8  
2563-2951

FRIDAY  
MAY 31, 1991

002830  
80  
aak

0 Absent

The Consent Calendar is adopted.

SENATOR JOHNSTON:

Madam President, on Page 22, a matter on the Consent Calendar, Calendar 278, Substitute SB623, I would move for suspension of the rules for the immediate transmittal of that bill to the Governor.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Is there any objection in suspending the rules on Senate Calendar 278, Substitute SB623 for immediate transmittal to the Governor? Is there any objection? Hearing none, so ordered. Thank you, Senator. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Calendar Page 13, Calendar 571, Substitute HB6416, AN ACT CONCERNING PERMITS FOR MIXED MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE COMPOSTING FACILITIES, ASSESSMENTS PAYABLE BY OPERATORS OF RESOURCES RECOVERY FACILITIES AND MIXED MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE LANDFILLS, AND ALLOCATIONS FROM THE MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE RECYCLING TRUST FUND. As amended by House Amendment Schedules "A", "B", "C", "D" and "E". Favorable Report of the Committee on FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The Chair will recognize Senator

FRIDAY  
MAY 31, 1991

002831  
81  
aak

Spellman.

SENATOR SPELLMAN:

Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further?

SENATOR SPELLMAN:

Thank you, Madam President. This bill requires municipal solid waste composting facilities to obtain a certificate of need from the Department of Environmental Protection Commissioner. It also authorizes the Commissioner to permit one demonstration composting facility, exempts that facility from the requirement of certificate of need. It contains a number of environmental protections, including the fact that the Commissioner must require source separation of household hazardous waste or any other potential compost contaminant as a condition of granting any permit for a facility.

It requires the adoption of regulations that specify the production quality and use of the end product for the compost and it establishes a specific order of priority for solid waste management in the solid waste plan. This bill dovetails nicely with our

FRIDAY  
MAY 31, 1991

002332  
aak

overall plan for dealing with solid waste in the State of Connecticut and fills a gap in regard to our planning in regard to composting.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator. Would anyone else wish to remark? Would anyone else wish to remark on Senate Calendar 571? Are there any further remarks? If not, Senator Spellman.

SENATOR SPELLMAN:

Madam President, if there is no objection I would ask this be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Is there any objection in placing Calendar 571, Substitute HB6416 on the Consent Calendar? Is there any objection? Hearing none, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Calendar 572, File 686, Substitute HB7192, AN ACT CONCERNING COMPLAINT PROCESSING AND OPERATIONAL EFFICIENCY OF THE COMMISSION ON HUMAN RIGHTS AND OPPORTUNITIES. Favorable Report of the Committee on GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND ELECTIONS.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Is Senator Avallone here? Is someone here that would like to bring this bill out. Senator O'Leary.

FRIDAY  
MAY 31, 1991

002837  
87  
aak

#2.

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.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Mr. Clerk. The issue before the Chamber is Consent Calendar #2 for today, Friday, May 31, 1991. Mr. Clerk, would you please read the items put on Consent Calendar #2.

THE CLERK:

The second Consent Calendar begins on Page 13, Calendar 571, Substitute HB6416 and Calendar Page 15, Calendar 580, Substitute HB5739. Madam President, that completes the second Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. You have heard the items that have been placed on the second Consent Calendar for May 31, 1991. The machine is open. You may record your vote. Senator Przybysz.

SENATOR O'LEARY:

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

The machine is closed.

FRIDAY  
MAY 31, 1991

002838  
88  
aak

The result of the vote.

36 Yea

0 Nay

0 Absent

The second Consent Calendar is adopted.

Senator O'Leary.

SENATOR O'LEARY:

Thank you, Madam President. On a note of personal privilege I would like to address the Chamber and ask that the Senators who have bills to take out today please remain in this Chamber. I don't want to come in tomorrow because the Screening Committee is planning on meeting tomorrow morning and has a weekend full of work. But if we can't move the business I am going to adjourn the Session today and we are going to have to come in tomorrow to complete it. So we are going to try one more time to complete today's business, but if we get to a bill and the Senator is not ready to take it out I am going to adjourn this session, we are going to have to come in tomorrow morning to complete it.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator O'Leary. The Chair appreciates that and would hope that everyone heard it. On that note, Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS

ENVIRONMENT  
PART 3  
805-1219

1991

sr

ENVIRONMENT

March 4, 1991  
2:00 p.m.

PRESIDING CHAIRMEN: Senator Spellman  
Representative Mushinsky

## COMMITTEE MEMBERS PRESENT:

SENATORS: Fleming, Gunther, Matthews  
Maloney

REPRESENTATIVES: Amann, Brown, Caruso,  
Collins, Dargan, Davis,  
Farr, Gambardella,  
Giordano, Graziani,  
Holbrook, Knopp, Maddox,  
Mordasky, Norton, Piscopo,  
Poss, Prelli, Ruwet,  
Smith, Stevens, Tiffany,  
Winkler

SENATOR SPELLMAN: Throughout this public hearing, both public agency heads, legislators, and public we're going to try to maintain a 3 minute limit. So if could please try to keep your comments limited within those times frames.

DICK BARLOW: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman.  
Recognizing that there are a number of bills on your agenda for this afternoon, on behalf of the Department I would like to just comment briefly on several of them. We'll be providing written testimony on a number of others. First are HB5180 and HB5661, which are acts concerning solid waste management.

The Department supports the intent of proposed HB5180 and HB5661, which is to provide compensory consideration of composting facilities and alternative mixed solid waste disposal options. I'd also point out the HB6416 and Raised HB7082, both include specific language that would accomplish this objective. Proposed HB5427, AN ACT CONCERNING COLLECTION OF HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE and proposed HB6420. AN ACT CONCERNING REGIONAL HOUSEHOLD HAZARDOUS WASTE COLLECTION FACILITIES.

The Department supports the intent of both of these proposed bills which would be to provide for permanent and regional household hazardous waste collection facilities. The Department has administered a program of one-time household hazardous waste collection days for municipalities over the last several years. Those efforts, though highly successful in terms of the turnout on those individual days, certainly don't reach a large magnitude of the household that could, or would, like to participate in those events.

And the state funding for those projects has been minimal, usually in the range of about 10 cents on a dollar. The Department would offer a role in establishing a permanent household hazardous waste regional collection system modeled after the way that we have developed the regional recycling programs, where we would offer the municipalities to come together in regional groups of their own choosing and to develop facilities.

I would comment that the emergency spill response fund which you are proposing to use as a source of funding for this program, is, at this present time, severely limited by a number of other revenue uses. And the Department would recommend against using it for this purpose. Finally, proposed HB6016, AN ACT CONCERNING THE PERMITTING MIXED MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE COMPOSTING AND BIOMEDICAL WASTE TREATMENT FACILITIES. The Department which proposed raised HB7082, which is a similar bill concerning determination and need for mixed municipal solid waste composting facilities, supports the intent of HB6416.

The bill provides a formal determination need for municipal solid waste composting. And allows for the consideration of composting as an alternative technology. Sections 1 through 4 of the proposed legislation, establish the determination of need process similar to that presently used for resource recovery facilities and land fills. Section 5 would require adoption of regulations by the Department on compost quality and end use.

The Department sees that as a function that is necessary if we're going to move into an area of composting as an alternative technology. Section

6, recommends the use of the solid waste fund for funding a pilot program. We would again caution you against, there's a number of drains presently on that funding source and we don't feel that there's sufficient money there to fund that pilot out of that source.

Finally, Section 7 deals with the establishment of a determination of need for biomedical waste treatment facilities. The Department, at this point in time, would question the need for the establishment of that type of a program. Biomedical waste makes up roughly 3/10th of 1 percent of the total waste stream that we're dealing with. And at present we have one operating facility and no additional applications in front of us for consideration. Thank you. I'd be happy to answer questions.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Thank you. Questions from the Committee? Senator Fleming.

SEN. FLEMING: Your comments on Section 6 about use of the solid waste fund, and your concern about their not being enough money in it. Are you saying that if we can't find an alternative funding source that you would not support the bill? Is that what you're saying?

DICK BARLOW: I'm not saying we wouldn't support the intent of the bill. We couldn't support a pilot that would take funds out of that fund. Certainly the concept of a pilot is a very appropriate way.

SEN. FLEMING: Not using that as a source of funds?

DICK BARLOW: Not using that as a source of funds. I think the pilot's an excellent idea.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Any further questions?

REP. MUSHINSKY: Yes, I have a question. And I don't have the bill in front of me, I'm at a disadvantage. But on HB6416, do you see any problem with time tables? You know, if we have to do rigs on composting, it's a new area for us, municipal solid waste composting. Do you see any

problems with time table? With your staffing is it going to take one year or two years, or how fast can we go ahead with this.

DICK BARLOW: I guess I'd start off by saying, I think two years is probably a reasonable period. We're working with the Northeast Waste Management Officials Association to try to work in this area to develop some common framework that we could establish standards throughout the Northeast. I would like to give that a change to go and then do the rigs. Knowing the time it takes to work through the process, I don't think two years is an inappropriate amount of time if we use that as a lead and then move from there with all the hoops you have to jump through in rates development.

REP. MUSHINSKY: All right, if there are people waiting for permits, would you recommend that we put some of the requirements that normally go in regulation, in statute?

DICK BARLOW: I think that those could best be put in as permanent conditions if you wanted to permit facilities in the time frame between, you know, the inaction of the legislation and the development of the rates.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Put permit conditions in the statute?

DICK BARLOW: No, put the conditions on compost use in the permits not in the statutes. I think I'd be difficult to write that kind of a comprehensive programs into the statutes.

REP. MUSHINSKY: All right. So, if people are pending now, the applications are pending now, does this in effect mean that they would have to wait for two years before their application would be taken care of?

DICK BARLOW: In the wording in the bill that would be considered Friday, the Department recommended that in the meantime we would put applicable conditions in the permits to try to control compost quality and end use. With the goal of having the rates within a period of, let's say, two years.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Okay, so you don't need statutory language to do that? You can do that...?

DICK BARLOW: We can put those, establish those, as permanent conditions under the existing solid waste authorities.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Okay.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Senator Gunther.

SEN. GUNTHER: Just a quick, you can go to the emergency rig route a hell of a lot quicker than two years. If you want to, if you have an idea of what you want in the regulations, you can get them in here through the emergency route that they can get licensed before two years.

DICK BARLOW: I think the first concern is that we try to establish something that is uniform throughout the region and that's why I said that, that length of time. I think that we're seeing that compost material is going to move from state to state and we want to make sure that we have a standard here in Connecticut that, you know, says that if you end up with a bag of compost or a truckload of it, it could be used in Massachusetts and the controls would be similar.

SEN. GUNTHER: I still say you can do it in a hell of a lot less than two years.

DICK BARLOW: You may be able to.

SEN. GUNTHER: If you want to. The idea is, it's the Department. I know we don't always move out rigs as fast as what we ought to be doing, but it can be done in much less time.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Anything else from the Committee?  
Representative Brown.

REP. BROWN: Dick, my concern after this morning's testimony about composting as well, the situation might be comparable in other municipalities, but Waterbury is facing a landfill closure. And our choices are going to be very limited and we do have some overture and people are looking at composting.

Now if the landfill closed, our only alternative is resource recovery, given the time frame that you set.

DICK BARLOW: Or landfill.

REP. BROWN: Or landfilling. So, my concern is, maybe you could, I don't know, maybe we could work together trying to figure out to make these options more available given the time constraints that you're talking about and given, you know, what we're trying to do. And one other comment, in terms of the hierarchy, you know, the legislation that we passed, where do you see composting? I was looking at the figures, you know, of the new solid waste report, and I thank you for that, it's excellent.

I don't know, the figures are very confused in my mind in terms of where composting... Are we looking at that as source reduction?

DICK BARLOW: No, we're looking at composting as an alternative technology basically to resource recovery and landfilling. We're taking source reduction as a first cut, we're taking recycling as a second. And then the third cut can be resource recovery or alternative technologies, composting and then finally the bottom of the rung is landfilling.

As I said this morning, it's very important to realize that, and you see some people trying to put recycling and composting on the same rung, and it really isn't. Because recycling you're trying to use it for the best possible use, composting in some cases you may be compromising paper products or quality items for a lesser use.

REP. BROWN: Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Representative Anderson.

REP. ANDERSON: Can you give us some brief idea of where the other New England states are on developing standards? Or are we ahead, behind, or where are the rest of the states?

DICK BARLOW: We're kind of maybe a little bit behind. Some of them dealt with standards for municipal sewage sludge. We certainly, I think, in that area, have gone forward in the document that was executed with the MDC to establish that. But, Maine and Massachusetts are working on them. New York has some rigs, but nobody has a real comprehensive package, that they feel, I think, covers everything.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Okay. Thank you very much. We'll have Bill Darcy to be followed by Senator Kevin Sullivan.

BILL DARCY: Good afternoon. I'd like to testify just on one bill this afternoon, proposed HB6621. That's the bill that proposes another moratorium on resource recovery capacity until recycling and source reduction goals have been achieved. My basic response to the bill, who has as it's purpose to ensure that the state does not permit overcapacity of resource recovery that would inversely impact recycling, is that the Legislature has already solved this problem.

A bill was passed a year and half ago, that set a cap on resource recovery to be done by DEP. DEP has done that and has reiterated that in the solid waste management plan that was just issued and Representative Brown just referenced. So that, they will not permit an overcapacity of resource recovery capacity. So, it's basically not a problem. I also, for that reason, it's also not going to make negatively impact recycling because their plan assumes that between source reduction and recycling that 37 percent of the waste stream will not be touched by any alternative technology, be it resource recovery, composting, or landfilling.

In addition, since the 37 percent number was based on waste stream as of 1989, which included probably 10 percent recycling effort already in, the actual goal or waste stream that's put aside for recycling and resource reduction is over 40 percent. So that, this is not a problem and it's been already solved. I would also note that if this law was

REP. GAMBARDELLA: It seems that what you're trying to do here is to require testing beyond the negative declaration, but they already, if they have some suspicion to within more than a thousand feet of a hazardous waste facility they've already, theoretically, would have to go beyond that simple negative, stage one negative declaration. So, I'm not quite sure what you're trying to get at. Am I misinterpreting what you're trying to do?

SEN. SOMMA: I'm not sure that's the case. What I'm trying to get at is, basically, setting a thousand foot perimeter around those sites, hazardous waste facilities, DEP determined sites, and find out what the extent of contamination is. That's my intention. But Representative Mushinsky, as you point out, this is a proposed bill. It's very general and very vague. I've talked to David Luft and I'd be glad to work with him in the future on it. And also with others that have an interest in this and kind of narrowing it down as best we can. But I'm encouraged by your initial support.

REP. MUSHINSKY: I'm not speaking for everyone, I'm speaking for myself, but I'm just saying that we've got to assign you the additional work or the bill won't move.

SEN. SOMMA: I appreciate it and I'll provide the Committee additional information and work with David.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Thank you.

SEN. SOMMA: Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Charles Frink to be followed by Jon Purmont.

CHARLES FRINK: I'm Charles Frink, Chief Sole Chemist and Vice Director of the Connecticut Agricultural Experiment Station in New Haven. Thank you for giving me the opportunity to address you very briefly on the subject of HB6146. As you know, many of you know, the experiment station is currently involved with research on a variety of composting operations ranging from the wind-blown composting of leaves and grass clippings to

in vessel composting of earth, of animal manures with earth, to the composting of sewage sludge in vessel systems in Fairfield.

The most extensive experiments we have underway are with the composted sewage sludge from the MDC in Hartford where we will be investigating the potential leeching of nitrate and heavy metals to ground water. We're also involved in a small cooperative project with the CRRA to determine whether the unburned residue from the CRRA plant here in Hartford, can be composted. And we're also looking at the proposed compost quality standards that some of you may have heard discussed.

Will specific reference to Section 6, Sub-Section F, of HB6416, I'd like to say the station would certainly be very pleased to participate in a pilot project to determine the feasibility of collecting and composting a pre-segregated waste. We conducted a modest experiment with IPS and the town of Fairfield in collecting restaurant waste and composting them. We've talked with Representative Davis and his people in Northeastern Connecticut and we certainly look forward to continuing to work with them and any other group in such a pilot study. Thank you for listening. I'll answer any question you might have.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Yeah, on the testing your doing for the CRA residue, residue from what? What point are you?

CHARLES FRINK: That's the unburned residue, Representative Mushinsky, that does not make it through the plant. About 400 to 600 tons a day comes in and is made into fuel, but about 20 to 40 of that fine falls through the fine grade sieves and so it's particles of garbage and paper and broken glass.

REP. MUSHINSKY: So, small size...?

CHARLES FRINK: Small stuff. And it does compost readily. But, of course, it has the problems of broken glass and other material in it.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Metals content?

CHARLES FRINK: Metal contents are relatively high. But that's based on a very limited number of analyses. It does say the material can be composted. I think that's really what that says.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Senator Fleming.

SEN. FLEMING: If the dollar amount of 100,000 dollars, is that going to be sufficient? Can you do this without funding?

CHARLES FRINK: My boss told me not to ask for any money when I came up here. We're already working on composting mirrors. We would do what we could, but funding would be a help.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Representative Winkler.

REP. WINKLER: Yes, thank you. Sir, do you have any current, do you have any current regulations that could apply to this legislation?

CHARLES FRINK: Do we have current regulations that could apply to this particular legislation? Dick Barlow might be able to answer that question better than I, but DEP has currently regulations concerning the acceptable metal content of composted sewage sludge and I would think that those concepts could be extended to an acceptable quality of an MSW. The same would apply to package ends and other contaminants that would be present.

Also the compost quality standards that I spoke to and Dick Barlow mentioned very briefly, there is an interest in developing appropriate compost standards to be used throughout the Northeast and we're working on those as well.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Senator Fleming.

SEN. FLEMING: I don't think I have an answer to my question. There's a hundred thousand dollars that is being proposed be taken from the solid waste fund, to fund a pilot program. My question, DEP testified that they did not think it was a good idea to take money from that fund for this purpose.

My question is can the experiment, does the experiment station need additional funding to do this pilot program.

CHARLES FRINK: In the sense that a certain amount of that project involves logistics and the trucking of material separation and trucking of material to a site, that would certainly be out of pocket costs that we could not bear. The testing of the compost is probably something that we could accommodate. But out of pocket costs for setting up the transport to the compost facility and those sorts of things is not something that we could afford.

SEN. FLEMING: Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Senator Anderson.

SEN. ANDERSON: Since you worked on the EPA, on the 503, maybe you'd just take a minute or two to just comment on how you see that coming forward and the time schedule. How it may effect what the state's doing.

CHARLES FRINK: The question was the current status of EPA's so-called 503 sewage sludge regulations. They were promulgated, I guess, is it two years ago, Representative Patterson? Intended to be final and are still interim. They have evolved towards what one would call the clean sludge concept, that is to define a level of heavy metals that would be acceptable at any normal rate of application. And that is the approach that have been taken by Connecticut DEP. As far as I know, from the workings of EPA, those will probably be the recommendations that will be forthcoming on sewage sludge.

It also seems likely that they will extend that reasoning and that rationale to the application of any other waste to soil.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Okay, thank you very much.

CHARLES FRINK: Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Jon Purmont to be followed by Representative Arthur O'Neill.

Because, you know, I'm sure every agency is coming before us saying you know, we can't, but we still have the responsibilities to the state of Connecticut. I mean, we're not, I don't think the state of Connecticut is on a freeze, I mean a total halt, in trying to serve the public. So, if you could come up with some recommendations as to maybe a first step, or some way to help us, we would really appreciate it. Thank you.

JON PURMONT: Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Representative Knopp.

REP. KNOPP: As I read the bill, then, Section 5 is really the only part that concerns your Department. Is that correct?

JON PURMONT: Yes.

REP. KNOPP: And it's probably an obvious question to ask, aside from your inspection duties under this bill, I would assume that the Department would have no position against the bill, if those were deleted.

JON PURMONT: No, the concept of the bill we certainly support. There's no question about that. We find that laudable. But it's the extra burden of the inspections that we have problems with.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Thank you very much, Mr. Purmont. Representative Arthur O'Neill. And after Representative O'Neill, we'll move on to the public portion of the agenda.

REP. O'NEILL: Yes, thank you, Chairman Mushinsky, Chairman Spellman. I'm here to testify about HB6416 and in connection with that also HB5661, which is, I believe, a precursor of some of the concepts that have been incorporated into HB6416. I support the concept of treating composting facilities as, in effect, an alternative to incineration facilities. And some of you may know a composting facility of 700 tons was proposed for my district in the town of New Milford, which sort of focused my attention on the issue of composting more than most anything else would.

And I initially had the impression composting was something that's similar to what you described in, I believe it's, Section 6, Paragraph F, leaf and clipping composting. And it came as quite a shock to discover that we're really talking about something quite different. Something that really is an alternative to incineration. And therefore which really ought to be considered under the same kinds of criteria and standards as incineration is. At least in terms of whether we want to permit that many more facilities of that type.

And recognizing that what we're doing is setting up kind of a competition with the incinerators. So, I am very supportive of this concept of recognizing that these solid waste composting facilities really should be subject to the same basic regulatory approach as the incineration and other facilities that are really designed not to intercept some waste before it gets to an incinerator, but rather really to be a substitute for incineration. And also so that we do not end up becoming, unless it is the policy of this Legislature, that we become a major importer of solid waste from other parts of the country. Thank you very much.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Thank you, Representative. Okay, with that we'll move on to the public portion of this public hearing. And I'll state again that right now we're moving on to our third page in terms of people being signed up to speak. So, we're going to be strict in terms of a three-minute limitation. If you hear people testifying in regard to the same bill that you're testifying on, making the same points, if you could associate yourself with their comments, that would be helpful. If you have written testimony, you can submit it to the clerk. And I would prefer that you summarize rather than read the testimony.

And, lastly, if we have more than one person from the same organization. And I don't pick it up in terms of the sign-up list, if you can advise me and then I can call up the co-representatives at the same time. All right. It looks like Fred Knous from Connecticut Water Works Association. To be followed by Richard Goddman.

This bill, this proposed bill, would help to create a permanent site and would obviously give us an ongoing opportunity for continuous local action. The ability to have a permanent site would help us to direct homeowners experiencing either real or perceived health problems from the storage of this household hazardous waste within their homes, to proper disposal area. Be it municipal or be it proprietary, run by a permanent site authority. With that, that's really the conclusion of my testimony on this proposed bill.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you, any questions? Bruce Jones and Mary Harrop.

BRUCE JONES: Thank you for the opportunity to testify today before the Environment Committee on municipal solid waste composting. My name is Bruce Jones and I work for Proctor and Gamble in Cincinnati. Proctor and Gamble has spent the last several years studying municipal solid waste composting through projects in the U.S. and Europe and we've concluded that solid waste composting can be an important waste management solution when it diverts compostable materials from the solid waste stream that are otherwise not recycled and converts them into useful products that are safe for humans and the environment.

(HB 5661)  
(HB 6416)

We believe that solid waste composting offers a resource recovery path for the degradable materials in the solid waste stream. And initially in studies in Minnesota and also in Germany, we looked at composting as a route for diaper material recovery, but quickly realized that it offers the opportunity to divert, not only the one to two percent of the waste stream that is disposable diapers, but up to 30 to 60 percent of the solid waste from landfills.

And during the past year we have visited all the composting facilities in the U.S. and several of the state-of-the-art operations in Europe and what we've seen is that composting is technically proven. There are over two hundred facilities in Europe, many of which have operated for 15 to 20 years. The compostable fraction of the waste

stream includes leaf, and yard waste, food waste and paper and paper board that otherwise is not being recycled.

We think that it's economically viable in many portions of the U.S. today. Composting requires tip fees of about 50 dollars a ton. Composting can produce a beneficial end product with an every expanding number of uses in agriculture, horticulture, land reclamation, and erosion control. And we think that composting fits in well with an integrated waste management framework, maximizing recycling and composting to divert waste from landfills.

Today there are nine facilities in the U.S., there are another 40 projects that are in an advanced stage of development and over 100 projects in early planning stages. In 1991, 6 facilities will start up that are an excellent example of modern material recovery facilities. And they'll process between 100 and 660 tons of municipal solid waste each day. They're located in Portland, Oregon, Bellingham, Washington, near Fort Lauderdale, Florida, and three within one hundred miles of Minneapolis, Minnesota.

And it's important to point out that the first processing step in these facilities to sort recyclable materials like paper, glass, plastics and metal and the compostable material is separated from non-processable matter and high quality compost is achieved in about 3 to 6 months. I think it's also important to point out that solid waste composting has it's share of potential risks. For instance, there are many companies that don't have any experience that are selling composting systems in order to make a quick profit. And even the best systems, if run improperly, can result in water problems or production of off-quality compost.

And the only use for poor compost quality is for land fill cover. One potential source of poor quality is heavy metal content. I think this requires separation of batteries and other hazardous materials from the waste stream and good

equipment for removal of recyclable and non-compostable materials in the pre-processing step.

I think the private sector can have a positive influence in promoting these fundamental changes in waste management and ensuring well designed operating facilities are built. Proctor and Gamble has helped form the Solid Waste Composting Council, a national non-profit association of government, industry and academic institutions. And it's first priority has been development of uniform compost products, standards to protect public health and the environment. The Compost Council is developing guidelines for the design and operation of compost facilities to ensure quality compost is produced.

And, additionally, it is working directly with interested states and communities to help them advance their efforts to get solid waste composting plants operating successfully. I think, if we look to what states have taken the lead in this area, Florida and Minnesota are two good examples. Seven of the ten compost facilities in the U.S. and over 25 percent of the projects will be in those states. I think the reason why is in 19, the mid-1980's, both states enacted enabling legislation. They have laws that set mandates for high levels of diversion from landfills.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Do you have recommendations on the legislation before us?

BRUCE JONES: We have, we are in the process of reviewing that, but haven't taken a position on the legislation before you.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Okay. We'll have it in our possession for several days at least. It would be good if you could send us your testimony specific to the bills within the next maybe three to five days.

BRUCE JONES: Okay.

REP. MUSHINSKY: If you'd be able to do that. We'll be screening the bill.

BRUCE JONES: We'll be happy to do that. Thank you.

MARY FERRY: The group formed last month. We've had one meeting, so we haven't done anything yet.

REP. CARUSO: The only reason I'm asking that is because it just seems to me that the source we should be trying to cut down on. It's almost like the incinerator that we have in town. I'm just wondering if we're looking at that?

MARY FERRY: I agree with you. Source reduction is part of the problem, or part of the solution.

REP. CARUSO: Okay. Thank you, Mary.

REP. KNOPP: Yes, thank you. I'd like to ask first, Representative Caruso, what did he do when the Drano didn't work on his bathtub? It's kind of the soft path. Mary, thanks a lot for coming up. I appreciate your making the effort to come all the way up from Greenwich. It's my understanding that a South Central facility, apart from the state supported debt for construction, is operated entirely by user funding, based on the quantities brought and the number of people from the different towns. So, I presume that in your Committee you've been discussing a similar kind of arrangement. So, we're not talking about operating funds from the state?

MARY FERRY: No, we're not.

REP. KNOPP: Thank you very much.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Dave Galt followed by Lynn Werner.

DAVE GALT: Representative Mushinsky, members of the Environment Committee, my name is Dave Gault. I'm Environmental Policy Analyst for Connecticut Fund for the Environment. I'd like to speak on several bills before the Committee today. First, HB6416, CFE supports the addition of composting and the organic material component of the municipal solid waste, which would be separated at the source of generation from other wastes, to the management guidelines in the state wide solid waste management plan.

Municipal solid waste composting could constitute and excellent alternative technology to resource recovery, incineration and to landfilling. CFE supports that, recommends, that any proposed mixed municipal solid waste composting facility should be subject to the same determination of need process and permit requires as proposed resource recovery facilities. In the state solid waste management plan it states, any mixed municipal solid waste tonnage committed to alternative technology should be offset the need to resource recovery capacity.

CFE supports the requirement in the bill that DEP develop minimum standards to the quality and application of the compost before any permits are issued to construct the composting facility. CFE also supports public HB6420, CFE supports the creation of regional household hazardous waste facilities to avoid disposal of contaminants in landfills and incinerators. Residents should be able to safely dispose of materials that can be dangerous to public health and to the environment.

We support HB6455, this important bill would educate Connecticut citizens regarding the hazardous nature of certain household chemicals. And the proper methods for storage and disposal of the residual material that will not be used. The amounts of oil, toxic chemicals, acids, and other hazardous materials that go down the drain and into landfills and into backyards is largely unknown. Many, manufacturers and vendors supply the customer with information on how to use the product safely to avoid personal and environmental harm and to avoid future environmental damage they should provide the same information about the proper disposal of those materials.

We would also say that we would take out, we would urge taking out, have the Department of Consumer Protection enforcement if it will aid the passage of the bill to get the program started. Finally, CFE supports proposed HB6621. This bill addresses a possibly loophole in Public Act 89386, and the determination of need process and it's impact, possible impact, on recycling.

little bit, but probably not be very much. The difficulty is that towns and even people from out of state report what they're sending to some of our transfer stations. And then our transfer stations send it to the incinerators. And it's a little difficult to calculate, but I'm sure that could be done. I'm sure those figures are available. But from what I've seen, I didn't see very much at this point.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you, Dave. Lynn Werner followed by Norman Richards.

LYNN WERNER: Good afternoon, Representative Mushinsky, members of the Environment Committee. Again, my name is Lynn Werner. I'm from the Housatonic Valley Association and Ruth is beside me in case you have any specific questions that I can't answer after I'm done. Just to begin with, we'd like to also offer our support for HB6420 and HB6455 for the reasons listed by speakers before me and CFE.

We're also in support of HB6621. We think it's important to allow alternative technology, including municipal solid waste composting to become a reality in Connecticut. With regard to HB6416, HBA does believe that municipal solid waste composting is viable when it's done in a certain way. That it can, in combination with recycling, help to divert over 2/3rds of the solid waste stream. And that it appears to be more environmentally than incineration plants and landfilling.

For those reasons, we think MSW composting should be part of Connecticut solid waste management strategy. Strategy, both now, and in the future, but in order to be done right in Connecticut it should include certain things which are common to successful MSW composting elsewhere. Successful projects, for example, either source separate or employ aggressive front end separation on site. But source separation has the advantage of taking out materials which either can't be composted or which threaten the quality of the final compost product from the incoming waste stream before they get a chance to get mixed.

Even plant operators that have been recently surveyed appear to favor source separation as opposed to separation at the site because from their perspective recyclables are then cleaner and easier to market. Source separation helps to reduce the operation and energy cost to the plant and the final product is of a higher quality.

Successful composting facilities usually also operate in conjunction with a household hazardous waste diversion program with compost quality standards and with mandated recycling. So, for these reasons, HBA strongly supports Sections 2, 3, and 5A of this bill. These sections mandate the placement of composting in the state's solid waste plan hierarchy and establish the proper source separation policies for Connecticut.

We also strongly support Section 4, as proposed which would subject composting to the same determination of need requirements as resource recovery and landfilling. Composting must be evaluated in a manner consistent with the state's overall waste management needs and Section 4 will provide for this. With this in mind, we'd also like to see this bill specify that separated, compostable, organic material is still considered mixed municipal solid waste. And that the processing of such is clearly subject to determination of need requirements.

We also support Section 5B, which would require DEP to adopt regulations for the production, quality and use of compost. We know, from past experience, that certain controls can be applied to enhance product reliability and final compost quality as well as compost success. It might also be useful to have quality control standards apply to compost which is imported into Connecticut as well as produced here.

However, we're concerned and at this time opposed to Section 5C. Because this Section would preclude DEP from permitting municipal solid waste composting until regulations are actually adopted. Since necessary composting controls are already known, for the most part, and since most of Connecticut's solid waste stream is already

committed to incineration, we believe that DEP should, in the interim, review composting applications on a case by case basis and incorporate controls into permits until regulations are formally adopted.

Otherwise, Connecticut will likely miss the opportunity to both employ composting the near term and also begin to establish a track record for the future in larger role than MSW composting can play in Connecticut. Again, thank you. We'd like to work with you in the future on this very important issue. And if you have any questions we'd be happy to try and answer them.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Are there any questions for Lynn.

REP. BROWN: Thank you for your testimony. In terms of the certificate of need, previous speaker brought up the idea that we now, we already do have composting in terms of sewage composting that does not come under the certificate of need. Have we looked at that at all? I'm just, and I personally hadn't thought of that in terms of being too restrictive. I mean, I personally have never factored in sewage as part of, you know, the solid waste stream. But I don't want to be restrictive, if you can offer a comment on that. Because I don't want to restrict that.

LYNN WERNER: From our perspective, we're talking about MSW composting and we're referring to a portion of the waste stream that is also handled either through incineration or landfilling or some other technology. We see MSW composting as a viable alternative to those other types of waste management and, therefore, we feel that MSW composting should be subject to determination of need requirements.

The waste stream that's left over after separation had occurred, is still mixed. And it's a portion of the larger picture. We don't intend, and we didn't mean to imply, that you should be, you know, very narrowly restrictive with tires, or wood or sewage, that kind of thing. That's not what we intended.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Wait, I have a question. On section five of HB6416 you objected to the requirement in sub C, that until the regulations are adopted no permit shall be granted. You want us to proceed without delay, I understand, but do you have any objection to the state requiring as a condition for granting the permit the presegregation or separation at the source of items containing hazardous household chemicals.

LYNN WERNER: No, we support that section.

REP. MUSHINSKY: O.K. so as long as we don't hold up the process.

LYNN WERNER: Yes.

REP. MUSHINSKY: You don't mind the preconditions being in the statute?

LYNN WERNER: No.

REP. MUSHINSKY: In other words you don't object to the requirement for presorting.

LYNN WERNER: Absolutely not.

REP. MUSHINSKY: You just have a problem with the time table.

LYNN WERNER: We're concerned that if we wait until regulations are actually formally adopted we will miss an opportunity to have composting happen. So we do support source separation, especially of household hazardous materials and any other items that shouldn't be composted.

REP. MUSHINSKY: O.K. Thank you. Norman Richards, Merritt Ball, Jim Funderburk.

NORMAN RICHARDS: Good afternoon Representative HB 6343  
Mushinsky and other members of the Environment HB 6337  
Committee. My name is Norman Richards. As environmental advisor to the city of Groton, Connecticut, I have been directed by the Mayor and the Town Council to speak on their behalf in favor

chemicals are on the list. I think it's over 300. But it's for the use of those chemicals. Some of them are under permit programs of the DEP, Federal permit programs. Some of the emissions are what's called "fugitive emissions" where no permit is even necessary. So it's well beyond the hazardous waste concept.

REP. FARR: But you can't characterize the different industries that would be most heavily affected by this type of...

TOM TURICK: Again, I would say that just under 400 manufacturers reported under this SARA Title 3 for a year. That is your largest manufacturers. A heavy industry primarily but...

SEN. SPELLMAN: I'll interrupt...that data is readily available from DEP. They'll give you a list of Connecticut businesses that would be affected. Thank you Tom.

TOM TURICK: Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Okay, Marty Smith to be followed by Tim Wiens.

MARTY SMITH: Good afternoon Chairmen Spellman and Mushinsky and members of the Environment Committee. My name is Martin Smith. I'm Vice-President and Chief Operating Officer of Safeway Disposal Systems in Middletown, Connecticut. I'm here in support of HB6416, AN ACT CONCERNING THE PERMITTING OF MIXED MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE COMPOSTING AND BIOMEDICAL WASTE TREATMENT FACILITIES.

For background, Safeway disposal operates Connecticut's only commercial biomedical waste disposal facility. We provide collection and disposal service to approximately 80% of Connecticut generators who ship their waste off-site. That is, those who do not have their own incinerators on-site.

The information I wish to provide the Committee is to give you an idea of how much biomedical waste is generated in Connecticut, and how much we process in our Middletown facility. Based on our actual experience, and based on data from the Connecticut

Hospital Association, the Connecticut Medical Society, and the Connecticut Dental Society there are approximately 5,427 generators of medical waste in Connecticut. This includes hospitals, labs, clinics, doctors, dentists, veterinarians, nursing homes, and blood banks. There are additional miscellaneous categories such as funeral homes and teaching facilities.

These facilities generate approximately 15,209,000 pound per year or approximately 7,600 tons a year of regulated biomedical waste. Our existing facility in Middletown has the capacity to handle more than this amount. Our existing capacity is very conservatively estimated at 8,400 tons per year, with a permitted capacity of 8,400 tons per year. That's compared to the 7,600 tons per year that's actually generated. The point is, with our existing facility in Middletown, we can more than adequately handle every pound of medical waste generated in Connecticut.

If it is the General Assembly's intent to control a disposal capacity or to provide for disposal capacity for our own in-state needs without causing substantial excess capacity to be constructed, then I believe Committee HB6416 will do the job for you. Without it, I believe any additional biomedical waste disposal capacity will only be far in excess of the State's needs. Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Thank you very much. Any questions from the Committee? Thank you Marty. Tim Wiens. to be followed by Matt Shafner.

TIM WIENS: Good afternoon my name is Tim Wiens. President of Environmental Recovery Systems of New Milford. I'm here, generally, to testify in support of recycling and composting facilities in this State. Although our company, commonly known as ERS is based in Denver, Colorado its origin comes from right here in Connecticut. We are a company dedicated to providing an environmentally sound alternative to burning and burying Connecticut's waste stream. ERS since 1986 has developed a recycling and composting technology to do just that. The ERS system involves the mechanical and manual separation of recyclable materials, such as

Hospital Association, the Connecticut Medical Society, and the Connecticut Dental Society there are approximately 5,427 generators of medical waste in Connecticut. This includes hospitals, labs, clinics, doctors, dentists, veterinarians, nursing homes, and blood banks. There are additional miscellaneous categories such as funeral homes and teaching facilities.

These facilities generate approximately 15,209,000 pound per year or approximately 7,600 tons a year of regulated biomedical waste. Our existing facility in Middletown has the capacity to handle more than this amount. Our existing capacity is very conservatively estimated at 8,400 tons per year, with a permitted capacity of 8,400 tons per year. That's compared to the 7,600 tons per year that's actually generated. The point is, with our existing facility in Middletown, we can more than adequately handle every pound of medical waste generated in Connecticut.

If it is the General Assembly's intent to control a disposal capacity or to provide for disposal capacity for our own in-state needs without causing substantial excess capacity to be constructed, then I believe Committee HB6416 will do the job for you. Without it, I believe any additional biomedical waste disposal capacity will only be far in excess of the State's needs. Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Thank you very much. Any questions from the Committee? Thank you Marty. Tim Wiens. to be followed by Matt Shafner.

TIM WIENS: Good afternoon my name is Tim Wiens. President of Environmental Recovery Systems of New Milford. I'm here, generally, to testify in support of recycling and composting facilities in this State. Although our company, commonly known as ERS is based in Denver, Colorado its origin comes from right here in Connecticut. We are a company dedicated to providing an environmentally sound alternative to burning and burying Connecticut's waste stream. ERS since 1986 has developed a recycling and composting technology to do just that. The ERS system involves the mechanical and manual separation of recyclable materials, such as

Hospital Association, the Connecticut Medical Society, and the Connecticut Dental Society there are approximately 5,427 generators of medical waste in Connecticut. This includes hospitals, labs, clinics, doctors, dentists, veterinarians, nursing homes, and blood banks. There are additional miscellaneous categories such as funeral homes and teaching facilities.

These facilities generate approximately 15,209,000 pound per year or approximately 7,600 tons a year of regulated biomedical waste. Our existing facility in Middletown has the capacity to handle more than this amount. Our existing capacity is very conservatively estimated at 8,400 tons per year, with a permitted capacity of 8,400 tons per year. That's compared to the 7,600 tons per year that's actually generated. The point is, with our existing facility in Middletown, we can more than adequately handle every pound of medical waste generated in Connecticut.

If it is the General Assembly's intent to control a disposal capacity or to provide for disposal capacity for our own in-state needs without causing substantial excess capacity to be constructed, then I believe Committee HB6416 will do the job for you. Without it, I believe any additional biomedical waste disposal capacity will only be far in excess of the State's needs. Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Thank you very much. Any questions from the Committee? Thank you Marty. Tim Wiens. to be followed by Matt Shafner.

TIM WIENS: Good afternoon my name is Tim Wiens. President of Environmental Recovery Systems of New Milford. I'm here, generally, to testify in support of recycling and composting facilities in this State. Although our company, commonly known as ERS is based in Denver, Colorado its origin comes from right here in Connecticut. We are a company dedicated to providing an environmentally sound alternative to burning and burying Connecticut's waste stream. ERS since 1986 has developed a recycling and composting technology to do just that. The ERS system involves the mechanical and manual separation of recyclable materials, such as

PETER CASHMAN: Yes I did.

REP. WINKLER: O.K. Another question, do you have any idea how many companies are currently in the permitting process?

PETER CASHMAN: In Connecticut? For a hazardous waste incinerator? I don't know of any, but I could get response to that. I could respond to that, I could let you know.

REP. WINKLER: Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Thank you. Jim Williams to be followed by Elizabeth Rabotave.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Sir if you wish to speak you have to sign the signup sheet.

: I have, one of the problems, the wife has.

REP. MUSHINSKY: You're about another 6 or 7 down, we have not come to your name yet.

SEN. SPELLMAN: We've got a three page list here, we have quite a few people yet to testify. O.K. Jim Williams.

JIM WILLIAMS: Thank you good afternoon Senator Spellman, Representative Mushinsky and members of the Environmental Committee. My name is Jim Williams and I reside in Wallingford, Connecticut at 9 Sylvan Avenue. I'd like to thank Representative Mushinsky for sponsoring HB6416, I wish to focus my remarks on the biomedical waste treatment portion of that legislation as it relates to the certificate of need process.

As a citizen observer of the controversy surrounding the solid waste disposal facility sited in my community of Wallingford. I have come to recognize a number of issue that surround any solid waste question in this state. All of us understand are the highly emotional charged reaction that at companies the siting of wasted related facilities and the need for Connecticut to solve its own waste problem. And those are the reasons that I support this particular bill.

Connecticut seems to be solving its own biomedical waste problems. And comments by Mr. Smith certainly suggest that we're in good shape in that regard. It's my understanding that more than enough capacity already exists in this state to handle the biomedical waste generated by our own health care providers. At this point there appears to be no need to disrupt communities with proposals to site facilities that aren't needed for Connecticut generated waste.

I've seen how my community has been impacted by a solid waste facility. And in terms of biomedical waste, communities such as West Haven, Bridgeport, Windham, and Plainfield have all been up in arms over proposals to site medical waste facilities that are designed primarily for the removal of out of state biomedical waste. The certificate of need determination, it already exists for resource recoveries facilities, should be extended to biomedical waste facilities as well as to any other solid waste facilities.

This would eliminate the unnecessary over building of facilities designed primarily for the disposal of out of state generated waste and would also eliminate the unnecessary citizen uproar and upset that accompanies these proposals. Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Any questions?

REP. MUSHINSKY: Just a comment, thank you for coming in and I guess the two of us would like to erase from our memory banks that whole siting controversy in Wallingford. Not wish it on anyone else.

JIM WILLIAMS: That was unfortunate and I think that this certificate of need process would have some effect on eliminating it.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Elizabeth Rabotille to be followed by Thomas Fillburn.

ELIZABETH RABOTAILLE: Good afternoon my name is Elizabeth Rabotaille. I'm here to talk in favor of bills HB6337 and HB6343. I have four young

That is this incinerator. This commission is in operation and has been for several years in the state of Connecticut.

The commission regulations from Washington concerns below regular regulatory concerns. And that has been changed so that some of your waste that was included as being hazardous is no longer hazardous and I think that was effective March 2, 1991. What I was interested in viewpoints of this committee and the Connecticut Hazardous Waste Committee in relation to incineration or the use of this incinerator a method of disposal.

SEN. SPELLMAN: This is a public hearing, we take comments from the public basically.

MARSHALL BURKHARDT: I might add as part of the record that I would like your committee to take this under consideration because you're working with a commission up on Asylum Avenue that been in operation.

REP. MUSHINSKY: We actually have a bill on that and we will be voting on that, the low regulatory concern bill, so that is in our committee also.

SEN. SPELLMAN: O.K. Any questions from the committee? Thank you. Trenton Wright to be followed by Robin Miyashiro.

TRENTON WRIGHT: Senator Spellman, Representative Mushinsky, thank you for the opportunity. My name is Trento Wright, Executive Director of Stop the Incineration Now Committee, a multi town environmental group in the Windham area. We are not opposed to incineration, however, and we are not part of the nimbi not in my backyard syndrome. We have the first trash to energy facility in the state along with a regional basis with a regional landfill for the ash.

We're here to speak in support of committee bill HB6416, specifically to the biomedical waste treatment facility section 7 we find extremely helpful and needed. However, I would comment that the Connecticut siting council seems to have some overlapping interests in terms of the certificate

of environmental compatibility and need. However, we have no problem with designating someone to review the essential issue of need.

Especially for Connecticut for these types of facilities. The DEP staff member earlier indicated, or did not take a very forthright position with section 7 in terms of the number of applications that have been pending. But there is one presently pending and, excuse me, a referendum on the issue is pending in Windham on March 19th for a facility to truck 30 tons of biomedical waste from New York, New Jersey, Rhode Island and other medical waste tracking states to be deposited in Windham, incinerated and landfilled in Windham.

For which another prior person indicated a facility already exists in Connecticut that can adequately handle up to 100% of Connecticut's medical waste. We view this proposal as not a proper proposal for the state and that the state should address the issue of need as a matter of law which this particular piece of legislation actually does. We would however, have a question as to whether this particular legislation would apply to a municipal solid waste facility that is being modified to accompany biomedical waste?

We are in need of assurance that it will apply to a facility, let's say that accepts 40% biomedical waste and 60% municipal solid waste. We see these facilities as the waste stream changes due to recycling and composting, which we entirely support, that the void created, that the reward for the recycling should not be the out of state medical waste from New York and New Jersey. If a facility already exists in Connecticut operating in compliance then we support this legislation with those comments and we thank you.

REP. MUSHINSKY: May I ask our attorney if this language will cover this situation?

DAVID LEFF: Well what this language will do would be to deny a permit where the existing capacity of biomedical waste facilities is sufficient to cover the entire state so I think the situation where that your depositing where Windham would accept biomedical waste although there is an existing

facility that would cover 100% of the state's waste this language would not be something in favorable with your project.

TRENTON WRIGHT: One remark. And it's I hope the committee will understand the intent, it's only for a matter of public disclosure that this bill may impact a particular company, Natural Resources, which has a proposal of which two of the principal officers are members of the general assembly, I make no implication whatsoever in making that factual statement to you.

REP. MUSHINSKY: Yes, that has no influence on this committee. I hope you don't get the impression it does.

TRENTON WRIGHT: Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Any questions? Thank you. Robin Miyashiro to be followed by Debroah Lee York.

ROBIN MIYASHIRO: Thank you Senator Spellman and Representative Mushinsky and members of the committee for this time. My name is Robin Miyashiro, I'm the Director of the Windham Residents Against Pollution, known as RAP. I'm a resident of North Windham, Connecticut and I would like to say that I'm in favor of bill HB6416 that requires the siting of new medical waste incinerating facilities and the proof of need for Connecticut's medical waste.

As I state before I am from North Windham where a municipal waste incinerator is located in my neighborhood. As of last year this incinerator burned approximately 100 tons of solid waste a day. However, with the success of recycling mandates, the waste stream has been reduced to 85 tons per day. Because of this reduction in waste stream that has been blamed on recycling, a Hartford based company called Natural Resources, Inc. has proposed to the town of Windham to haul in 30 tons plus a day of medical wastes which RAP is opposed to.

On of the three incinerators shall be retrofitted and contracted to NRI to burn medical waste for many of the state's participating in the EPA's demonstration program of the medical waste tracking

act, if it passes referendum. In addition to those states any state that will join the MWTA in the future will also be eligible to be contracted by NRI to ship their infectious medical waste to Windham. Will this be our reward for recycling and reducing the waste stream in Connecticut?

Should the people of Connecticut be penalized for obeying the law only to be dumped on by our neighboring states? What will happen when plastics are removed from the waste stream thus reducing the amount even further? Will we be given more medical waste to fill the incinerators from other states? As it was said before, Safeway Disposal Systems of Middletown, Connecticut is now incinerating 80% of Connecticut's medical waste.

And they also claim that they can handle 100% of Connecticut's medical waste. As a state we have already fulfilled our responsibility for regional medical waste incineration. Do we want to be responsible for the entire northeast as well? I should hope not and so we would like to strongly urge that this Committee vote favorably for this bill, HB6416 I believe it is, I said. And do not allow neighboring states to dump on us. Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Thank you. Questions from the committee. Beverly York, to be followed by Sarah Cosner.

BEVERLY YORK: Senator Spellman, Representative Mushinsky, members of the committee thank you for this opportunity to speak. My name is Bev York and I live in the town of Windham. I served on a committee to study the medical waste proposal and also on the recycling committee. I wish to give testimony in support of bill HB6416 regarding the section on biomedical waste and permitting of biomedical waste treatment facilities only after determining the need, if the need is necessary.

I believe that new medical waste incinerator businesses should have to prove that they are needed in Connecticut. I don't believe Connecticut should allow in an excess of medical waste facilities for companies to profit burning out of state biomedical waste, or any other waste,

from out of state. Leaving Connecticut with future, or possible future environmental effects of such waste disposal.

It is my understanding that your environmental committee has in the past supported similar certification of need, bills to limit facilities that do or could contribute adversely to Connecticut's environment. At the Windham energy recovery facility there is a proposal for one of three incinerators to be retrofitted and permitted for medical waste. Most of which will come from out of state.

I am opposed to this private firm's proposal, leaving the Windham region with the problems of storage, handling, emissions, ash residue, hazards and pollution of trucking and future unknowns to our fragile Connecticut environment.

As we recycle to reduce our waste stream let us not bring in waste oceans from out of state. Thank you.

SEN. SPELLMAN: Thank you. Questions from the committee? Sara Posner? Sara Posner here? She left, O.K. Peter Roper to be followed by Susanna Rumon.

PETER ROPER: Good evening, I thank you all for hanging in there. This is sort of discouraging when the audience disappears but if the committee disappears too I'd feel like it was kind of a wasted day off. I'm Peter Roper, I live in the Mystic portion of Groton. I'm self employed, that's why I was able to take the day off today, first I'd like to say that you'd have more hearings at hours when working people are not working. I realize you're working people but it makes it inconvenient for those of us in the interlands.

I'm especially pleased that I can speak to Senator Spellman who is my Senator and Representative Winkler who left I guess, I'll catch her later. I'm speaking in support of the proposed bill HB6343, I'm concerned about the hazardous waste incinerator. Not just the proposed EB incinerator or any incinerator that might be proposed for Connecticut. I feel my first priority should be,