

PA13-285

SB1081

Environment	2564, 2567-2574, 2694-2723, 2725-2727, 2736-2743, 2745-2754, 2757-2758	62
House	10476-10522	47
Senate	1093-1096, 3488-3518, 3859-3889, 3993-3995	69
		178

H - 1180

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VETO
SESSION**

**VOL.56
PART 31
10451 - 10795**

Yes. On Page 31, Bill Number 669, a favorable -- or excuse me -- House Calendar 669, Favorable Report of the joint standing committee on Planning and Development, Substitute Senate Bill 1081, AN ACT CONCERNING RECYCLING AND JOBS.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I will recuse myself from this bill to avoid any appearance of a possible conflict of interest.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Very good, sir.

House will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

House will come back to order.

The distinguished Chair of the Environment Committee, Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the joint committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill, in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Question is on passage and concurrence.

Representative Gentile, would you care to explain the bill?

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes several changes, technical changes removing some obsolete statutes to the state's laws relating to recycling and solid waste management. Some of the things that it would do would broaden the scope of the law that requires certain generators of organic materials to separate organic materials from other solid waste and recycle them at composting facilities.

It would require the DEEP Commissioner to consult with state or quasi-state public agencies and identify opportunities to establish a recycling infrastructure investment program. It establishes a Resources Recovery task force to study the operations, financial

stability, and business models of the Connecticut's Resource Recovery facilities.

It also would require the DEEP, Department of Environmental and Energy to audit the Connecticut Resources Recovery Authority to, among other things, review its financial condition, provide a summary and provide a summary of the audits' findings.

With that, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 5746. I ask that the Clerk please call and I be granted leave to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The Clerk is in possession of LCO Number 5746, previously designated Senate Amendment Schedule "A."

Mr. Clerk, please call the amendment.

THE CLERK:

Senate "A," LCO 5746, as introduced by Senator Meyer.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The gentlewoman has asked to leave the Chamber to summarize. Is there any objection?

Hearing none, Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is a bit of a technical

amendment. It makes some technical changes to the original bill and it also strikes Section 3 in its entirety from the original bill and Section 6 in its entirety from the original bill.

Mr. Speaker, I -- I urge passage -- I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The question is on adoption.

Will you remark on Senate Amendment Schedule "A?"

If not, let me try your minds, all those in favor, signify by saying Aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Opposed, Nay.

The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Moving right along, the Clerk is also in possession of LCO Number 7442 [sic]. I ask that the Clerk please call and I be granted leave to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The Clerk is in possession of LCO Number 7742,

previously designated Senate Amendment Schedule "B."

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Senate "B," LCO 7742, as introduced by Senator Meyer.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The gentlewoman has asked to leave the Chamber to summarize. Is there objection?

Hearing none, Representative Gentile.

A VOICE:

Seven-seven-four-two.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is -- this amendment is a strike-all amendment which essentially becomes the bill. It would -- in the first section, we have a number of definitions.

The second section would require DEEP, reporting actually to DEEP by scrap metal processors for in-state generated scrap metal, and it also exempts from definition of collector any self-generated solid waste. It requires source separation of organic materials from solid waste.

And with that, Mr. Speaker, I would move for

mhr/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

291
June 5, 2013

adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Question is on adoption. Will you remark on
Senate "B?"

The distinguished Ranking Member of the
Environment Committee, Representative Shaban, as soon
as I can get a sight line to you.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I may, a few questions to you to the proponent
of Senate "B."

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill has gone through a couple of
iterations, both in the Environment Committee and then
up in Senate, so just to kind of get us all back up to
speed, because Senate "A" kind of took stuff out,
Senate "B" kind of put stuff back in, so if the
Chairman of the Environment Committee would indulge
me, a brief but thumbnail sketch of kind of what's
still left in here.

So through you, Madam Speaker [sic] --

mhr/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

292
June 5, 2013

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Ahem; Mr. Speaker --

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Oh.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

-- would be better. Thank you.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Mr. Speaker, I have my reading glasses on, so I apologize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

So do I; I understand.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed, sir.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, sir.

Section 1 of the bill, jeez, jabbed at that definition. Let's look at Section 2.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, what is Section 2 trying to do? What's it do; where we going on Section 2?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile, do you care to respond?

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Senate -- Section 2 is actually describing or defining scrap metal processors within the State of Connecticut and anyone that does business with scrap metal processors and anything generated within the borders of the state.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you.

Are -- are scrap metal processors currently licensed, either under this bill or would they be licensed under this bill but are they also licensed under other existing law?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

One moment. I don't see anything about licensing. Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry, but is the gentleman referring to a particular line? I'm looking

quickly; I don't see any particular language for licensing.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Shaban, would you care to rephrase your question?

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Gladly, Mr. Speaker.

Actually, I was doing the same thing. I guess the better question on the rephrase would be: Are scrap metal -- if the, if the gentle lady knows -- are scrap metal producers currently licensed under existing law, outside of this bill?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Thank you for the, thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank the good gentleman for the clarification.

No, they are not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

And, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So as I'm, as I understand the bill from when we

mhr/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

295
June 5, 2013

first saw it a couple months back and now we're seeing it now, the scrap metal guys are basically reporting in how much scrap metal they think they're generating.

So, through you, Mr. Speaker, is that information going to be public?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That information would be submitted to the department and therefore I would assume that it -- it could be made public.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, my concern was at the time we first heard this bill and now that I guess some scrap metal guys may have some concern about where they get their material. So providing this estimate could potentially fly, you know, give someone else a peek under the hood of their business model, but let me move on here.

Section 3 of Senate "B"; through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm trying to conform this to the old bill. What does Section 3 of Senate "B" do, vis-a-vis the original bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you.

Section 3, once again, is mostly definition language; it clarifies the definition of a collector.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Does a collector -- I'm trying to read the definition on the fly here -- does a collector include the standard, residential trash hauler?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

If I could refer the good gentleman to Lines 47,

beginning in Line 47; it states, specifically, a collector does not include any person who transports solid waste and would define the collector within those -- those lines.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yeah, that's it; as the gentle lady was flagging it, I was flagging it, myself. So I know that was also a concern.

There was also a concern in the original bill; I think it was originally Section 7; I note that that came out on our JFS. That did not come back in Senate "A," and it appears that it's not back in Senate "B," so I'll trust my eyes and move on.

Section 7, if the -- through you, Mr. Speaker -- could the, could the gentle lady expand on the -- the need and the contours of this audit that's being described? You know, why are we doing it and how will it help?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It is my understanding that this has all been negotiated, and this audit is to be done not later than June 30th of this year. It will be done in conjunction with the department, Office of Policy and Management and will be a full audit of the CRRA.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And just for the -- the information of the Chamber, what, the ultimate goal of the audit, my understanding -- and maybe the gentle lady can confirm it -- my understanding of the goal of the audit is to, is to make CRRA basically more efficient at processing some of this solid waste.

But if the, if the Chairwoman could confirm my understanding and/or add some gloss on that, I'd appreciate it.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile, would you have, would you care to gloss on that, please?

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker; yes, I'd be happy to.

If the, my good Ranking Member could refer to lines, I believe starting in Lines 118 through 134 of -- of that section; those are all the things that would be considered in the audit.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker; it's correct.

Yeah, they, I -- I guess the audit, I mean, the language obviously of the bill speaks for itself. But, you know, the goal here is to drive us in the direction as described by the Chairwoman.

I think the remaining sections of this bill are pretty much as described. I note for the Chamber that, you know, this bill, like I said when I first stood up, has taken a couple of twists and turns. Senate "A" and "B" added a couple turns to it. So I'm going to, as it stood before it got through, up to the Senate, I was generally in support of the concept, as it had been amended. I believe we're still in good shape here, but I'm going to confirm that as I, the debate continues and we continue to look at it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further on Senate Amendment Schedule "B?" Will you remark further on Senate Amendment Schedule "B?"

If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Opposed, Nay.

The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, one last time, the Clerk is in possession of LCO Number 7911. I ask that the Clerk please call and I be granted leave to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Clerk is in possession of LCO Number 7911, previously designated Senate Amendment Schedule "B" [sic].

Mr. Clerk.

mhr/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

301
June 5, 2013

THE CLERK:

"C."

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

"C" -- sorry.

THE CLERK:

Senate "C," LCO 7911, as introduced by Senator
Maynard.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The gentlewoman has asked to leave the Chamber to summarize. Is there objection?

Hearing none, Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this is a short amendment.

Basically, this amendment would exempt contract extensions of the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection that are approved by the Commissioner for solid waste contracts in force as of December 31, 2008, from the original law of the 30-year contract limitation.

And I would move adoption or --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Question is on adoption.

Will you remark on Senate Amendment Schedule "C?"

Will you remark on Senate Amendment Schedule "C?"

If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Opposed, Nay.

The Ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Will you remark on the bill as amended?

The gentlewoman from the 55th, Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Good evening.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

A question, through you, to the proponent of --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

-- the last amendment and the gentle lady who is our distinguished Chairman of the Environment Committee.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

I apologize I wasn't on my feet sooner, before, when we were still on Amendment "C," but that is where my question is, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, sir.

Obviously this looks like it is a specific situation that needed to be dealt with because of the December 31, 2008, mention in Line 13. Could you please elaborate on what the actual situation is that we would need this kind of special legislation?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, this is a very specific situation related to the Town of Preston, alone, and it is my understanding that they had some work which had, was not able to be started on time, so they just need an extension for the 30-year limitation from the time the work actually began.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I would like to thank the Chairwoman for that answer. That's always helpful when we have a -- a very clear description of what a very interesting narrative gives us that only you must, are faced to read between the lines.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, madam.

The gentleman from the 8th, Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And a question, through you, to the proponent of the bill as amended.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Does this -- and I kind of briefed through it as quickly as I could, not serving in your committee -- if a contractor, say a, contractors that take products from a job site, pool liners are one, plumbing items may be another, copper scrap, electrical wire to be stored, they could through this bill as amended be able to bring the product to their place of work,

store it until the time in which they bring it to the collector, the recycler?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker; one moment, please.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, as I read it, I would think that that would be possible.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe because what you may find is people in those trades might collect a small amount of product rather than take the product directly to a recycler, store it in their shops and be almost considered a recycler, unfortunately, through the other. So I'm hoping that's how it reads. I think it would be good for individuals not knowingly caught off guard and think that they have to pay a -- a fee to be a collector.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you to the good, gentle lady.

mhr/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

306
June 5, 2013

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

The gentle woman from the 112th,
Representative Hovey.

REP. HOVEY (112th):

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, a question to --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed.

REP. HOVEY (112th):

-- the proponent of the bill. Thank you, sir.

Just because this is not a, the, a committee of what I'm a part of and because there's been quite a few amendments here, and in shuffling all of the papers, one of the parts of this particular bill that I was especially appreciative was a part, Section 3 -- new language (k) -- which had to do with the Municipal and Regional Recycling Incentive Program.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, based on the amendments, am I to believe that that piece of -- of this legislation has been removed and that is no longer a part of this bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, that is correct. During our public hearing process, we had heard from a number of the independent haulers that this could be quite problematic for -- for them, so we did remove that section.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Hovey.

REP. HOVEY (112th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I thank the gentlewoman for her answer.

I just want to weigh in on this that I -- I believe that the only way we're going to be able to sort of save our planet, save our state is to really look at incentivizing, reusing, and recycling. And I've been one of those individuals that's been extremely concerned about the overpackaging that occurs on just about everything that we as consumers are exposed to.

And I would encourage, going forward, that while the haulers may not necessarily appreciate it, the consumers and the environmentalists and the next generation or generations would really be appreciative

of us being more thoughtful about recycling and reusing. And we really need to, I think, make a determination that we are going to invest in incentivizing people to reduce the waste stream.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, madam.

The gentleman from the 122nd, Representative Larry Miller.

REP. L. MILLER (122nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I have a couple of questions of the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed, sir.

REP. L. MILLER (122nd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

What is the reason we're going to collect all this data from the scrap iron and metal dealers for the waste they collect from businesses; is there a purpose for that?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It is my understanding that we currently do not have any information as to how much metal materials are actually collected and could be available for processing and recycling, and that's why the information is being gathered, so that we can look into the possibilities of recycling and reprocessing, perhaps creating jobs.

REP. L. MILLER (122nd):

Oh.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Miller.

REP. L. MILLER (122nd):

Yeah; and through you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, scrap iron, metal dealers were probably our first recyclers; they've been around for hundreds of years. Some had a horse-and-wagon operation. Today they're very sophisticated and they have unbelievable equipment to recycle and -- and move materials to their proper designation for reuse.

So, number one, if we're going to collect all this data, it's going to be a pile of paperwork, and I just want to make sure that we're not going to hire people to accumulate this data.

And, secondly, I think Representative Shaban talked about competitors looking under the hood. And is this going to be a matter of public; can the public go there and look up this material at any time they want?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker; I didn't hear that.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Miller, would you care to repeat the question?

REP. L. MILLER (122nd):

I forgot what I was asking. Are we going to have to hire people to monitor the data that's being collected? Will that be done in-house? And will this be a matter of public record, where people can come in and look and find out who's selling what or buying what?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the gentleman for rephrasing his question. No, this will all be done within available resources, through the department; there will be no need for any hiring. And as far as public information, I would think that it would be made a public -- public, available to the public, as long as there are no trade violations or anything like that in place.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Miller.

REP. L. MILLER (122nd):

And through you, Mr. Speaker.

There's a section here where it allows municipalities to provide ordinances to give a tax break on equipment, and I'm concerned about that because most of the scrap iron, metal dealers, they have large parcels -- they're kind of a captive audience. They're not going to move from one town to another because it's not a -- a business where you can get approval from planning and zoning readily. The fact is that they're very sophisticated today, the scrap iron, metal dealers. They have machines that cost, you know, upwards of a million dollars. What

would be the benefit to give them a tax break when they're a captive audience and they're buying this machinery to make their operations more efficiently?

Through you, Madam [sic] Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Miller, it's Mr. Speaker; but okay.

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It is simply a local option.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Miller.

REP. L. MILLER (122nd):

Again, through you, Mr. Speaker.

I know all our towns are flush with money, so they're obviously going to jump at this one.

And lastly, what was I going to say? Now a lot of scrap dealers, they, there are not that many scrap dealers left in Connecticut, because they're really, because of the loss of our industrial base. A lot of these companies just closed up or merged to the left or whatever, so that a lot of stuff is sent to export.

So there's a lot of stuff that is mingled in, for

instance, scrap metal, like iron and iron and steel. All that stuff is mingled in and sent to a -- a dock in, say, New Haven or -- or wherever for shipment overseas, to Japan or some other country.

It would seem to me it would be very difficult to categorize each -- each pound of metal that goes to these docks for shipment. And I -- I just, again, I'd have some concern about all this data and how we're going to use it and how it's going to be collected and -- and stored and all that stuff. So I think it's going to be a problem.

And I don't think they can be that accurate with giving the state particular data; at one location they picked up a, you know, 500,000 tons or another location we picked up 200,000 tons. I think it's going to be very difficult. You're do going to put a -- a strain on the administrative offices of the scrap iron and metal dealer. And, again, I think it's kind of, almost like a mandate; we're going to force them to do a lot of bookkeeping that they shouldn't have to be doing, because it just, I don't know what the purpose is going to serve.

These guys want to recycle metal and keep it off the streets and -- and do the right thing; they have

been for hundreds of years. So I just think that I have some concerns about it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

The gentleman from the 74th, Representative Noujaim.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Good to see you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Good to be seen.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I do --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Mr. Speaker.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

-- just have -- mister.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

What do I -- never mind.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

I know, I messed up. You look like a mister to me. I need apologize --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Well, I would hope so.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

-- Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

You're changing so much that sometimes it's confusing.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Don't dig the hole deeper.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, just a couple, simple questions --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed (inaudible).

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

-- to the proponent of this, to this bill; Mr. Speaker, through you to Representative Gentile.

I'm looking at Line 26, and I presume that the scrap metal processors that in this, in being described here in this line is a metal, a scrap metal

processor that I presume is for-profit.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker; one moment, I need to find the line.

Through -- through you, Mr. Speaker. Could -- could the good gentleman repeat his question again?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Noujaim, could you --

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Thank you --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

-- repeat your question.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

-- Mr. Speaker.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Line 26, that describes such a scrap metal processor, I am presuming that this such metal scrap processor is a person who collect metals and uses it for recycling to make profit. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

He is absolutely correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative --

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Noujaim.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

And through you, Mr. Speaker.

On Lines 28 to 29, it talks about scrap metals generated within the borders of the state. Does this mean, through you, Mr. Speaker, that any metal that is generated outside the borders of Connecticut would not be classified under this bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

As I read it, that would be correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Noujaim.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So through you, Mr. Speaker, then for legislative intent, then any metal that is processed outside the State of Connecticut and then is brought into the State of Connecticut for processing would not be, would not be the responsibility of this bill, will not be counted in this legislation.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Noujaim.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker.

I am moving on to Lines 36 to 39, basically talking about reporting the inventory, identifying the monthly and the amount of scrap generated within the state or recyclable. And it seems to me that I'm reading through this legislation, this only describes

scrap material that is generated by the State of Connecticut, not by -- by physical entities, not by private enterprises.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That could be correct but it could also be a private; and, regardless, it -- it wouldn't be required to be reported to the department.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Noujaim.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So then for legislative intent, any scrap material that is picked up from a private enterprise, from a commercial business that is for-profit business, then does not qualify to be and to be counted under this legislation.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm not sure that I understand the question.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Noujaim, could you rephrase --

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Thank you --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

-- your question?

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

-- Mr. Speaker. Through you, if I may restate my
-- my question.

Basically, what these three lines says, Lines 3
-- 36 to 38, they talk about materials or scrap
material generated within the state, recyclable
material generated within the state, and recycling
residue generated. And it seems to me if I read the
balance of the entire bill, it simply specifies
material generated within projects that are done for
the State of Connecticut by the State of Connecticut
for projects, projects that are authorized by the
State of Connecticut and not by private enterprises or
private businesses or only, or for that matter, for
public businesses, public manufacturing business.

Through you, Mr. Speaker -- publicly held

mhr/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

321
June 5, 2013

manufacturing business.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

As I'm reading it, I would think that it doesn't matter whether the scrap is from a private business or not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Noujaim.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Therefore, for legislative intent, so scrap picked up from private businesses, commercial businesses must be also counted for and inventoried by this bill.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe the good gentleman is correct. That would be my understanding as well.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Noujaim.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, Mr. Speaker.

I presume and for legislative intent, once again, that Section 3 of this bill, because of the previous amendment is totally struck out.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, the previous Section 3 was totally struck out.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Noujaim.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker; I appreciate the answers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Gentleman -- gentleman from the 151st, Representative Camillo. Looking very --

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

-- NATTY, sir.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Good afternoon.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent of the bill, just a couple, quick questions.

I was trying to find it here in the bill, since it's been amended a few times. The original bill had local haulers having to register with DEEP as well as their local municipalities.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, is that still in the bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that has been removed.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Camillo.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you. And one -- I thank the gentlewoman for her answer -- and one last question; I'm just trying to find it.

There was a provision in the original bill about pricing for the local haulers, that somehow the Commissioner of DEEP would have to, I guess, approve some of the local charges. And I think -- I'm not sure if that was removed also -- through -- and I wish I had the section to -- to refer to it.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not see that language in this, so I believe that it has been removed as well.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Camillo.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you.

And as I look here, it was, I believe in Section 7, subsection (c) of that, of that bill. So if the -- the gentlewoman thinks it's been removed, that's a, that's a good sign.

And I think the bill as amended is very good now, and I plan to support it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

The gentleman from the 66th, Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I wanted to just speak to the part of the bill that I -- I think Representative Ackert was trying to get at, and that was to make a distinction between someone who might have a contractor's license, let's say plumber, and at the end of each day come home and take a certain amount of scrap metal off his truck and leave it in a barrel, let's say at the end of his garage. And that there might have been a notion at one point that that individual would have had to register for something.

And as I understand the bill, what the bill intends or tries to do is to make the distinction between those collections that are part of some other, completely different activity -- so if an electrician brings back copper wire and aluminum or a roofer brings back gutters or copper flashing -- that that collection is picked up in terms of quantity at some point farther down the line, differentiated from

someone who has developed a business going perhaps from one place to another place to another place, solely for the purpose of picking up this scrap. And that my understanding is that those are the individuals, Mr. Speaker, that we're trying to identify and then feed all that data into a system so we can see how we do versus other states in terms of collection, processing, reuse and the like.

And so I -- I was a little confused when the bill first came out and trying to make those, listen to the distinctions, but I think that is pretty much what I understand the story is. And it's my intention to support it, and I hope the Chamber will as well.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

The gentleman from the 130 -- 135th,
Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

On the bill, itself, if -- just one or two follow-up questions to the Chairman -- if I may.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Looking back at Section 4, we're kind of wandering into a slightly different model that I guess was passed a couple years back, specifically under Title 22a-226, dealing with the recycling of source separated organic materials, basically food, kind of split it off from different things or different types of organic materials. I was trying to remind myself; I was looking through the statutes for some of the definitions.

So, through you, Mr. Speaker -- because I didn't, I'm not sure I saw one -- a commercial food wholesaler or distributor; it's on Line 68. It would, just for legislative intent, could the proponent of the bill define or give us a -- a more general description of what is meant by commercial wholesaler or distributor?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes; it could include a grocery store or any such thing like that, that would generate food waste. And

it specifically is in regard to composting.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and that was my understanding as well.

I -- I guess some of the concerns or not concerns, some of the questions -- because I -- I understand where this thing is going -- you know, because we -- we use that term. We use industrial food manufacturer or processor -- I think that makes sense. Supermarket makes sense. Then resort or conference center; now, see, presumably the -- the reason using resort or conference center is, you know, large banquets and stuff like that, big kitchens.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, would the standard family restaurant be captured in these definitions?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Thank you; seems like we're having some technical difficulty here.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, as I read through it,

they would have to be generating two tons or more per week. I would believe that like a little family restaurant would probably not quite generate that much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

And thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I think that's important for legislative intent and purposes.

I agree with the Chairwoman that, you know, the -- the goal here is to capture large operations, larger operations.

And then I guess in 2020 we step that back down to, I think it's 52 tons per year. So it's basically a ton a week, which I believe we received some testimony that that is still probably on the high side for a family restaurant.

Last question, if I may, through you, Mr. Speaker. The, there's a 20-mile demarcation from an authorized source-separated organic material composting facility. I don't recall; that's why I'm asking, because it's more curiosity, that information. Through you, Mr. Speaker, how many of these exist in the State of Connecticut now?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE (104th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It is my understanding that currently there is only one.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

And thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So I, so just for the -- the Chamber's information, the goal here being is so more of these composting facilities are created or come on line, that would capture the regional areas around them within a 20-mile radius to try and bring their food waste there, as opposed to throwing it in the landfill or -- or putting it, just you, in the garbage can, as we're doing now. So that's the -- the intent of this section. I thank the Chairwoman for helping me flush out some of these definitions.

And upon reflection, thought, and a lifting of the three-day, no-sleep haze, I rise in support of this bill. So --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

I understand the three-day, no-sleep, haze part.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

If not, staff and guests please come to the Well of the House. Members take your seats. The machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.

The House of Representatives is voting by role. Will members please return to the Chamber immediately.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Have all the members voted? If so, the machine will be locked. Now the machine will be locked.

Clerk will take a tally.

And the Clerk will announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

In concurrence with the Senate, Substitute Senate Bill 1081, as amended by Senate "A," "B," and "C."

mhr/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

332
June 5, 2013

Total Number Voting	145
Necessary for Passage	73
Those Voting Yea	145
Nay	0
Not voting	5

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Bill as amended is passed in concurrence.

Mr. Clerk, Calendar 279, please.

THE CLERK:

On Page 42, Calendar 279, Favorable Report of the joint standing Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding, Disagreeing Action; Substitute House Bill 571, AN ACT CONCERNING MUNICIPAL AUTHORITY TO PROVIDE TAX ABATEMENTS TO ENCOURAGE RESIDENTIAL DEVELOPMENT.

(HB 5718)

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The gentleman from the 9th, Representative Rojas.

REP. ROJAS (9th):

It's a good evening, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Good evening.

REP. ROJAS (9th):

I move for acceptance of the joint committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill, in concurrence with the Senate.

S - 654

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL. 56
PART 3
614 - 910**

And I just want to close by thanking all the employees of our university system and community colleges and Charter Oak State College because it's been -- this has all been very rough on them, and I want to thank them for their service to our students.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark?

Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER:

Thank you, Madam President.

Just as a concluding remark, this is an important step, but I would underscore that it is just one step in a movement to a more opened, more transparent, more accountable process that has -- had a stain on it in the last couple of years. But it is just a step, and I hope that if the Board of Regents is listening, and we just did get an e-mail from the Board of Regents announcing their Audit Committee meeting which is a wonderful thing to have it be open and online -- this is super -- but when they meet, they also discuss making sure that they have a governance committee, a compensation committee; that they have an audit and finance committee that is independent of each other, and they -- they stick to the practice -- the best practices of good governance, and certainly, also, entertain conflict of interest policies, as well, so that we can improve the functioning in the process going forward. So for that I'll -- we all should be supporting this strongly, as this is a good step in the right direction.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

cd/gbr
SENATE

52
April 18, 2013

Will you remark? Will you remark?

If not, Mr. Clerk, will you please call for a roll call vote, and the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members have voted, all members have voted?
The machine will be closed.

Mr. Clerk, will you call the tally.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 6648.

Total Number Voting36

Those voting Yea28

Those voting Nay8

Those absent and not voting 0

THE CHAIR:

The bill passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, would yield the floor at this time if there are any members for announcements or points of personal privilege before asking that we stand at ease for a few moments as we will be preparing additional - additional go items.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any points of personal privilege or announcements? Seeing none, we will be -- Senate will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will come back to order.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Madam President.

We do have some additional calendar items to mark at this time. Some items to mark go, some referrals, and some items to add to our Consent Calendar and then we'll have some additional markings later, especially, probably some additional referrals.

Madam President, on Calendar page 9, under "Favorable Reports," Calendar page 9, the item -- the last item at the bottom of page 9, Calendar 93, Senate Bill 858, that item is marked go.

On Calendar page 10, Calendar 94, Substitute for Senate Bill 861, marked go; also Calendar page 10, Calendar 100, Senate Bill Number 273, marked go.

Moving to Calendar page 11, Calendar 110, Senate Bill Number 521, marked go; Calendar 111, Senate Bill Number 825, marked go.

Calendar page 13, the next item, Calendar page 13, Calendar 127, Senate Bill Number 927, marked go; the next item on Calendar page 13, Calendar 128, Senate Bill Number 1032, Madam President, move to place that item on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Continuing on that page, the next item on Calendar page 13, Calendar 132, is marked go; last item at the bottom of that page, Madam President, Calendar 137, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 837, Madam President, move to place that item on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, moving to Calendar page 14, Calendar 139, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 158, that item is marked go; the last item at the bottom of that Calendar page 14, Calendar 145, Senate Bill Number 958, also marked go.

Moving to Calendar page 15, Madam President, the second item on Calendar page 15, Calendar 147, Senate Bill Number 1061, Madam President, move to place that item on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Next item, two items down on that page, Calendar 149, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 909, Madam President, that item is marked go; the next item Calendar 151, Senate Bill Number 63, Madam President, move to place that item on our Consent Calendar.

S - 663

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL. 56
PART 12
3488 – 3812**

mhr/gbr
SENATE

246
May 29, 2013

Numbers 1 and 2, dated Wednesday, May 29, 2013, to be acted upon as indicated and that the Agendas be incorporated by reference in the Senate Journal and the Senate Transcript.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes; thank you. Thank you, Mr. President.

A couple of additional items to mark at this point; first, Mr. President, an item on Calendar Page 48, under Disagreeing Actions, Calendar Page 48, Calendar 306, Senate Bill Number 111. Mr. President, move to place this item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

And, Mr. President, if the Clerk would call as the -- the next bill, Calendar Page 42, Calendar 305, Senate Bill 1081, from the Environment Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On Page 42, Calendar 305, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 1081, AN ACT CONCERNING RECYCLING AND JOBS; it's amended by Senate "A," Favorable Report of the Committee on Environment. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

mhr/gbr
SENATE

247
May 29, 2013

SENATOR MEYER:

Almost good evening, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Almost.

SENATOR MEYER:

I --I move acceptance of the joint committee's
Favorable Report and passage of this bill.

THE CHAIR:

On acceptance and passage, will you remark sir?

SENATOR MEYER:

Thank you. I will, Mr. President.

There is a strike-all amendment, and I'd kindly ask
the Clerk to call LCO 7742 and I be given permission
to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 7742, Senate "B"; it is offered by Senator
Meyer.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

I move the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

On adoption, will you remark?

mhr/gbr
SENATE

248
May 29, 2013

SENATOR MEYER:

I will.

Colleagues, this bill has got two parts to it. The first part deals with solid waste collectors, and it's pretty technical in nature but it provides, for example, it extends the date for solid waste collectors to begin providing reports to the towns in which they do business. It prohibits solid waste collectors from mixing recyclables with solid waste, a real no-no in this business. It establishes dates by which generators of organic materials must separate organic materials from solid waste and recycle them in -- in composting facilities. It increases the information that scrap-metal processors must provide to DEEP in order to be exempt from needing a solid-waste facility permit. It also allows our towns to adopt ordinances providing property tax exemptions for certain recycling machinery. And that's the first part of the bill.

The second part of the bill is very provocative. It relates to CRRA. And you'll have noticed in reviewing the bill that it does several things. The first thing is that it requires an extensive audit of CRRA to be made in the near term.

Secondly, it provides for a resource recovery task force which will look at the problems of resource recovery in Connecticut.

Third, it provides for a CRRA transition plan. You know that CRRA is in some trouble; it's lost a number of towns. The -- the cost of energy has gone down, which has hurt its -- its bottom line financially, and so the bill provides in Section 9 that CRRA will develop a transition plan for achieving a sustainable business model. And -- and alternatively, it can, it can do a plan conducting its own dissolution; that's an alternative to it.

So those are the -- the major measures of this bill. There is, in addition, an amendment, and I'm going to ask the Clerk kindly to call --

THE CHAIR:

Senator, we haven't adopted the amendment --

SENATOR MEYER:

I'm sorry.

THE CHAIR:

-- that we have right now.

SENATOR MEYER:

I'm sorry; on -- on the strike-all, first. Yes.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, as the proponent said, this is a two-part, strike-all amendment before us. I think it's important to point out that the first part is actually a -- a legislation brought to us by the department, itself, the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection to enhance recycling and jobs in the State of Connecticut.

And one of the things, one of the things we learned during the public hearing process was that the Connecticut Economic Resource Center has done a study on the impact that recycling has on the State of Connecticut. And according to that report, these recycling activities generated 746 million in sales related to recycling activity and represented about 4800 recycling jobs.

They also estimated that these 4800 jobs contribute 275 million in payroll and 59 million in tax revenue to the state. So as you could see from those figures, this is an industry in the State of Connecticut that is, should be valued, and I think the bill before us,

mhr/gbr
SENATE

250
May 29, 2013

at least the initial parts help in those efforts to make it an even more, a greater asset to the State of Connecticut.

As the proponent said, the second part of the bill is quite a bit different. I think he used the word "provocative," and in that regard, I have some questions, through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Section 7 talks about the audit requirements that you mentioned, Senator Meyer. Can you tell me who would be charged with performing those audits?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Yes. The -- through you, Mr. President -- the -- the audit would be performed by the Office of Policy and Management.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Mr. President,

And if -- if OPM didn't think they had the expertise under this language, could they contract it out to somebody who may be more familiar with this type of business and those sorts of audits?

Through you, Mr. President.

mhr/gbr
SENATE

251
May 29, 2013

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Yes, through you, Mr. President; that is, that is correct, Senator Chapin. They would be able to do that.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Mr. President,

And the purpose of this audit, I assume, would be to show how viable the business has been or is today; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Yes, Mr. President, to Senator Chapin.

That -- that is the purpose. The -- the audit would include a careful examination of CRRA's financial condition. It would include a look at its revenues, its actual revenues and protected revenues, its cash flow and its operations generally. It'd be a -- a thorough and extensive audit.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Mr. President, and again through you.

I see that Section 7, the audit section is effective upon passage and the agency not later than June 30th of this year would consult with OPM about initiating these audits. But it looks like the audit is supposed to be done by the end of October. Does the gentleman think that that's a reasonable time period to perform such an audit?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Mr. President.

That is a pretty expedited time period, but I know that the Executive Branch, who came to us with this portion of the bill, feels that the audit of CRRA and a transition plan for CRRA are so important for our constituents in Connecticut that we need to do this on an expedited basis.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Mr. President, and again through you.

So it -- it would appear in Lines 139 and 140 that this audit or at least the report of the audit would end up -- summary of the findings from the audits would be reported back to the Environment Committee, the Appropriations Committee, and the GAE Committee. Would I be correct in assuming that would be in anticipation of any future action by the Legislature?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Mr. President.

I -- I think that probably the reaction of the Legislature will come from both the audit and also from the transition plan that's referred to later in this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Moving on to the task-force section, in Section 8, it looks like there's some standard appointments by legislative leadership. And one of the -- as a member of both the Environment Committee and Energy Technology Committee, as I am, one of the continuing dialogues I have or I'm engaged in has to do with trash-to-energy plants. And obviously CRRA maintains trash-to-energy facilities, but there are others in the state. Would those others have any role in the task force that's created in Section 8?

Through you, Mr. President.

SENATOR MEYER:

Yes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

A good question, through you, Mr. President.

The task force does include a representative of a solid waste hauling industry. It also includes four representatives from the resource recovery facilities in Connecticut, so there is pretty good representation

mhr/gbr
SENATE

254
May 29, 2013

there.

There are other, you'll see there are some other representatives on the, on the task force who would be representing different aspects of the industry and of the municipalities with which the industry works.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Mr. President, and again through you.

I believe I heard you say that because of lower energy prices, that's one of the reasons why this portion of this amendment is before us, because it speaks to the financial viability of CRRA. Would this task force be looking beyond CRRA's financial viability as to perhaps the -- the impacts that energy prices have on other trash-to-energy facilities?

Through, you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Yeah; good question, through you, Mr. President.

Senator Chapin, you and I have worked on waste-to-energy facilities. We're familiar with not only CRRA but Covanta; Wheelabrator, Bristol, Preston, Bridgeport, and Hartford -- I think I'm naming most of them -- and -- and this task force is empowered to look at that entire industry, not just CRRA, as we try to preserve waste-to-energy, which has been an important segment for Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I -- I think that that's an important point, that it -- it is an important way of solid waste management. While some may disagree, I -- I guess I'd have to say, Mr. President, that our solid waste policies in the State of Connecticut lend itself to this.

Is it possible that this task force may come to a different conclusion and suggest that trash-to-energy plants are not the right policy for the State of Connecticut and perhaps something such and a landfill might be a better option?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Yes; through you, Mr. President.

Senator, you're -- you're correct. There's no limitation on what the task force could find and recommend.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Moving on to the transition plan in Section 9, I guess the way I read that is it looks like there's very little room for what this transition plan can look like; it's either how does CRRA, what's their plan to stay in business or what's their plan to dissolve. Is that your interpretation as well?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

mhr/gbr
SENATE

256
May 29, 2013

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Yes; through you, Mr. President.

I -- I think that's a very accurate description that the CRRA has been given a choice. They can come up with a plan that's sustainable, as it, you know, to be able to continue in a more efficient way that it has be, more profitable way, or it can come up with a plan of dissolution.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Mr. President, and again through you.

As I recall, CRRA was created by statute and so I would have seen -- I would assume that any such plan that may lead policy makers to believe that dissolution was the right way to go would require action by the Legislature. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Mr. President.

I believe, as I understand CRRA, that would require an act of the Legislature, upon --

THE CHAIR:

Senator --

SENATOR MEYER:

mhr/gbr
SENATE

257
May 29, 2013

Upon a recommendation of CRRA and its board.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

And moving on to Section 10, which mostly looks like existing language until Line 364, it looks like this piece of the amendment is intended to eliminate the steering committee of the board of directors. Is that the gentleman's understanding as to what that section is intended to do?

Through you, Mr. President.

SENATOR MEYER:

Yes; through --

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

-- you Mr. President.

That's exactly true. That's what, as I look at it, that's what, beginning at Line 364 does; namely, eliminates the CRRA Steering Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Mr. President, and again through you.

I'm not as familiar with the workings of the CRRA board, and apparently the steering committee is a part of the board of directors. Can you tell me the rationale behind getting rid of the steering

mhr/gbr
SENATE

258
May 29, 2013

committee?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Mr. President.

The only information I have is that -- that the Executive Branch does not feel that the steering committee is providing a useful function and that the board of directors of -- of the CRRA is a useful function, and therefore it's trying to streamline, make a more -- more streamlined administration.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Mr. President, and again through you.

I -- I guess it would be easy to assume that maybe there was a conflict between the steering committee and the board of directors, but I'm not aware of any. Can the gentleman tell me if he's aware if -- if that is an issue before -- that's really brought us to the language before us?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Mr. President, I have not -- I don't have any direct information about a conflict between the board and the steering committee. I think as -- as maybe Senator Chapin is suggesting it's a natural implication, but I -- I don't, we don't have any specific information.

mhr/gbr
SENATE

259
May 29, 2013

There has been certain tension between the board and parts of the management, but not with the steering committee, as far as I know.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank the Chairman for his answers.

Mr. President, Sections 1 through 6 are, again, they're in keeping with the intent of the bill. I -- I think they're certainly a good part of the amendment. I think the Chairman has acknowledged that the second part of the amendment is something that was brought to us by the Administration, and on its face it certainly looks reasonable at this point, but I look forward to more discussions.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

- Thank you, Senator.

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I rise to support the amendment. I just have one question, for -- for verification purposes, so, through you, sir.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you, Mr. President, and through you to Senator

mhr/gbr
SENATE

260
May 29, 2013

Meyer.

In Section 10, in my quick read, that's existing language; there's no additions or deletions at that, is there?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you.

The only, the only change in Section 10 is the elimination, as Senator Chapin and I were discussing, of the CRRA Steering Committee. Otherwise there's no change with respect to existing law that governs CRRA.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I thank Senator Meyer for his answers.

I -- I know that the, we've had quite a change in the board of directors at the CRRA. They're doing yeoman's work trying to keep a quasi-public agency afloat with the changing of -- of tipping fees and the, and the costs of electricity and -- and what they can get on the open market. So it's something that we certainly need to look at, for those of us that have many of the towns that work out the -- the Mid-Con plant, and I look forward to its adoption.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

mhr/gbr
SENATE

261
May 29, 2013

Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark?

Senator Fasano, from the 34th.

SENATOR FASANO:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, to the -- the proponent of the amendment -- and I apologize; I did not have time to review the entire amendment -- but through to the proponent of the amendment.

The issue of the \$30 million that's being transferred to DEP, as I understand it, is that in the underlying bill, in the amendment; and after the amendment passes, is it still on the table, if you would?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, to Senator Fasano.

Senator Fasano, there is no reference directly or indirectly to the \$30 million in this bill. We do know that the Governor made a proposal; we haven't reached a -- a conclusion on our budget yet -- but we do know the Governor made a proposal of a transfer of \$30 million from CRRA to the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. That has not come to pass because we haven't done a budget yet.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO:

Thank you, Senator Meyer for that answer.

I have no other questions on the amendment; I'll talk

mhr/gbr
SENATE

262
May 29, 2013

on the bill.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further on the amendment?

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO:

Yes; thank you, Mr. President.

I guess I'm more curious than anything of the possibility of even transferring \$30 million from CRRA to DEEP or to anyone, knowing that at five or ten years ago they were \$220 million in debt. And if that's the case, then they must have recovered their \$220 million totally, which means those boards must have done a pretty decent job of running CRRA during that period of time. So I, the boards generally have been run by chief elected officials or officials of various towns in the 75 towns. And the -- assets of CA -- CRRA are owned by those towns, so I'm not sure what the underlying intent is.

If the underlying intent is that we have a statewide, solid waste plan that takes us into the future, then this is a great idea. We have incinerators. We have landfills. We have garbage taken out by truck, garbage taken out by train; and, in fact, we have 169 rail policies for disposing of solid waste in the State of Connecticut. We're too small a state for that to be taking place.

And so if we're going to really look at this, I hope we do the job we should do and come up with a statewide policy that fits everyone and brings us into the future, manages environmentally clean disposal of waste, and brings us into the future the way we should.

I hope that's the intent of the bill, and I'll support it.

mhr/gbr
SENATE

263
May 29, 2013

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

President, could we have a voice vote on this amendment?

THE CHAIR:

We're having a voice vote, Senator.

Any other comments?

In not, I'll try your minds. All those -- I'll try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Those opposed, nay?

The ayes have it; Senate Amendment "B" is adopted.

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Thank you, colleagues.

There is a -- a final, small amendment. Will the Clerk kindly call LCO 7911.

THE CHAIR:

mhr/gbr
SENATE

264
May 29, 2013

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 7911, Senate "C," offered by Senator Maynard.

THE CHAIR:

Senator -- Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Mr. President, I -- I move -- move the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

On adoption, will you remark, sir?

SENATOR MEYER:

And I'd like to yield to Senator Maynard who can describe this amendment more clearly.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maynard, do you accept a yield?

SENATOR MAYNARD:

Yes, I do, Mr. President. Good evening.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, sir.

SENATOR MAYNARD:

If I have leave to summarize, the amendment is a technical amendment that was approved by the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. It would allow a trash-to-energy plant in Southeastern Connecticut that serves 12 or 11 municipalities in my area the ability to extend its contract for a period of an additional 15 months and 2 days. It was a

mhr/gbr
SENATE

265
May 29, 2013

trash-to-energy plant that was licensed at the early part of this period of 30 years; it was licensed to operate for 30 years but had a construction delay of 15 months and 2 days for opening. They would like to be able to serve out their entire 30-year period, and they're in the midst of negotiating a -- an extension of the contract or a renewal of licensing.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment?

If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Those opposed, nay?

The ayes have it. Senate "C" is adopted.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

Senator -- Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I -- I certainly appreciate the Environment Committee for bringing out this bill.

And I also have an amendment that I'd ask the Clerk to call and I be allowed to summarize; it's LCO Number 5834.

THE CHAIR:

mhr/gbr
SENATE

266
May 29, 2013

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 5834, Senate "D," offered by Senator Witkos.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS:

I -- I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

On adoption; will you remark, sir?

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you, Mr. President.

While we're -- the underlying bill talks about recycling and creating jobs, one of the things I -- I learned as we -- part of the General Law Committee when we went to visit different communities that had to deal with alcohol issues; that was from the, not only the retail perspective but the wholesale and the distributor, was the recycling of bottles.

And so what the amendment plainly does is asks the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection to do a feasibility study, whether we should phase it out or not; as more and more communities move in to single-stream recycling, do we need to have this onus or this burden placed upon our businesses? And all we're asking is asking DEEP to -- to study the possibility of if it should phase out or not. And they should report back no later than February of next session, so it will give us some -- some factual data of whether or not we want to move forward on this issue. So I ask the Chamber's adoption of the amendment.

Thank you, Mr. President.

mhr/gbr
SENATE

267
May 29, 2013

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further on the amendment?

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Senator Witkos' amendment, Mr. President, is -- is a very positive one because it deals with really implementing single-stream recycling by DEEP. I'm going to oppose it, though, because we're -- I just talked to Rob LaFrance, a representative of DEEP, and the agency has not been consulted about this. We don't know whether or not they have the resources actually to carry out this kind of a project.

But I would, I would say that I'd like to come back in the next session with this, because this is a very significant thing. Single-stream recycling has really been adopted by the State of Connecticut, and Senator Witkos's amendment moves in the right direction. But I just don't think the timeliness of it is appropriate.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further on the amendment?

Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you.

Mr. President, if I could, a few questions to the proponent of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Senator Witkos -- through you -- in reading your amendment here for the first time, you've referenced statutory Sections 22a-243 to 22a-246, inclusive. Could you please give me a better understanding of the entirety of those statutes; are we, are we talking about the bottle bill or are we talking about something more inclusive than that?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you.

If the Chamber could just stand at ease for just a moment.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease.

(Senate at ease.)

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will come back to order.

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Sections 22a-243 to 22a-246 speaks specifically to beverage containers' refund value exceptions, labeling and design requirements, registration of redemption centers, a special account of deposit-initiated reimbursement payments, all having to do with the

mhr/gbr
SENATE

269
May 29, 2013

bottle bill.

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

And I thank Senator Witkos. I, my -- my understanding was that we were talking about looking at the bottle deposit law, but I wasn't sure if we were talking about things beyond that, and -- and I want to thank the Senator.

Mr. President, I'm surprised to hear Senator Meyer's explanation for his opposition, that the department does not have or he's unaware if the -- I want to make sure I get his words right -- unaware if the department has the resources to deal with this.

As I understand it, our bottle deposit law is part of our solid waste management plan. Our Department of Environmental Protection -- excuse me -- our Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, DEEP -- I still like DEP better -- is constantly looking at and charged with implementing a solid waste management plan. I don't know why we have a Department of Environmental Protection if they're not constantly looking at the impacts of single-stream recycling, our bottle deposit law and other things on our solid waste management plan.

So as someone who has great respect for the work that they do, who worked as a member of the Environment Committee on the bottle deposit law and many of its different iterations, going back to my very first term here when the House Co-chairwoman Jessie Stratton was fighting just to get a public hearing and a vote out of committee on the bottle deposit law, not even imagining a day when it would pass the General Assembly, I'm -- I'm -- I -- I have a hard time believing that our department doesn't have very good, capable, hard-working, intelligent people already

mhr/gbr
SENATE

270
May 29, 2013

looking at these very issues. In fact, I think, I think they already are.

Now, there may be some who are supportive of our bottle deposit law; we don't need to rehash that debate here. Many people would argue that it's been very helpful to eliminate litter, trash on our roads and parks and highways, beyond its impact on our recycling and solid waste. What the impact single-stream recycling would have, if we phased out the bottle deposit law is something that the department should be looking at and reporting to the Environment Committee already.

So I think Senator Witkos's amendment is worthy of discussion and passage. It -- it is more than appropriate on a bill concerning recycling and jobs, because that's exactly what we'd be looking at; there's our impact on recycling in the same State of Connecticut and what single-stream recycling and/or phasing out of the bottle deposit may have on jobs in the State of Connecticut. And so I would urge adoption.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Mr. President,

Through you, a question to the proponent of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Mr. President.

mhr/gbr
SENATE

271
May 29, 2013

Senator Witkos, in -- in looking at your amendment, would part of this study in the potential of phasing out the provisions of this section, would they include the private, for-profit recycling centers? And what I mean by that is I have one in my district and I know there's one locally in nearby Wolcott, and both of which have talked about their inability to stay afloat because of what the state provides them as a percentage of that deposit, that five-cent deposit.

So my question to you would be: Would part of it -- and I know where you're -- you're coming from on the single-stream recycling and I agree with you on that -- but would part of it include the inability for these private recycling centers, their ability to succeed based on the provisions that the State of Connecticut holds on them when collecting these bottles?

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

And thank you, Mr. President.

Through you, to Senator Kane.

The bill doesn't specifically state the -- the scope of the study that the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection shall do; basically it states that they will study, if as single-stream recycling grows by town, shall we think about eliminating the -- the bottle bill that's on those. Because the -- back in 1979, when the bottle bill was first passed, part of the reason was, the concern was environmental concern, that people just throwing it out on the, on the side of the road; that's -- that's one measure.

And now -- because it was too difficult to separate those and have multiple containers in your home and it just, a lot of extra work -- and now that we've adopted, we have the technology where everything can go in one container and -- and it's done automatically through single-stream, that maybe we don't have to have this program any longer.

mhr/gbr
SENATE

272
May 29, 2013

So it's really up to the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection to do the study around the corners that they feel is necessary and report back to us. There -- there are no recommendations beyond that.

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Mr. President,

And, no, I understand that, and -- and of course. But I guess what I'm asking is can you see as part of the scope of this study not just the impact for the state and/or the municipalities but for the private industries that are included in the underlying issue, which is the bottle bill, because there are private, for-profit recycling centers that accept these bottles and cans and, you know, look to turn a profit by having that niche.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I would assume that they would take that into consideration through their study as they would look at the other entities that are required to reclaim those bottles as part of the state statute that they must take them and hold on to them and -- and clean them and recycle them, as currently required under the statutes.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Mr. President,

I thank Senator Witkos for his answer.

And -- and actually that's what I was looking for, because I will think part of that study you would find that it is very onerous for these recycling centers to stay alive and stay afloat, based on the percentages of the five-cent deposit and what they are given to, through the State of Connecticut. And I think it's getting more and more difficult for these centers to stay alive.

And what's happening, I do agree with you that even my house, we do the single-stream recycling in our town, and I find that to -- to be a lot better. So I think what it would also show is that these entrepreneurs are having a difficult time based on the policies of the State of Connecticut. And I think that would go a long way for -- for those individuals, so that's why I, too, would be in support of this amendment.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further?

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Mr. President, I'm going to ask for a -- a voice -- I mean I'm not -- for a roll call vote on this, if we might.

But I do want to say that -- that I -- I'm urging colleagues to vote no on this, again, because it would be committing this department to what could be an extensive study without knowing whether it has the

mhr/gbr
SENATE

274
May 29, 2013

resources to do it.

I know that Senator Witkos, Senator Kane, I believe you and definitely Senator McKinney were major proponents and supporters of the bottle bill. And if we're going to phase out the bottle bill, we need to find out what the circumstances of that and it has to be a serious study, and I don't, I don't think we should do it at this time.

But I'm going to put it, if -- if this, if this amendment fails, I'm going to put it in my file for 2014 legislation.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

For a second time and just briefly to clarify, I -- I thought I heard Senator Meyer to say that this would cause the phase-out of the bottle bill; this -- this amendment does not do that. And as someone who, when our former-colleague, now Mayor of Bridgeport, Bill Finch was Chairman of the Environment Committee and we worked on expanding the bottle deposit law, you probably remember and I'm sure you got cornered in your caucus many times, Mr. President, about Mayor Finch's talking about whether there were bubbles in the drink or not determined whether it was part of our bottle deposit law.

But this amendment does not require the phase-out; it simply asks the department to study the impact of single-stream recycling on that law. So as someone who has fought for many of those good environment bills, I am very comfortable supporting an amendment. But I -- I, with all due respect, I thought I heard Senator Meyer say that he couldn't do this now because it would lead to the phase-out of the bottle bill, and

mhr/gbr
SENATE

275
May 29, 2013

this amendment simply does not do that. It asks for a feasibility study, nothing less and nothing more.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment?

If not, Mr. Clerk, please announce the pendency for a roll call vote. The machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Senators please return to the Chamber. Immediate roll call on Senate "D."

THE CHAIR:

Senator Boucher.

Have all members voted? If all members voted, please check the board to make sure your vote is accurately recorded. If all members have voted, the machine will be closed.

The Clerk will announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "D" for Senate Bill 1081.

Total Number Voting	34
Those voting Yea	14
Those voting Nay	20
Absent and not voting	2

THE CHAIR:

The amendment fails.

Senator Looney.

mhr/gbr
SENATE

276
May 29, 2013

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes; thank you. Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, if the bill might be passed temporarily, because I believe there is a -- a potential bipartisan amendment being drafted. So if we might stand at ease for a moment, Mr. President, until we prepare the next item.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease.

(Senate at ease.)

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will come back to order.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. -- Mr. President.

Let me just -- might stand at ease for just a second, Mr. President; be right back.

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease.

(Senate at ease.)

SENATOR LOONEY:

Mr. President?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

S - 664

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL. 56
PART 13
3813 - 4129**

And then moving earlier in the Calendar, Madam President, Calendar Page 7, Calendar 356, House Bill 6253 marked go.

And then Calendar Page 45, Calendar 553, House Bill 5250 marked go.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On Page 41, Calendar 305, that is --

THE CHAIR:

Senate bill --

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 8 -- oh, I'm sorry, 1081, AN ACT CONCERNING RECYCLING AND JOBS. It's been amended. It's a Favorable Report of the Committee on ENVIRONMENT and (inaudible) Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

Good evening, sir.

SENATOR MEYER:

Good evening, Madam President. Nice to see you.

I do move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage.

Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR MEYER:

Thank you, Madam President.

Yes, colleagues you recall that we took this bill up yesterday. That we approved Schedules "A", "B", and "C" as Amendments and that the bill got passed temporarily because of a further amendment that raised some issues that had to be discussed. So we have discussed those issues.

The underlying bill, you'll recall, deals with two things. First solid waste collectors and the reports that they have to follow with our towns and also deals with CRRA and some reforms to CRRA. The -- the amendment that had raised some -- that caused the postponement, raised some financial issues and in that connection, I would like to yield to Senator Fasano and then to the Majority Leader, please.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator -- Senator Fasano, do you accept the yield, sir.

SENATOR FASANO:

Yes, I do.

Thank you, Madam President.

Thank you, Senator Meyer.

Yes, this bill would -- the amendment that we had put forward in a bipartisan spirit would say if 30 million dollar or if money is transferred from CRRA's account by the State or any other agency, that they would need permission of the municipalities. And the reason why that was put in is because as municipalities, such as Cheshire, North Haven, Wallingford, Hamden all pay tip fees. A portion of the tip fees are put to the side for a fund, that at the time they closed the landfill, that we use the fund. In the contracts it does state that if there's not enough money in this fund to pay

for the closing of the landfill, the towns would have to then proportionally, based upon use, pay more money. And it was brought to all of our attentions that since they already put the money to the side and we were to sweep it and the money wouldn't be there, the towns would end up paying twice. So the -- the bipartisan amendment was to do away with it.

It's my understanding that through the implement or much later on, post-budget, that this matter is going to be resolved and we've been assured by the DEEP and the Governor's office that they'll take certain procedures in the implementers to resolve this problem. Being by the party of minority status, my position, with respect to the implementers and is not going to really rank on that scale. So with that, I will yield to the Majority Leader, Senator Looney.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney, will you accept the yield, sir?

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes I will, Madam President.

Thank you and thank you to Senator Fasano for the yield and to Senator Meyer for his work on this bill.

Madam President, Senator Fasano's summary of the situation leading up to the -- the drafting of the proposed amendment, which was, in fact, to be a bipartisan amendment, with both House and Senate Members from both parties coming from the towns that were affected by the issue of potential landfill closures and the -- the CRRA bill and Senator Fasano's representation is exactly what -- what I understand the situation to be, is that there will be, according to the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, a language in the implementer that will be advocated by the -- by the administration that will reference an -- an MOU to be signed between the DEEP and CRRA, in effect, to provide benefits for the communities that have, in effect, made payments into this -- into this fund, in terms of making sure that they are -- they are provided for and held harmless in the event of -- of closure. So that obviously those

communities that have already made an investment or had taken financial action in -- in this regard, should not be in anyway victimized or disadvantaged by an ultimate change in the -- the -- in the status of - - of refuse disposal or matters related to CRRA.

So there are a number of communities involved in this, as Senator Fasano said. The town of North Haven and the town of Hamden, as well as -- as well as Cheshire, as well as Meriden, maybe some other communities involved as well. And that is the understanding that there will be language in an implementer to address this situation through the creation of an MOU between the Department and CRRA with those towns, in effect, to be the beneficiaries of that MOU.

Thank you, Madam President.

I would yield back to the Senate Chair of the Environment Committee, Senator Meyer.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer, do you accept the yield, sir?

SENATOR MEYER:

I accept the yield and want to thank Senator Fasano and the Majority Leader very much for their contributions.

It's been a good bipartisan effort. The Ranking -- the Ranking Leader of the Environment Committee, Senator Chapin, has also been part of this arrangement and is making this possible.

By this bill, we will have a significant stride forward in recycling. We'll be providing jobs and we'll be taking a good look at CRRA and trying to make it a healthy organization. So that is the bill before us.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? Will you remark?

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, very briefly because we did debate this bill yesterday, I was remiss in not mentioning and thanking Senator Meyer for -- for the efforts in making a -- a bill that actually came out of Committee, I think, with quite of objection and concern. Working with Senator Meyer and we addressed some of the industries' concerns and I'm very appreciative of that.

And I again, would encourage my colleagues to support the bill.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

Through you, I have a couple questions to the proponent of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

I'm sorry, Senator.

Oops, Senator Meyer prepare yourself.

Senator Kane, proceed.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

Just looking at the OLR analysis, Senator Meyer. Well, let me take a step back. Yesterday, Senator Witkos had an -- an amendment in regard to single-stream recycling. And the amendment was defeated and, but yet you said that you would be willing to look at the issue come next Session.

In the bill itself, in looking at the analysis, it talks about -- number four talks about prohibits solid waste collectors from mixing designated recyclables with other solid wastes, regardless of whether they do knowingly. So does that speak to single-stream recycling?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

It -- through you, Madam President.

It -- it suggests single-stream recycling because it's trying to avoid the mix that you described, Senator Kane. So it does -- it does -- it brings in the concept of single-stream recycling, yes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

It suggests it or prohibits it? Because it -- according to this, it says, prohibits solid waste collectors from mixing designated recyclables with other solid waste. Am I not reading that properly?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Madam President.

No, I think you're reading it very accurately.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

Maybe we could -- it -- it -- let me -- maybe I'm not asking the question properly.

Single-stream recycling means, from what I know, based on my own yard, is I throw the -- all different types of recyclables in there. It is separated from our solid waste. So this is going to promote single-stream recycling in regard to all the materials that are recyclable and separate the solid waste and prohibit them from doing so? Is that -- is that the way I'm reading it?

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Madam President.

Single-stream recycling is -- is defined by different towns in different manners. It can refer to the fact that everything goes into the single stream, including non-recyclables or it can be, as you're suggesting, Senator Kane, that the recyclables are separated from the non-recyclables, such as solid waste. But I -- I have heard it, in my experience, described in both of those ways.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

And is this going to require any type of mandate on our municipalities when dealing with trash and recycling?

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Madam President.

No, the -- the mandate here is actually on -- on the solid waste collectors and not on our towns.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Certainly. And if the solid waste recyclers have an agreement with the towns, are the towns going need to separate their disposal between solid waste and recycling prior to -- prior to the -- entering the agreement with the recyclers.

Through you.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Madam President.

I'm not sure that I understand that, but the intent of this legislation is to put the responsibility of the separation with the collectors and haulers and not with our towns. In fact, we're trying -- we're trying

to take the municipalities out of this process as much as possible through this -- through this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

As -- thank you, Madam President.

As in many cases, a lot of times the costs are then filtered down to the end user or consumer. In this case, could be the municipality and/or consumer. So do you anticipate those -- well let me take a step back. Are there accelerated or increased costs based on this bill?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Madam President.

I don't see in the work that we've done on this bill any analysis of the cost, but I think it's -- it's very much implied that there could be some labor costs in making the kind of separation that this bill calls for.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Well -- thank you, Madam President.

In the fiscal analysis, the -- the fiscal note says the cost of DEEP is potential. And then it says the cost to various municipalities is potential. So that's why I -- I asked that question. Whether -- what -- what typically happens is that cost will be

passed along to the end-user or the consumer, so I'm wondering if increased costs on the recyclers will be passed along to the municipality.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Well -- through you, Madam President.

That -- that really will depend upon the solid waste collectors or haulers in terms of whether or not they do, in fact, have an increased labor cost. I agree that it's suggested that they might and then whether or not they'll -- they'll feel the need to pass that on to the town and the town passes it on to the ultimate consumer as you point out.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

So then -- so then it is a mandate?

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

It's not a mandated extra cost (inaudible) as the (inaudible) notes that as we just can see it as a possibility, as a potential. We don't -- we don't know exactly if there -- if there will be an extra cost and if there is an extra cost, whether it will be passed on to the ultimate consumer.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

Was there any testimony in the under -- in the public hearing about that potential? What that potential may be?

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Madam President.

I'm just looking at the -- at the testimony to see if there was any. Let me just have a moment.

Madam President, in answer to Senator Kane's question, I don't see anything in the testimony that discussed the issue of cost.

SENATOR KANE:

Okay.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

And one last question, if I may. Is there any change into the Board of Directors at CRRA in this bill?

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Madam President.

There's no change in the Board. There is an -- an elimination of the Steering Committee, but no change with respect to the Board of Directors.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

And -- and can you tell me, through -- through you, who is on that Steering Committee or what's the makeup of that Steering Committee is?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Well the bill - the bill does away with the Steering Committee and I think -- if I could just have a moment I'll pull it and see if -- I imagine the existing law is part of the -- of the bill and will indicate who the members of that Steering Committee are.

Just a moment, Mr. -- Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease, sir.

(Chamber at ease.)

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senate will come back to order.

Proceed, sir.

SENATOR MEYER:

Yes. Beginning at Line 364 it does establish who the members of the Steering Committee are. Namely, three -- between three and five members of the Board of Directors appointed by the Governor, by the President Pro Temp of the Senate, and the Speaker of the House.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

One last question, if I may.

The makeup of that Steering Committee. Are there any municipal officials on that Steering Committee?

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Yes. The bill -- the bill -- the law -- the existing law before us, which is part of the bill, says -- says that very specifically. It says that the Committee shall consist of at least one municipal official.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

So we're going to lose that municipal official on that Board?

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Madam President.

Yes. We are going to lose the Steering Committee because the analysis that's been made of CRRA indicates that this is an ineffectual committee and that -- that we -- we best rely as a matter of best practices on the Board of Directors and not the Steering Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

And -- and just one last question if I might.

So that -- I -- I get that. That makes sense if we get rid of the Steering Committee, but the municipal officials or the municipalities won't lose a place on the Board it's just this particular committee will be done away with -- as far as I understand it. I just want to confirm that.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Yes -- yes. Through you, Madam President.

To Senator Kane that is correct.

SENATOR KANE:

Great.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

I thank Senator Meyer for answering my questions.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Madam President.

We have before us a bill, an Act Concerning Recycling and Jobs and as I've said numerous times in the Circle, jobs are the number -- in my opinion, jobs are the number one issue facing Connecticut. Because if we can put Connecticut back to work and have meaningful jobs for Connecticut families, a lot of the issues, and in -- in particular the issues surrounding State finances would be resolved and we could do a lot of good work for a lot of good people in Connecticut.

The other aspect of this bill talks about recycling. And we've heard a number of bills, since I've been here, talking about the virtues of recycling and how important it is to go green. And we all recognize the importance, not only of recycling, but of our environment and to protect it, not only for ourselves, but for generations to come. And as a parent, that's one thing that you really think about. As you go

forth every day you wake up, because you not only think about yourself, but you think about your family, you think about your kids, and you think about the future that you're trying to create for them.

So here we have a bill that talks about recycling. And one area that when we start talking about recycling, not only for today, but for tomorrow, and for generations to come, is to start to set the foundation, the seeds, if you will, in those future generations, our children, to educate, to expose, to enlighten them to the virtues of recycling and a green environment. And to why we need to recycle and we need to preserve and protect our environment.

At one time, CRRRA operated a museum dedicated to that purpose in the town of Stratford. And on October -- excuse me, on August 25, 2011, it was suddenly closed, which extinguished for children, school age children, the opportunity to learn these virtues about recycling, the need to preserve our environment. And it wasn't just to the town of Stratford, but it was a regional resource. It was for southern Connecticut. It was for Fairfield and New Haven Counties. And that was a loss to our region.

Now what I would like to do is to have the opportunity to reinstate that. To give that opportunity back to our children, so that they recognize the importance of a clean environment, of recycling and so that they can learn the wisdoms that we've learned.

And so, Madam President, the Clerk has an Amendment in his possession, LCO Number 8184. Would he please call the Amendment?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 8184, Senate Amendment Schedule "D", offered by Senator Kelly.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Madam President.

I move adoption by roll call and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

We will have a roll call and the motion is for adoption.

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you.

This amendment would reestablish that an education -- educational and environmental resource that existed in the town of Stratford and put it back. It's something that I think, well I know, because so many kids that I know friends with my children, many of my neighbors, people that I go when I see my -- my town, and in the district. They come and they say, you know, that was a great time. And when you talk to people throughout the region, they all say, you know that was a great time going to that CRRA Museum. And it was impressive.

So why don't we put back something that, a, people enjoyed, b, provided a valuable educational resource to, c, our children, which is the next generation that is going to be stewards of the environment. And when you read the Connecticut Environmental Protection Act that is at its foundation. It talks about as citizens of Connecticut we have a stewardship with the environment. And that just doesn't happen.

It's something that needs to be taught, needs to be present, not only in the classrooms, but in conduct and in action. This is an example of where we can fulfill that opportunity to the next generation so that they learn the virtues of recycling, environmental protection and hopefully being good

stewards of the environment to pass on to their generation and the next generation, so that this just isn't a temporary idea, but something that is long lasting and permanent.

I would move adoption of this Amendment.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

Senator Boucher.

Oh and for correction, this is Senate "E".

Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, I rise to support this amendment.

Energy and waste products and trash are really pretty essential in our society. And having a museum that is being proposed to be reopened would be extremely valuable in the society we have today.

When I was growing up, one of the most poignant advertisements we would see on television that did so much to change an entire generation of us to be sensitive to environmental concerns was that Indian chief on a horse looking about the landscape that he held so dear and from his eyes a single drop would come out and I think that we all here might remember those -- that particular ad and it was really quite compelling. It made us all consider how important it was to be conscious of our environment and protect it.

These days we don't -- as -- pay attention to that very important aspect of our lives as we did, I think, in those days. We have a very hurried environment. We're barraged by technology. We run around as -- in a pace that often distances ourselves from our

society, as well as for the natural surroundings that we have. And being aware of that is critically important and any way we can draw attention to that would be helpful.

This museum would go a long way to supporting the curriculum that we have in our schools to have students realize just exactly how important it is.

In fact, the trash that we have actually is a symbol of who we are as a society, as people. Archeological digs, anthropology all surround not just what was found that people used, but what people threw away. What they consumed in their everyday lives and how it mattered to their society and how it was a symbol of who they were at that time. And certainly these days, I'm sure that the trash that can be explored in any one household or any business could be dramatically different than what it was just a couple of decades ago.

A museum such as this would play a tremendously strong role in really reinforcing the fact that we have to protect our national -- natural resources. We have to be aware of what we have and how, instead of consuming as a society we are and throwing things away that we actually can utilize a great deal more of what we have.

There are some societies that throw away very, very little. Composting became very much the -- the rage for a while and yet, it was something considered a new thing to do. There were actually items you could purchase that would help you recycle and you spent some money on it, whereas in the past, that was just a natural way of living. That nothing was really thrown away. We didn't have garbage disposals. That composting was very natural and it produced the fertilizer that was often used in the gardens that populated the time, which now are very, very rare.

It's really quite extraordinary that now we actually have to put in place programs in schools to teach about farming and growing plants, in particular in our inner cities. And as a movement in Connecticut to preserve some of the old farms that were, again, the way of life in those times.

A museum such as this could teach so much that is valuable. That recycled resources generate revenues. They also save energy. That materials, such as aluminum, carpet, copper, consume so much energy in production that recycling these energy-intensive products really results in a lot of savings as a society.

They would also learn that recycling preserves natural resources as well. There's so much that can be learned and that, in fact, with recycling everything is also now possible. They can talk -- they can learn about the value of disposal and minimizing waste and whether incineration is a positive thing or not. There is so much that can be learned and at some time, just by experiencing that trip to a museum, such as this, could actually produce someone that is interested in that whole field and possibly proceed to talk about or to invent or to discuss or to dream about the possibility of taking trash and turning it into energy.

That could be the next paradigm shift, when everything that we consume, and we consume so much more and it's all prepackaged, that creates such a bulk in our -- in our trash disposal areas that we might be able to have an invention that could actually incinerate it and, in some cases, there is great experimentation around plasma machines that actually can incinerate something so that even the DNA is not yet exist after it -- that -- that process is completed.

So it is not only a huge industry, but it -- it also can be a source of tremendous energy and that the educational outreach that this would be able to produce would be of great, great value. It's about science as well. Not just the environment, but about science. And it's one of the great priorities that we have in the State.

So I really applaud Senator Kelly that brought out this amendment. This particular endeavor would be a wonderful educational opportunity for us. And some might find this a bit humorous, but in fact, it's really quite serious, and would be a wonderful educational opportunity for our students.

It is also the possibility of drawing as a tourist attraction to our State, augmenting our great educational institutions endeavors that we have.

So thank you Senator Kelly for bringing it out.

I stand in great support of this amendment and I hope that others here will find this of interest as well.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark?

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much, Madam President. Great to see you this evening.

THE CHAIR:

And here, sir.

SENATOR KISSEL:

I don't want to go too long on this, but I want to commend Senator Kelly for bringing this amendment forward and allowing myself and the remarks of Senator Boucher.

A long time ago, probably about the beginning of the 70's, when I was growing up in Windsor, I remember probably in elementary school there was an ecology parade that they had in town right on Broad Street, right near St. Gabriel's Church and Town Green in Windsor. I remember that the teacher wanted us to carry signs. And you know, this is a Vietnam War era and they're protest signs, but this was an ecology parade. And of course, we had to get permission from our parents, but I'll always remember what the teacher had suggested my sign to be. And it was boycott disposable bottles and cans.

And the first question I had for my parents was what's the word boycott mean. I had no idea. Never heard of that one before, when you're a fifth or sixth grader. And you know, it was like well don't buy them. You know, sort of protest them. And so here I am not really knowing, but being part of the ecology parade in Windsor. Boycott disposable bottles and cans. And that was sort of my first foray into the public arena.

And it was sort of neat being part of this parade, but being in the middle of the parade and seeing other kids signs and stuff like that and sort of protesting, you know, you sort of felt like you were like living the life of being in the "Partridge Family" or something like that. It just was nothing that was usual and all of a sudden you're in the middle of it.

But it did have an impact. And as the years went by, I don't know when Connecticut eventually did have deposits on cans and bottles, but I think that that ecology parade was one of the first seminal events to get that whole mindset rolling. So that was sort of interesting.

I don't know whether that would be a part of such a museum, but I will say this, all the things that Senator Boucher highlighted, there are so many things that could be part of this museum. And it's my understanding that the museum down there in Senator Kelly's district is mothballed. That they just decided, they wrote it -- they just decided by fiat, we don't have the money to move forward and within a few weeks, if not a few days, they just mothballed it.

So it's not like we have to start it from scratch. It's not like we need a huge capital investment to get it up and running. We just need to turn the lights on, get out the cobwebs, and -- and dust off the exhibits, and it's good to go. And it's -- it's difficult to underestimate how young people are impacted by this. Not exactly on all fours, but we have the Science Museum here in Hartford that's been a big hit, trying to bring to the forefront fundamental notions, such as mathematics and engineering and biology and all those things associated with the sciences.

Well ecology, refuse disposal, and things like that are ever so important as well. And in fact, at the request of one of the garbage haulers in my district, I took a tour one winter day, it was the better part of an entire morning, and we went to two plants, one in the greater East Windsor area and another one in the, I would guess, Newington area.

And that first plant was where all the like heavy debris was sort of put into separate piles and there were mixers and I have to say that that just -- I just -- the coldness of the day, the fact that most of it was outside with just a roof overhead. I mean, this is where they would take, you know, the plaster board, separate it from the bricks, separate it from the lumbar, then they would have to just yank it, put it in one pile. But all of that stuff does eventually get recycled and it's used for various purposes.

And so, but that's a brutal job. You would never -- that -- I give my -- my hat's off to anybody that has that job, brutal, brutal. You're dealing with the dust that's coming up in your face, but this is like when they tear down a building, a house, a corporation and they just plow all that stuff into trucks. They got to bring it somewhere. And you know, sometimes they just decide we're going to sent it out to the Midwest and dump it into pits, but there are plenty of places in Connecticut and this was one of them, where you take it, they separate it out, and they get value for the products that they have. And they turn some of this stuff into stuff that they lay down on streets and stuff that they use for compost around buildings and, you know, if there's a market for it, there were a way to make profits out of it.

The other place that I went to in Newington also was similarly fascinating. A lot of, I mean, really not that -- just like 20 minutes down the road from here, you know, pretty much down the Berlin Turnpike and then you take a -- a right, right before you get to the -- the town of Berlin and back in there, there's, you know, tucked away there's a very large building. Several folks, and I couldn't believe it, I mean, we were talking about immigrants last night. There were people in all different voices, everything from elderly women to young men, but they were all working

in various capacities. And this place was completely different. This was sort of like that Mousetrap game where there was conveyor belts and everything leaving.

And it was amazing, because this is where the single-stream recycling takes place. Where just any amount of stuff were put on the initial conveyor belts and then using various kinds of technology, the process took place where it was all sort of separated out. So at the first thing they will do like this giant camera check of exactly what's on the conveyor belt.

And then all of a sudden this huge burst of air and the burst of air would have the ability to take newspaper and other light paper-kind of materials and plastic and that would all fly over here, but anything that was below -- more than a certain weight, would remain on the conveyor belt and then it would go here and there. And you would get to portions where there would be individuals with gloves just taking things off but a lot of it was completely computerized. Amazing how it worked. How there are things where that conveyor belt would jump over something and there would be things that could make it over and things that just wouldn't.

And by the end of the day they had probably a dozen different piles with everything from cardboard to glass to metal to all different things, all separated out. And -- and, you know, the -- the quality control is very, very high because they're turning around and either bringing it to a melting plant, bringing it to a reprocessor, or turning around and maybe even selling it to China, although I heard China recently decided that it wasn't going to take anymore garbage from the United States, but that was a lucrative market. And what the Chinese did with these things for years I don't know.

But again, an entire morning with these two plants and it was absolutely fascinating. So imagine this on a smaller scale level, in a museum where young people could go in the great city of Stratford to go and observe this and learn about recycling, garbage, waste collection.

I was just talking to Senator Bye and, you know, her whole approach to this, to her great credit, is that not only do we want to teach about recycling and the better use of our resources, but if there are ways that we can go about doing our daily lives without even utilizing the components that end up having to go into recycling or -- or the waste stream, then we're even better off that way.

And you can do that by just the things that you do in your home, if you avoid using things that are just disposable and try to do things that are reusable. If you make things in bulk and sort of use them throughout the week, as opposed to just running out and getting some sort of fast food all the time. That you could really bring down what is recycled in the household.

So I just wanted to say I commend Senator Kelly for bringing this amendment forward. I think there's a lot of merit to it. I think young people are -- they have a history of being fascinated with this. Everybody loves to learn about, you know, mechanics and conveyor belts and how do things get processed. It's really a hands on kind of thing, but also learning how we can be better citizens going forward.

And -- and not to say that I believe that Americans shouldn't reach out there and grab life with two hands and say, you know, the resources that are available to us in this great country are -- are ours to use. We should not feel guilty about utilizing the great resources that we have as a nation, but we also need to be mindful and smart about utilizing diminishing resources or utilizing them in a way so that we can use them over and over and over again, so not only our children, but our children's children can continue to have the quality of life that we have. And also the fascination with trying to -- to solve problems, not only in esoteric computerized way, but also in a fundamental mechanical way.

So for those reasons, Madam President, I am happy to stand in support of the -- of this amendment.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Madam President.

I too rise to support what I think is a great amendment and very time appropriate, in -- in my mind. In fact, it was just a week ago I was at work and I got a text from my wife who said she's going on a field trip today to the Trash Museum in Hartford. Trash -- Trash Museum, I had never heard of the Trash Museum in Hartford. And it was getting rave reviews, highly recommended from some of her friends.

And let me tell you, the kids went and they had a blast. So I didn't know about the Trash Museum. I leaned over to my good friends, James Didanado, somebody I actually started practicing law with way back when, and who at one point in time represented at CRRRA, of all irony, so he knew -- he knew really well about this Trash Museum and had visited it on a number of occasions with his son, James, who, by the way, is an avid reader. But in any event, they had a great time. My kids had a great time. Wonderful pictures. Wonderful exhibits. Just lots of great things to do.

And it's a shame that -- that right now, that's just isolated in Hartford. And -- and I think if we could broaden our young -- our youth's exposure to the Trash Museum by all agreeing with Senator Kelly's amendment and demothballing the one that's currently mothballed, I think it would be a great -- a great thing.

In fact, the Trash Museum in Hartford, there's this amazing mural. It's relatively new, by Ted Esselstyn. And essentially the mural depicts the history of trash. And it begins with trash -- people throwing garbage into the streets, just like they did in -- in ancient times. And then it's got a scene with individuals heaving items out of windows during the pre-Colonial days.

And then there's people piling garbage in heaps during Colonial times. Then they've got pictures of pigs being let loose, because that's how during the pre-Industrial era they would deal with trash. The pigs would just eat the trash. And then, of course, during the time of the robber barons, they were incinerating garbage by then. And then there's today's methods, to generate electricity or burying it in landfills.

The point is, we all generate trash. It's everywhere. And the evolution of how we've dealt with those things that we dispose of is important, especially today, as we run out of room, as trash continues to pile up. When it's incumbent upon us to come up with creative ways to deal with this, to create energy out of it, to recycle, to reuse. What better way to underscore this message to our youth than to vote in favor of Senator Kelly's amendment to bring the Trash Museum back.

So with that, I thank Senator Kissel for his great history of trash. Hopefully, I've added a little bit to it. And I think this just proves a point that a Trash Museum is needed.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

Through you, I have a couple questions to the proponent of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Prepare yourself, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam --

THE CHAIR:

Proceed, sir.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

This is probably one of the more intriguing amendments I have seen in my time in the Senate, Senator Kelly. I was not aware of a Garbage Museum in the town of Stratford nor was I aware that there would be a Museum of Garbage. It's kind of a -- almost an oxymoron, if you will. But, at the same time, when you spoke about the amendment, you talked about how the kids from your district and probably beyond would learn the effects of recycling and the environment and Mother Earth. So if you could, maybe you could just speak to some of the displays that are there in the Garbage Museum and/or programs that they have for children when they visit it.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Madam President.

And thank you Senator Kane for that -- that question. And -- and people may think or look at this lightheartedly, when you talk trash, but the fact is this is serious business. And I'm not trying to be lighthearted. Connecticut, in this area, is a leader. The reason you haven't heard about Trash and Garbage Museums is because they really don't exist anywhere else. And it is a novel concept.

For instance, in one year alone, Stratford attracted 32,000 visitors. Hartford 27,000. That's 60,000 visitors to a Recycling Museum to learn the virtues and values of recycling. I have a quote from someone from Sherman, Connecticut, nowhere near Stratford, and talking about an exhibit. It -- it was the Trashosaurus, which was a 2,000-pound figure, which is the average amount of waste everyone in Connecticut

discards on an annual basis. He said, "It's pretty cool. All the garbage on it, how big it is, and how much it weighs. It puts our waste in perspective for our youth, so that they start to understand that when we throw things away that means something, because it's got to go somewhere. And you know what's great is they bring that jewel of wisdom home to their parents, so it's just not a one-way street to the kids and to the future, but it also helps us in the past. That information comes home."

And that's why this was just a phenomenal resource. It was a destination. It brought people into our communities, but more importantly, it showed Connecticut's ingenuity to take something, our waste, our trash, our garbage and take that which we disregard and turn it into something positive and productive. And move it forward to the next generation. Isn't that the type of ingenuity that we want to reward and create and encourage. This amendment does that. It would -- it would reinstate 100 percent, by 100 percent the -- the Garbage Museums in the State. So that's -- that's an idea of what happens at these garbage museums.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

I thank Senator Kelly for that answer.

It sounds truly interactive and all of us who have kids around this Circle know when you buy them Christmas presents they don't -- don't even look at the present, they're just into the wrapping paper and the box and -- and the trash that comes along with it. So I can understand how it may be an exciting place to visit and something that attracts a great number of visitors, as you mentioned, and is an -- economic activity engine for the town of Stratford.

And I truly support the measure.

Thank you, Mr. President.

(Senator Duff of the 25th in the Chair.)

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you
remark further on the amendment?

If not, Mr. Clerk, please announce (inaudible) roll
call vote. The machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Senators please return to the Chamber. Immediate roll
call on Senate Amendment Schedule "E" has been ordered
in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted. If all members have voted,
please check the board and make sure your vote is
accurately recorded.

If all members have voted, the machine will be closed.

The Clerk will announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "E" for Senate Bill 1081.

Total Number Voting	33
Necessary for Adoption	17
Those voting Yea	14
Those voting Nay	19
Those absent and not voting	3

THE CHAIR:

The Amendment fails.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Mr. President, that is the bill and those are the amendments. And looking around the room to see if there's any objection, I ask that it go on the Consent Calendar if there's no further objection or concern.

THE CHAIR:

Is there objection to placing this item on the Consent Calendar? Any objections.

Hearing and seeing none, so ordered.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On Page 15, Calendar 518, Substitute for House Bill Number 6316, AN ACT CONCERNING THE STATE PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS FOR AGRICULTURAL LAND, PRESERVATION, AND CERTAIN REVISIONS TO THE COMMUNITY FARMS PROGRAM, Favorable Report of the Committee on ENVIRONMENT and there is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I do move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of this bill.

THE CHAIR:

On acceptance and passage.

Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR MEYER:

Oh -- I apologize.

SENATOR LOONEY:

On the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

If there's no objection, it will be placed on the
Consent Calendar.

I apologize.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, Madam President.

Madam President, if the Clerk would now list the items
on the Second Consent Calendar so that we might move
to a vote on that Second Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On Page 5, Calendar 275, Senate Bill 299.

On Page 7, Calendar 356, House Bill 6253.

Page 15, Calendar 518, House Bill 6316.

And Page 18, Calendar 555, House Bill 5836.

On Page 21, Calendar 579, House Bill 6358.

Page 40, Calendar 265, Senate Bill 191.✓

Page 41, Calendar 305, Senate Bill 1081.

And on Page 43, Calendar 388, Senate Bill 1096.

And Page 45, Calendar 553, House Bill 5250.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, please call for a roll call vote. The machine will be open for this Second Consent Calendar.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Senators please return to the Chamber. Immediate roll call on today's Second Consent Calendar has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Do me a favor. Call it one more time now, so we can get them in here faster. Thank you.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call ordered in the Senate on the Second Consent Calendar of the day. Senators please return to the Chamber. Immediate roll call in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

All members have voted, all members have voted, the machine will be closed.

Mr. Clerk will you call the last tally of the night.

THE CLERK:

On the Second Consent Calendar of the day.

Total Number Voting	35
Necessary for Adoption	18
Those voting Yea	35
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar passes.

Senator Looney, do you have some good news for us, sir?

SENATOR LOONEY:

Madam President, just before moving for adjournment, we have a couple of other just Calendar items. One item on the foot of the Calendar.

Madam President, Calendar Page 49, Calendar 240, Senate Bill 849. I would move to remove that item from the foot and just mark it passed, retaining its place on the Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

And also, Madam President, other item on the foot of the Calendar, Calendar 182, Senate Bill 1000. Would move to remove that item from the foot and to mark it passed, retaining its place on the Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you.

Madam President, the other items previously marked go for this evening, should now be marked passed, retaining their place on the Calendar. We hope to begin with those items early tomorrow.

And I would yield the floor now for Members for announcements of Committee Meetings or other Points of Personal Privilege.

THE CHAIR:

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC
HEALTH
PART 8
2384-2726**

2013

SENATOR BARTOLOMEO: Thank you. I much better understand that. Thank you.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you. Yes, Representative Cook.

REP. COOK: Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you for your information. You said that you have been through the process of trying to --

MATTHEW GALLIGAN: We tried to go to process in 1997 with Attorney Barry Giuliano. We sat with them and they basically talked us out of it and told us that you know, they were just not (inaudible).

REP. COOK: Could you tell me how long, from the time you started that process to the time you got the answer? How long was it?

MATTHEW GALLIGAN: Well, I would say that probably in 1998, so it was probably maybe six or seven months.

REP. COOK: Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you. Yes, Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO: Madam Chair, thank you very much. This is actually, I'm sorry, less of a question, more of a statement.

The gentleman approached this in 1997 before the statutes were changed in 2000. So in 2000 there were implemented mechanisms whereby the process would have been made easier.

So, in 1997, to the gentleman's credit, he is correct. There would have been no mechanism by which to do this.

mutual aid agreements and they didn't address them.

Now, this last year in the summer, a few months after that meeting, we had a child pass away in our town and her name was Hanna Patrey, and it's very upsetting to me because she's a friend of my daughter, and I'm a member of the Town Council. And I had an opportunity to do something about this last March and I didn't. Excuse me.

The ambulance for Hanna arrived more than 25 minutes after the call, and she wasn't brought to the hospital until after 50 minutes from the call and the ambulance that was dispatched came from the Town of Hartford.

Now, South Windsor Ambulance Corps provides EMT service only. There's no advanced life support. One third of the time they provide no service to the town and one third of the time they provide one ambulance and one third of the time they provide two ambulances.

Their ambulances have been chronically out of service and when this young girl died, they had an ambulance out of service. When we brought them in last March, they had an ambulance out of service and it's just simply unacceptable that they're not able to operate their local facility in a way that is supportive and beneficial to our community.

Now, they also have this issue with billing. They essentially take all the low-hanging fruit. They do the transport and they do the basic life support calls, the EMT calls. They take all the money from those.

And in fact, when we have outside ambulance services, like ambulance service of Manchester coming in, they dispatch a second vehicle. Our

local ambulance corps dispatches a second vehicle, and do you know what happens? That paramedic on the ALS call has to leave the ambulance from the ALS service, take all of their gear and equipment and put it into our local BLS provider because they require it, and our BLS provider bills for transport and the ALS provider bills for the ALS service and so they do what's called bundled billing. It's unbelievable.

So we have two ambulances that respond. Our ambulance is dispatching to ALS calls. Sometimes they have only one ambulance in service. Sometimes they only have one that they're staffing and that ambulance is going out to an ALS call completely unnecessarily in order that they could bill for transport services.

They are a billing operation. They are taking all the low-hanging fruit and they are preventing us from getting ALS service because no ALS service provider wants to come into town just to do the ALS calls, to lose the transport calls, and to lose the BLS calls.

South Windsor is stuck. There's nothing we can do. We can't change our PSA for BLS because their standard for BLS is so low, it's so low, that we've been told that in order for us to prevail at the state level it would be nearly impossible.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you so much for your testimony and I wonder if anybody has any questions.

KEITH YAGALOFF: Thank you.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you. And I want to just say that I'm sorry for your loss of your daughter's friend and I hope that we'll be able to work on figuring out where the connections, where things are

working well and where things are not working at all or not well.

KEITH YAGALOFF: That's very nice of you to say that. We appreciate that. The whole community appreciates that and thank you.

REP. JOHNSON: Gary O'Connor, followed by Bill Campion. Welcome, and please state your name for the record.

GARY O'CONNOR: Thank you. Good afternoon, Senator Gerratana and Representative Johnson and Members of the Public Health Committee. My name is Gary O'Connor and I'm a lawyer with Pullman and Comley. I've represented American Medical Response for over 20 years and have been involved in that capacity in the EMS industry for all those years.

I've submitted written testimony, which is in depth, so I'll just highlight some of the points in that testimony.

Quite frankly, Raised Bill 6518 in my opinion, although well intentioned, will completely dismantle Connecticut's emergency medical services system and will reduce the quality of emergency medical care and it will politicize EMS in Connecticut.

And I know you've already heard a number of stories about what it was like prior to 1974 but at that time there was no statewide control or oversight or supervision of the EMS system. In fact, municipalities had a great deal more control. A lot of times, they would be the ones that would on a rotating basis select the ambulance providers.

But the system was a mess and there was corruption. There were gaps in coverage. There

was stacking of calls and massive delays in response, and as a result, a statewide system was developed.

And just like hospitals, it was felt that EMS being a very important component of the healthcare system in the state, needed to be controlled at the state level.

And as a result, we do have a very good system. Are there problems that can be addressed? Yes. All these really unfortunate incidents that we've heard today, I believe most of them are the result of really personnel issues, not, maybe the Department could move faster on some of these issues.

And it sounds like a lot of the municipalities have really failed to exercise the avenues that they do have. It's not just an emergency in which they can seek to replace a PSAR, it's also if the PSAR does not meet the performance standards.

Now, they can set out in their emergency medical services plan what those performance standards are, and those would include response times and things like quality of care.

And if that PSAR is not meeting them, they can petition the Commissioner for a replacement, and I think in some of these more egregious situations, that in fact is what should be done, and that's a lot different than just filing a complaint for a violation. I mean, this is, there's a process and it doesn't seem like that's been followed.

So I think instead of destroying what is a very good system, that is more cost effective, results in lower prices for the consumer and a very good quality care system as opposed to some of our

colleagues in the other states, you know, I don't think that we should throw the entire system out.

It's a good system that's worked and I think what we have to work on is maybe educating folks a little more as to what their rights are and how they can petition to remove a PSAR and maybe address some of the inertia issues that people suggest exist in the Department.

So those would be my recommendations.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you so much for your testimony. And you've summarized somewhat some of the things towns can do, but when they are separate entities, it does seem like it might be a more difficult process to deal with because the town in statute is responsible for providing the ambulance service but then you have the idea of a separate, private nonprofit organization running the ambulance services, making contracts with other ambulance services to provide a complete level, or multiple levels of ambulance services.

And it seems as though it's quite a bureaucratic morass to negotiate.

GARY O'CONNOR: Well, there may be a problem with the bureaucracy. And again, listening anecdotally to what people have said, but I do think that that's more an issue of the bureaucracy as opposed to regulations and the statutes.

There is a process and it doesn't seem like it's been tested very often, and if I were representing a municipality and I do represent municipalities on a number of different issues and I had an ambulance company that was farming out one third or more of their calls and had very poor response times, I would say that they were not providing the proper service. They were not meeting their performance guidelines under the

local emergency medical services plan, and I would petition the Commissioner of DPH to remove them.

REP. JOHNSON: Okay. And what about, if nothing occurs, now we have a fatality here, you know, because of perhaps a long period of time and let's just not use the example that was given but let's say that there's, isn't there supposed to be a response within five minutes of the provider?

GARY O'CONNOR: There are different standards depending on the region, the type of emergency call it is. I mean, and there are, you know, there are benchmarks that certainly every community and every provider wants to meet.

You know, it's a very complex system and a very fragile system because, you know, there is, you know, it's a balance between maintaining the cost and providing the level of services that provides good quality emergency medical services in the state.

And considering the amount of different communities we have, the miles that have to be covered, I think that the EMS system in the State of Connecticut does a very good job in providing quality emergency care.

I mean, one fatality is too many, and the goal is to eliminate any fatalities, but we do have to sit back and look at where it was before '74, where it is now, where it is compared to our neighboring states in terms of quality of care, cost effectiveness and responsiveness to the public.

And I think there was a lot of good reasons why that was believed it had to be done on a state

level. You would not get the commitment and the investment that a lot of the good emergency medical service providers are making if there was fear that every year they could be booted out, or every two years with the change of administration.

In order to do what's necessary and capitalizing the types of ambulances and emergency medical services you need and the training, and then coordinating all that with the sponsor hospitals.

I mean, it's an enormous investment and it takes many years to create that kind of teamwork between the EMS providers and the sponsor hospital services.

So it's something that cannot change like you change, you know, garbage hauling services year after year. It doesn't work that way.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you so much. Any additional questions? Yes, Senator Bartolomeo.

SENATOR BARTOLOMEO: Thank you. For the testimony that I've heard, because I've been here for the last hour, your situation is somewhat different because you're a for profit service and most of what I've been hearing are from those towns and municipalities that are serviced by not for profit or others, or volunteer.

Can you describe for us what your relationship with the towns that you service in municipalities, you service, what has that been like and have you been asked to make changes and how has your company responded to that with municipalities?

GARY O'CONNOR: I think it's a constantly evolving process and you know, we do make changes at the request of municipalities. We try to accommodate municipalities. Some have particular needs that others don't. Some emphasize some areas of care

over others, you know. It all has to be taken into consideration and yes, each community can and should develop their own emergency medical services plan.

And as the provider, and PSAR in that community, we have to be responsive to that plan because we understand if we aren't, the community can petition the Commissioner of Public Health and have us removed.

So that is always in the back of our mind and providing the service and doing it really, you know, at no separate charge to the town itself. I mean, we bill the patient, but it's not and now, it used to be years and years ago there would be subsidies from the communities.

So at least with my company now it, you know, we basically do it for what we can charge the patient, and so it's at no cost to the community.

SENATOR BARTOLOMEO: So one of the things that you had said was that, what you had been hearing at the same time that I have been hearing, you felt that some of these operations have not been maybe accessing the things that they have a right to as far as the process goes.

But I didn't really hear it that way. I heard that these communities have tried but they haven't been responded to by the Office of Emergency Services, Emergency Response Services.

So I guess what I'm wondering is, can you give us more, well, first of all, you think that primarily the system is working.

GARY O'CONNOR: Yes, I do.

SENATOR BARTOLOMEO: Others have a very different point of view. Can you pinpoint any ways in which maybe you would make suggestions on how the system could work better?

IAHCSMM represents approximately 19,000 central service technicians in the United States and abroad with, approximately, 145 technicians here in the state of Connecticut. The US Bureau of Labor Statistics estimated in 2011 that there were approximately 510 central service technicians in the state of Connecticut.

Today, I appear before you to testify in support of Senate Bill 894, which is -- would require the certification of central service technicians and allow them to maintain continuing education credits.

Central service technicians are those that are responsible for sterilizing medical instruments used for surgical procedures. Clearly, that's a vital component in the delivery of safe and quality patient care.

A compelling example, recently, in 2011, a Westport physician, a plastic surgeon, was found to have numerous violations of infection control procedures and instrumentation sterilization procedures. The Department of Public Health fined him and then went back in the spring of 2012 to recheck any -- any -- anything that had occurred and found numerous violations, again, in the spring of 2012, same issues, improper sterilization procedures, clearly, that demonstrates a clear and present need for a measure to ensure safe sterilization of the instruments in equipment here in Connecticut.

Without going into too much more of my written testimony that I -- that I've given you, I would just like to discuss some of the issues that have come up in opposition that has been submitted by the Department of Health in the Connecticut Hospital Association. We realize that the definition, currently, as drafted in the

legislation for central service technician, we agree with the Hospital Association that that language should be tightened, and we're absolutely willing to work with the Hospital Association on that.

The grandfathering clause in the bill, as drafted, we would like to see that change. Our intent was to grandfather everyone currently working as a central service technician up until the effective date. After the effective date, if you are a new technician coming in with no experience, at that point, then, having 18 months to -- to be certified then. I know the buzzer just went off so I will stop speaking and allow you to ask me any questions.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you. Thank you very much, and we appreciate your testimony and also your comments about those who also testified on the bill.

Are there any questions?

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you very much for your testimony.

This certification that you're talking about going prospective, who would -- would they go to a particular course? Or who would conduct the course for them to be certified and maintain their certification, whose responsibility would that be?

JOSEPHINE COLACCI: That's a great question there's actually no formal program that the technicians have to go through to be certified. You could study for the exam on your own and then sit for the exam. There are a wide range of programs if

someone did want to take a program. Purdue University has an online course. You have several community colleges here in Connecticut that offer courses, or a person could just get the study material and take it on their own.

As far as the CE credits, the statewide central service organization here in Connecticut has several conferences a year that would allow CS techs to get continuing education credits. Also, I have a list of organizations that provide free continuing education credits to the -- the CS techs. And then our national -- two national associations that are involved in the certifications provide CE credits, also.

REP. SRINIVASAN: Thank you.

So there are multiple ways in which a technician can, A, be certified and B, continue -- continue the certification?

JOSEPHINE COLACCI: Yes.

REP. SRINIVASAN: And a follow-up on that and who would monitor, under whose purview would it come that these technicians are certified and everything is as it should be?

JOSEPHINE COLACCI: The two associations, IAHCSSM, which I mentioned and then CBSPD, which is another national association for central service techs. Both of these associations monitor the certification and the continuing education credits.

REP. SRINIVASAN: Thank you for that, but that's not what -- maybe you misunderstood what I said.

JOSEPHINE COLACCI: Okay.

REP. SRINIVASAN: -- or maybe I was not clear and if -
- if a certification is not kept by a technician
or the -- or the practice that employees that
particular technician, would that then come under
the Department of Health, DPH, would be reviewing
to make sure that these -- these licenses are
current? Would it fall on them or would there be
some other body monitoring that?

JOSEPHINE COLACCI: Okay. Your question was more
toward enforcement. I apologize for
misunderstanding.

REP. SRINIVASAN: No, don't apologize maybe I wasn't
clear. I wasn't clear.

JOSEPHINE COLACCI: As far as the enforcement, right
now the associations do the enforcement, but what
could happen is when I believe your state would
fall under the Department of Public Health that
would go in and check. Some states have JACO
required to go in and check doctors licenses,
nurses licenses, et cetera. This would be
another check on the list when DPH would go in to
check for doctors' licenses, nurses' licenses.
It would be a check for CS techs.

REP. SRINIVASAN: Would there be any carve-out of
anybody who was exempted, hospitals or any
particular group, or this would be applicable to
everybody and anybody?

JOSEPHINE COLACCI: Right now as drafted it's
applicable to everybody.

REP. SRINIVASAN: Thank you and my final question to
you, you know, the -- the example that you gave -
- or the instance that you gave where there was
something that happened in a -- in a plastic
surgeon's office. How did the -- how did they
come to hear about it? Was it complaints or

355

March 15, 2013

pat/cd/gbr PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

10:30 a.m.

because I'm not sure how anybody would know that -- that such a thing had happened.

JOSEPHINE COLACCI: Actually, I don't know the answer to that the Hartford Courant didn't -- it was a Hartford Courant article. I don't know.

REP. SRINIVASAN: Thank you very much for this testimony.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you.

Thank you for your testimony.

Is there -- are there any more questions?

Thank you so much for taking the time.

JOSEPHINE COLACCI: Thank you. I appreciate it, again, for taking me out of order.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Okay. The next person we have listed is Tim Phelan to speak on House Bill 6519 followed by Paul Pescatello.

Tim Phelan?

Paul Pescatello?

Welcome and thanks for waiting and please state your name for the record and proceed.

PAUL PESCATELLO: Sure. Thank you.

Good evening, I'm Paul Pescatello. I'm president of CURE, Connecticut United for Research Excellence. Thank you for this opportunity, so late in the day, to testify in opposition of House Bill 6519, AN ACT CONCERNING LABELING OF GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOOD.

CURE's mission is to represent and foster the growth of Connecticut life sciences research and life sciences technology transfer. Perhaps, our most important job is to support the growth of that -- of the cluster of biotechnology and biopharma companies that CURE and all of you in the General Assembly have worked so hard to build.

As we try to underscore at every opportunity, biotech is first and foremost about cures and treatments and better ways of producing energy and food, but it is also about economic development. Biotech has about the greatest economic multiplier of any industry. - Simply put, investment in biotech, whether private investors or governments -- like Governor Malloy's recent recruitment of Jackson Laboratories to Connecticut -- will have the greatest ripple effect across the Connecticut -- across the Connecticut economy in terms of jobs and employment than any other industry.

I'm here to oppose HB 6519 on many grounds, most are stated in many of the letters and other information provided to the committee. They're two key facts: one, the existing rules, regulations and oversight of the FDA make the bill unnecessary. Pages and pages of audited scientific studies have been submitted to the FDA as part of its regulatory dossier.

Two, the organic labeling option means, by definition, that no genetically engineered seeds or crop were used in organic food production. HB 6519 would only confuse rather than enlighten consumers.

But the most important reason for CURE's opposition to HB 6519 is that it undermines the foundation of the hospitable environment for

biotech we've worked so hard to build in Connecticut. As we, you, did so astutely with stem cell research. We look beyond the confusion and anti-science rhetoric that our opponent sought to create and crafted legislation that broadcast to the world, Connecticut's openness to science, rational analysis and the high technology job opportunities of the 21st century.

If I could just have a second more to finish.

There are many things to be said about genetically engineered or modified foods, but they're essential -- but the essential quality is they are nutritionally identical to non-GE derived foods. Biotech helps us produce more food using less land and fewer pesticides with a much lower carbon footprint, but the food itself is -- is no different from food produced, quote/unquote, the old fashioned way.

To the extent food is modified in such a way that it is nutritionally different or has the potential to expose consumers to allergens, existing law requires that it be labeled as such.

Today, biotechnology as it applied to food production is part of a centuries long continuum of using science from monks employing Mendelian genetics to Nobel Laureate, Norman Borlaug's World War II green -- green revolution. The science of food production has allowed us to feed the hungry and free most of us from the need to farm allowing us to use our time, talents and treasure for other pursuits.

The use of biotechnology in food production is a very good thing. It is something to proud of not affix a scarlet letter to.

Connecticut is a high-cost state but one with much high value added intellectual properties to

sell to the world. The high living standards we enjoy in Connecticut depend on our creating more of that intellectual property. We must continue to confidently be known as a hospitable place to science and rational analysis and as a state that welcomes scientific research and researchers.

6519 would undermine that message and should be opposed.

Thank you.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you. Thank you so much for your testimony.

I think that we're talking about foods here. Is that what you do, do you genetically modify food, is that what you're doing in the -- in the work that you do through CURE?

PAUL PESCATELLO: We represent -- we represent companies that -- biotechnology companies that produce medicines, as well as are involved in food production in the -- in the -- the production of things that sometimes end up in seeds.

SENATOR GERRATANA: So -- but -- but isn't it true that most of the work that's being done has to do biomedical technology as opposed to food production?

PAUL PESCATELLO: You mean in terms of what --

SENATOR GERRATANA: Well, in terms of what CURE does --

PAUL PESCATELLO: The state's industry --

SENATOR GERRATANA: -- in a lot of the things that are being produced at the UConn Medical Center, for example, studying the human genome and those

kinds of things for medications. And I don't think that's what the focus of this is. This is a -- the focus of what we're doing here, what we're trying to ascertain and trying to see is, is to see whether or not we can label the food that has been genetically modified, not to say that it's bad or good, but just that it was modified.

PAUL PESCATELLO: Right and we're about promoting, you know, bioscience and biotechnology. And we believe that this bill undermines the promotion of biotechnology and it -- and that it actually misinforms the public.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Are there any questions?

Yes, Senator Bartolomeo.

SENATOR BARTOLOMEO: Thank you.

I have two questions for you. So, you know, the way I view science and science is for understanding, for information purposes, and for learning and so I guess I'm -- I'm wondering why, then, would you be opposed to just the information given to consumers that something is genetically modified.

PAUL PESCATELLO: Well, because there -- there's lots of things implied by that label. That it misinform the consumer that there's something wrong with genetically modified foods or that there's -- there's something different in the actual -- in the end product to the food that the consumers are eating.

I mean there're all sorts of things you could put on labels, you could say not produced by communists and that would imply that somehow that would be bad if it were produced by communists. All -- all --

SENATOR BARTOLOMEO: -- But I think that we owe it to consumers to allow them to make those decisions so, quite frankly, you know, either way -- it sounds to me and -- and tell me if I'm -- I'm looking at this the right way. It sounds to me that you're implying that the consumer doesn't have the -- whether it be the intelligence or the ability to decipher whether or not that label means something negative or positive in their mind.

If it simply says, "GMO," like on bottles and things where we say simply, "BPA" or "non-BPA." You know that simply all it says so I would think that a consumer has, you know, the wherewithal to decide whether or not they're okay with that.

PAUL PESCATELLO: I'm not sure what information that's giving to the consumer in terms of the end product and it's implying that there's a difference.

And I would -- I would also just point out I was thinking of listening to as -- as people testified, you know, all spices in this country are irradiated. The label does not say they are irradiated. And if you put irradiation on it, you could put a little symbol on it and -- and scare people and -- and irradiation is a great thing. There's no radiation in spices, but it certainly would might imply that to a lot of people and they might buy spices that didn't have it, irradiated. And it would spoil and it could -- could subject themselves to, you know, all sorts of toxins because of that.

SENATOR BARTOLOMEO: And maybe you just gave us an idea for next session.

PAUL PESCATELLO: You know, if I could just respond to something that you said earlier to that you --

you implied there's an equivalence that there's a -- there's science on both sides. There's equal science.

And I would really challenge the committee to look and look at all the data and look at all the scientific studies. I think it's a false equivalency. It's a -- there's a huge amount of science in favor of use -- use of biotechnology and the -- and the -- how -- how misleading this label would be versus a very small amount of science on the other side and -- and very questionable science.

SENATOR BARTOLOMEO: Well, and -- and I think what I said -- and I can go back and listen to it -- but I think what I said is not that there's an equivalent because I have not myself done an exhaustive search to compile the data that is on both sides. What I said is that the previous gentleman, the previous doctor who testified, his comments were phrased in a way that made it seem as though anyone of a different mindset was not educated or as intelligent and that there's certainly are researchers and geneticists and people that are well educated that have come to different conclusions. And that I thought that needed to be put out there and represented.

I wonder if you have any opinion for us, one of the things that -- that some people have said is that things, like -- and not just GMOs but GMOs and pesticides and all of that, have possibly contributed to our increase rate of cancer, which is, quite frankly, it seems as though just about everybody I know has faced with or has a one that's loved and dear to them these days.

Do you have -- is there any -- do you have any speculation on whether or not this increased rate of cancer that we're seeing, do you speculate what that might be related to?

PAUL PESCATELLO: Gee, I mean, they're all sorts of reasons. I think, factually, the cancer rate is going down but -- in this country, I think that's the actual -- very little of it is, but it's actually -- there's been a reduction in that last few years, just -- just a slight reduction, but I would just underscore as -- as strongly as I possibly could, GMO food reduces the use of pesticides. The -- the people who are here are so worried about GMO food. I would be way more worried about the use of pesticides in our environment, and GMO foods allow far less use of pesticides. This is a great thing.

SENATOR BARTOLOMEO: -- and here, again, here's where we come to -- here again where we come to different people who are -- who are well educated having differences of opinions because there is information out there and there is -- there are studies that say that over time that you do need to increase the amount of pesticides, again, on -
- on GMO foods.

PAUL PESCATELLO: I would just challenge the committee to really find that -- those valid and reliable studies. I don't think they exist. I think it's incontrovertible that GMOs use -- they're the future of feeding. I don't know how we're going to feed the world without genetically modified foods and were certainly use way more pesticides without them.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Any additional questions?

Thank you so much.

PAUL PESCATELLO: Thank you.

REP. JOHNSON: Michael Hanson followed by Henry Talmage.

Welcome and please state your name for the record and proceed.

MICHAEL HANSON: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Yes, my name's Michael Hanson, and I'm a senior scientist at Consumers Union, the policy and advocacy arm of Consumer Reports. I'm here to testify in support of HB 6519. I have worked on the issue of genetically engineered foods for more than 20 years and have been involved in the decisions and debates about these foods at the state, national and international levels. I've served as a -- an international expert on consultations on how to do safety assessments for engineered animals.

I want to make a number of points. First genetic engineering or genetic modification, unlike what Dr. Giddings says, is a very different than conventional forms of breeding. Genetic engineering allows exchanges of genes between life forms that could never to do so naturally. Scientists have used GE to put spider silk genes into goats and human genes into rice plants. Indeed that cannot be done with conventional breeding. Indeed there's global agreement that because genetic engineering is different than conventional breeding, safety assessments should be completed for all genetically engineered foods, including crops and animals prior to marketing. This is not true for any other form of breeding.

The human safety problems that may arise from GE and food introductions of new allergens or increased levels of naturally occurring allergens, plant toxins and changes in nutrition. There also may be unintended effects.

The U.S., unlike all other developed countries, does not require safety testing for GE plants;

although it does for GE animals. The FDA has not made a conclusion about the safety of GE plants or the safety of the technology as a whole. Instead, the FDA says it's up to the companies to determine the safety of any GE food. Dr. Giddings is wrong that the FDA only labels for health, safety and nutritional. I can give you many examples if you ask.

I'd also point out that the AMA just last June, they changed their official policy to one that now states, quote, our AMA supports mandatory premarket systematic safety assessments of bioengineered foods.

They changed their position from "it would be a good idea" to "this should be required."

That change means that they've admitted that there could be a health problem. There's 94 of these things that have gone through voluntary safety consultation without proper assessments. The only way you could figure out if you have a problem is you need labeling.

I would also say there is a considerable evidence of health issues. FDA is opposed to approving a GE salmon engineered to reach market in half the time of wild salmon. However, the company's own data suggests that it may increase -- that it may exhibit increased allergenicity. A carefully designed meta analysis of 19 published studies, all of them, feeding studies involving mammals, found damage in the kidney, liver and bone marrow, which could be potential indicators for the onset of chronic disease.

I'll finally end by saying the long-term feeding study that Doctor Seralini did, it was viciously attacked by pro-GE and industry affiliated scientists and what appears to have been an orchestrated campaign. However, what you might

not know is that both the French Food Safety Agency and the European Food Safety Authority have agreed with Dr. Seralini that such long-term safety assessments should be done and they will be in progress. You can ask me for more.

Finally, 62 countries with more than half the world's population require a labeling of engineered foods. A number of polls, from 1995 to 2011, have found 70 to 95 percent of Americans support mandatory labeling. Labeling is important because consumers have a right to choose the foods they eat and to avoid any unintended health effects for all these reasons. Consumers Union supports HB 6519.

Thank you.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you, thank you for your testimony.

Just a couple of things, I was wondering could you tell us a little bit about the difference between, say, a hybrid type of a, you know, a situation where you might combine two plants that have a similar genome with a -- with a genetically modified plant that has a gene that is taken from some other type of organism and placed into -- into that particular plant.

MICHAEL HANSON: Yeah. What the -- what the basic difference is, is when you're doing hybrids, you're basically mating things that can mate with each other, different varieties of tomatoes. With genetic engineering, you can both move genes between organisms that could never do that in nature. I don't know any other way you can mate a mouse with a -- with a corn plant or a human with a rice plant so there's that issue.

Also, the technology itself the way they insert things, you have no control over where you're

inserting it. That causes all sorts of problems, that's called insertional mutagenesis. And in fact, the FDA recognized ten years after their original policy that there is a difference and that there should be data on all these separate transformational events, but they're still going back to their '92 policy, which was promoted by, then, Vice President Dan Quayle as a deregulatory initiative not as a safety initiative.

So there is a real difference, and I would just point out, there's global agreement. This is the organization Codex Alimentarius. That's the food standard setting organization of the U.N., jointly run by the World Health Organization and the Food and Agricultural Organization. Any of their standards are written in to WTO. Right?

So they have all agreed that engineering is different. There should be required safety assessments. So that is what the global standard is. The U.S. does not meet that. So that's why we've been telling the U.S., you need to meet this standard because right now any country could pass a law, say that they would require this testing and then turn around and block material coming from the U.S, and the U.S. would lose a case at WTO because we do not require those kinds of assessments.

I could go into in exquisite detail of the kind of molecular characterization and other things that are called for by Codex that we don't do in the U.S. And in fact, I went to all those meetings, sat in most of the expert consultations, and I'll point out that behind closed doors, the U.S. does admit they don't require this information and they can't meet that standard.

REP. JOHNSON: So do you have access to the World Trade Organization guidelines for us?

367
pat/cd/gbr PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

March 15, 2013
10:30 a.m.

MICHAEL HANSON: Pardon?

REP. JOHNSON: Could you make the WTO guidelines available to us?

MICHAEL HANSON: Yeah, I -- I'll just point out, I can make all the Codex documents. I, also, will submit -- I brought with me and I'll submit, I did a submission to the AMA, which I think helped changed their position on the safety assessment. And I go through all the Codex documents. I can link -- I can send you links to -- they have separate documents for how you do safety assessments for engineered plants, engineered animals, engineered microorganisms and general risk analysis documents. I can make all those available to you. They're all up on the Web.

REP. JOHNSON: Certainly. And so, yes, I think the AMA remarks as well will be helpful to the ---

MICHAEL HANSON: Yes. Also, in my testimony anything I've referred to, you'll see that there's footnotes, and I have actual links that you can actually click on and find the -- like the AMA or, for example, reference to what the European Union has said vis-a-vis Seralini. That's all referenced. The technical studies, you can usually get sources on the Web. So this is all in what I have presented, and I will send it in electronically, as well.

REP. JOHNSON: Very good and -- and so just a -- just a couple more questions, and then I'm going to open it up for discussion here.

One is, one of the things when I read through the materials casually, I find that there are a lot - - there's a lot of discussion about and there has been some worry for the last ten or 15 years about what's happening to the bees that do the

pollination. And because they're genetically modified organisms in our plants they're supposed to act as pesticides without -- could you just -- do you have any information or is that something that's just kind of folklore or is that something that's an actual difficulty because of genetically modified plants?

MICHAEL HANSON: Yeah. There's actually a direct and an indirect connection between the colony collapse disorder with bees and genetic engineering. There have been some studies that have shown that some of these engineered plants in conjunction with other things can disorient bees, but what it's more important is the main link has been with these neonicotanic pesticides.

And what you need to know is that all the genetically engineered corn that is there to protect it from the corn rootworm, well, the dirty little secret is that doesn't work just when the corn germinates so all those engineered corn plants are all -- the seeds are all coated with neonicotanic pesticides so the genetic engineering and that goes together.

Ten years ago -- or 15 years ago, in terms of seeds, hardly any of them were coated with these neonicotanic pesticides, which are the ones that are linked to colony collapse disorder.

With the engineered corn seeds you can't find a single one that is not also coated with that. So genetic engineering, those seeds are coated with two or three fungicides and a couple of pesticides. So the neonicotanics are now in all the engineered corn seeds so that gets in the soil and can get into the plant and that's -- it's the neonicotinoids that are causing the a problem. The genetic engineering has actually vastly spread that.

REP. JOHNSON: For us laypeople, would you please define neonicotinoids.

MICHAEL HANSON: Yes. That's a -- that's a class of pesticides, and they're related to nicotine. Nicotine, which, of course, is in tobacco. Years ago, it used to be used an organic pesticide, but it is highly toxic and so they come up with these newer versions that are variations on that molecule, and that's why they're called "neo" or new nicotinoids.

REP. JOHNSON: Interesting. I actually heard about that in my garden club -- yeah -- in any event.

Yes, Representative Betts followed by Representative Miller.

REP. BETTS: I think what I'd like to do is have us go in recess and have a debate between you and Dr. Giddings and see what we can come out with it if any common ground.

MICHAEL HANSON: We've actually done that before after the --

REP. BETTS: I'd like to get the CD. I'm sure it's not less than an hour. But in any event, I respect what you both say, but I do share one concern that Dr. Giddings had said before and it's important to me.

I am not convinced because neither one of you -- I mean they're two points of views -- as Senator Dante Bartolomeo had said, we can agree to disagree, but there's clearly two different points of view on this. Okay.

And I don't think it's appropriate or acceptable or right to suggest without compelling evidence a label that says that GMOs are harmful, hurt your health, dangerous, whatever you'd like to put in

there, but I will not support something like that if that's included in the label.

If it's the label that says "produce with genetic engineering," I view that as educational not judgmental. And I'm wondering in response to a concern he had said, I'm wondering whether you would support, advocate, having a different type of label that would, in fact, in my judgment, mislead people because there isn't conclusive evidence of saying that GMOs are, in fact, dangerous, risky and bad for your health. And I really do need to know that.

MICHAEL HANSON: Well, I think you might have slightly misinterpreted our position. Consumers Union, we're not against genetic engineering. This technology -- all we want to do is it should meet the same standard if you put a new coloring agent or an additive in the food. The legal standard should be reasonable certainty of no harm. That's why we think the labels are needed because if you don't have that data, you can't accurately say.

I'm not hear saying that the engineered foods on the -- on the market right now are unsafe for you to eat. What I'm saying is we don't know enough. There are -- there is data in the literature which suggests that there could be health problems that needs to be followed up and, indeed, because of Seralini's studies, Europe is now going to do longer term feeding studies. So all we're saying is since we don't know, let's label it and let's get the -- a good science.

I agree completely. There should not be a label that says GMOs are harmful, and I like the term "genetically engineered." So a label that says just produced with genetic engineering I think is truthful, and it's up to -- if some people want to assume that that's a negative label, that's

their prerogative. Some folks will say that, you know, we have to label foods as to whether they have trans fats or saturated fat or all of that. People use that information. Some people say I don't want anything that has saturated fat or trans fat. Other folks say I don't care.

So to see those as warning labels is just wrong. It's information. And if some consumers view it one way or the other, well, isn't that what the market is about and shouldn't people that want to market it try to influence their publics. I think the term either genetically engineered or genetically modified is neutral, and that's the one that's been agreed upon globally, and it's very narrowly defined.

It's not these other things that Dr. Giddings has said -- has said. The definition is all the same. We're talking about these in vitro nucleic acid technologies. That's what we're talking about, nothing else. So to say that other things are -- are genetic modification, well, some scientists might say that in an ivory tower.

Any legislator in Europe, it is defined the same way that it is defined in this bill because this bill uses the language, which comes from Codex, and that's the globally agreed definition. And I should also point out it's the same definition that's in the Cartagena Protocol, which is part of the convention on biological diversity.

REP. BETTS: That was a short answer. Thank you.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you.

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I think we've determined that our bill is just about labeling, and we'd like to see Connecticut do what 62 other countries require by law. However, there are numerous countries which have banned genetically modified organisms because of their health concerns, and I don't want to just say it's about labeling and nothing else because I do have health questions and concerns.

You mentioned that genetically engineered foods can contain toxins and allergens. Can you elaborate briefly on that? .

MICHAEL HANSON: Sure. There is the -- there is the work with the engineered salmon that they just looked at six fish, and when they looked at the engineered versus the non-engineered variety, they actually had sera from people that are allergic to salmon and then you test that against the fish. And if it reacts more, then that tells you there'd be a stronger reaction. And what they found between the engineered -- the non-engineered fish that a certain reaction and they only looked at six fish so it's a really small sample size.

The engineered ones all had a much higher reaction. It was highly statistically significant. The FDA just ignored that data, and they looked at other data and said, well, there's not an issue. That's one study.

There was another done in Europe -- well, in Italy, that was very carefully controlled. They grew MON810 -- which is Monsanto's first beefy corn variety -- and the genetic parent it came from, they grew both of them in a growth chamber. So that means the environment is exactly the same so the only difference is would be genetic engineering. And they looked at all the proteins to see what was different and two things popped up.

One, it turns out in the non-engineered corn, there's a gene that codes for -- a protein called gamma-xene. That's a known corn allergen. Right. That was not turned on in the -- in the parent. But in MON810, it was. So that means a known allergen gene that was turned off in the normal plant got turned on as an unintended effect of genetic engineering.

Some of us 25 years ago had said this would happen. We were told that the chances of that were less in one in 5 million, and now there's a -- a study. It is referred to in my longer testimony. You can look it up. So there is evidence of changes in allergenicity, both in fish. This allergen, endogenous allergen got put into -- was increased in corn.

And I'll also point out, there's evidence that the cry proteins that are what are being put into these Bt crops, there's evidence that those are allergens, as well.

There was a study done with farm workers, and they actually found two of them that had IGE antibodies and that means that's for a true food allergy, to cry1Ab and 1Ac. That's what's engineered into many of those plants. This work was done by -- with funding from the EPA and Health Canada. When that professor, Dr. Carl Bernstein wanted to do this work because now he could test GMOs to -- to see whether there would be this -- this allergic reaction, he's not been able to get money or to do that test for the last ten years.

REP. BETTS: Thank you. And my final question has there been any global agreement on genetically engineered labeling?

MICHAEL HANSON: Yeah. Actually, at Codex after a 17 year fight. I will read to you on July of 2011, after the Codex Commission meeting, a note was sent out to journalists and here's what it said, quote, the Codex Alimentarius Commission has stated that governments are free to decide on whether and how to label foods derived from modern biotechnology, including foods containing genetically modified organisms. The labeling should be done in conforming with the text approved by the Codex Commission to avoid potential trade barrier. The decision which will help inform consumers choices regarding genetically modified food -- was taken at 34th Session of the Commission held in Geneva from July 4th to 9th, 2011; more than 600 delegates from 145 of the 184 member countries, U.N., intergovernmental and nongovernmental organizations attended.

So, yes, there is now global agreement that labeling can be permitted so that means countries don't have to worry about a trade challenge anymore from the U.S.

REP. BETTS: Thank you for your testimony.

And thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you.

Senator Bartolomeo.

It's getting late.

SENATOR BARTOLOMEO: I'm the problem legislator tonight.

So you mentioned you were a senior scientist, and can you tell us what exactly is your area of specialty. Are you a geneticists or --

MICHAEL HANSON: I have a PhD from the University of Michigan in evolutionary biology. So I'm an evolutionary ecologist. So I know a lot about genetics and other things.

SENATOR BARTOLOMEO: Okay. So are -- have you heard, seen, know about, I mentioned this to the other two gentlemen and they seem to think that there's no such thing, that there is an increase need over time for additional pesticides with these crops?

MICHAEL HANSON: Yeah. That's actually -- that is very true. The vast majority of crops that are engineered in this country are to -- so that they can be sprayed with more herbicides. The 94 -- the 94 percent of the soy beans that are engineered. That's all about spraying glyphosate or Round Up. The 95 percent of canola, that's all glyphosate tolerant.

That has led to an explosion in the use of glyphosate. It also has led to glyphosate tolerant weeds. There are now 14 different species of weeds that are resistant to glyphosate. They're infecting 60 million acres in this country; 50 percent of the farmers report this. We now have weeds that cannot be controlled by anything.

Palm or pig weed is one of the major weed pests. There's 100,000 acres in Georgia right now that is infested. They cannot control it. Glyphosate was the last thing. Now that it's resistant to that. They're going in and having to pay people to go in with machetes. That's why last May the National Academy held a big meeting for what are we going to do about the epidemic of herbicide tolerant weeds. And that is because most of these crops are being engineered so that you spray them with more herbicides and that increases herbicide use.

There was a study that came out that said in the first 16 years when you look at USDA and other data, there is an increase of -- a net increase of 325 million pounds more pesticides applied on engineered crops compared to the non-engineered counterpart. That was published just a couple of months ago, Dr. Charles Benbrook did it. I'm more than willing to supply that paper to the committee, if you'd like it.

SENATOR BARTOLOMEO: Thank you. So, once again, we have experts with different information.

The -- you had mentioned that there are examples of FDA labeling for more than just health and safety, and you would be willing to elaborate could you (inaudible).

MICHAEL HANSON: Yeah. This -- this going through with this voluntary safety consultation, it's sort of sham. The FDA can't. If they ask the company for more data, the company can say no. And at the end of the process, the FDA doesn't make any kind of conclusion. The companies all get a letter.

I'll read you one of the sentences from the Monsanto -- the first one that was sent to Monsanto about MON810. A variation of this sentence is in all the 94 letters.

Dr. Giddings is right. They're all up on the Web site. I can give you the URL, go look at them and read them yourself.

Here's the main sentence. This is the FDA speaking. This was sent to Monsanto on September 25, 1996. This is about MON810. And it states, quote, Based on the safety and nutritional assessment you have conducted, it is our understanding that Monsanto has concluded that

corn, grain and forage derived from the new variety are not materially different in composition safety -- safety or other relevant parameters from corn, grain, forage currently on the market, and they do not raise issues that would require premarket review or approval by the FDA, end quote.

The FDA doesn't make their own conclusions. They functionally say, Monsanto, Syngenta, Agro-Evo, we understand, you think these things are safe and don't require premarket review by the FDA.

That's what they're saying. There's been global agreement that there should be required safety assessments. This is not it. This is the FDA saying the company, we understand you think that's safe.

The reason these letters don't have a conclusion from the FDA where they say they think it's safe because if they did that that would give the companies partial liability protection. They did it for the flavor saver tomato but that's because Calgene asked them to treat part of this as a food additive. None of the other companies since have done that.

SENATOR BARTOLOMEO: Thank you for your well-informed testimony.

REP. JOHNSON: Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you very much for your testimony.

Just for me to understand what you've just said over the last half an hour, safety concerns with the GMO foods, is that a concern for us going forward that it has to be evaluated to make sure the food is safe, or are you -- do you already

have information that safety with the use of these foods is compromised already and that we are not aware of it?

MICHAEL HANSON: No. What I'm saying are two things: yes, there should more required safety assessments; but there is evidence in the scientific literature that does suggest that there are safety problems. The way this works with any test you find a problem in a -- in a laboratory study and you look further and you evaluate it to see whether this would translate into -- into a human problem. So there's been feeding studies, which have found adverse affects on the gut or other things, those need to be followed up.

So there's suggestive evidence, and it -- and it needs to be followed up. But all these studies should be required before the products come on the market so that we can determine whether they're safe. It would be like putting a new food additive on the market not requiring any testing and then saying, well, we don't have any evidence that there's a problem. You have to have the proper tests, and they have to be done with proper methodology.

REP. SRINIVASAN: Thank you very much, and one more follow-up question.

I know you alluded to this already but so that we are all clear. We were told that when these GMO foods are used, we will be -- sorry, let me rephrase that -- if -- with genetically engineered food, the need for pesticides would be reduced. And if it's not done, we will be start finding ourselves using, you know, far larger amounts of pesticides.

And I just want to make sure I know there was a discussion on both sides of the aisle, and I just want to hear that one more time from you.

MICHAEL HANSON: Yeah. It's -- look, make very clear, crops that are herbicide tolerant, they're designed to be sprayed with and herbicide. That means you will use pesticides on them. That's the vast majority of what's out there. The 94 percent of soy beans that are engineered, all herbicide tolerant; the 90 percent of canola, all herbicide tolerant; 95 percent of -- of sugar beets; that's all herbicide tolerant.

The other people are talking about the Bt crops. They reduced the use of pesticides sprays, but the Bt, that cry protein, that is actually a toxin. And there's developing information that that's a -- that could be an allergen and could cause adverse affects on the gut and the level that is being secreted from these plants is thousands of times the level of what that occurs in nature. And there's been calculations that the amount of that endotoxin that is created is ten times the amount of the pesticides that were saved that weren't sprayed on them.

So the other crops, these Bt crops, they're producing their own pesticides, and we have to look at the safety of that because there is an issue because when you put these things into plants, they act differently because of glycosylation and other things. So a gene that's in a bacteria, acts differently when you put in into plant; and they're technical reasons for that.

REP. SRINIVASAN: Thank you very much for your testimony.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you.

Are there any additional questions?

I just have one more question about this and that is it has to do with the plants -- once -- once they're harvested, they're genetically modified, they produce this pesticide. How -- how -- in terms of -- have there been any studies or is there any information on how, when they're ingested, you know, they -- they work when we're eating them -- if -- if they've been -- does the pesticide evaporate, does it stay with the plant, where does it go?

MICHAEL HANSON: No. There's actually -- there's some animal feeding studies that have found adverse effects on the gut, and there was also a study done in Canada where they were able to find in the blood stream of pregnant women that -- that cry1Ab protein. They -- that would have come from a food source.

Now you can't prove that that came from a genetically engineered plant. It could have, theoretically, come from a plant that was sprayed with Bt, but they're so few of those out there. And that study found it -- this cry1Ab was in the blood stream of pregnant women, and they could find it in very low levels in 69 percent of the fetal cord blood.

Now the implication that would have? We don't know because nobody -- people have said that that these proteins would be digested. They would never be seen in the blood stream. So that study has found that the implications of that are we don't know, we need to do further studies.

And I can point to other ones that have been done with cry1Ac, which have found impacts on the gut

REP. JOHNSON: Okay. Well, thank you for your very enlightening testimony.

MICHAEL HANSON: Thank you very much.

REP. JOHNSON: And we have an announcement from my co-chair.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you, Madam Co-Chair.

My announcement is that as a mother and a grandmother, you know, I have a lot of concerns about people with babies in the room so it's way past your bedtime. It's not past our bedtime, but it's way past your bedtime.

So I would like to hear testimony from Mr. Rodriguez, I believe, who has one of those babies in his arms.

DANIEL RODRIGUEZ: Sure.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Oh, and then Mr. Talmage will come up and testify.

DANIEL RODRIGUEZ: Thank you for letting us speak out of order.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Yes, I demand it.

DANIEL RODRIGUEZ: My name is Daniel Rodriguez, and I'm dad. And I would just like to know if my food is genetically modified. And we carry iPhone's and we can search the Internet but not everything's online so we just ask that the food be labeled. We're not saying it's good or bad, we just want to know.

HB6519

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you. Thank you so much for waiting all this time and -- and bringing your lovely children here. And do you have anything - anything else to say?

383
pat/cd/gbr PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

March 15, 2013
10:30 a.m.

Does your wife want to say something?

DANIEL RODRIGUEZ: Yeah. Today's there's been a lot of talk that, you know, we want to avoid GMO, that we could just go and buy USDA organic. It is more expensive and not everything that's not labeled "USDA" is genetically modified. So we would like to know the difference between non-GMO and GMO nonorganic. So the conventional grown food, it'd be nice to know so we could make a decision without having to spend that premium on USDA organic.

REP. JOHNSON: Very good so that's why we're here tonight so thank you very much.

DANIEL RODRIGUEZ: All right. You're welcome.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you so much.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you and good night. Sweet dreams.

Oh, I'm so envious. No, I find this -- I find this very interesting.

Next is Mr. Talmage, Talmage -- I'm sorry -- Henry Talmage and then Bill Duesing.

HENRY TALMAGE: Good evening, Senator Gerratana, Representative Johnson and members of the committee. My name is Henry Talmage. I'm the executive director of the Connecticut Farm Bureau. We represent 5,000 members across the state from all types of agriculture, large and small and all types of production, including members who are organic and conventional and in all aspects of agriculture.

HB6519

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC
HEALTH
PART 9
2727-3065**

2013

I come here tonight before you to voice our opposition to House Bill 6519, AN ACT CONCERNING THE LABELING OF GENETICALLY ENGINEERED FOODS.

I'm going to be a little less technical probably than the -- than the previous speakers, but I would like to -- to point out that what we're -- what we're concerned about is the impact this would have on our Connecticut farmers.

The Connecticut Bureau believes that any mandatory labeling, especially with regard to food safety, ought to be handled nationally not state by state. We have real concerns about what this will do to our competitive ability of our individual farmers to be able to market their products in different states, for example. And the cost it that would be associated with having different labels for different states in different requirements.

There's no guarantee that if Massachusetts does this their language will be slightly different or their font requirements will be slightly different as is Rhode Island, New York, and so on. So that's a compelling reason in our mind to do this nationally and not state by state.

In addition, even if we -- so we've heard testimony about the FDA's role in food safety. We believe we have confidence in that -- in that ability. And we think -- we don't oppose labeling food -- food for safety reasons or nutritional or allergenic reasons. In fact, we're in favor of it, we think that's a good thing, but what we would like to do, again, is have it be national in scope.

Even if you make the case that this is a right to know issue and that consumers have a right to know, it's still -- it's unworkable at a state-

that genetic engineering technology, as we know it, is only a fragment of what biotech has in store for us. You know we should be knowing more about nanotechnology, genetically engineered animals, laboratory fabricated muscle tissue, the list goes on. All of this is right around the corner, and I encourage all of you to educate yourselves.

It astounds me how we've allowed the relentless pursuit of profit on behalf of multinational companies to secure what could be viewed as a monopoly on our food. Where have all the checks and balances gone? Who's on the consumers' side anymore? American food policy making has never been so vulnerable to cooperate influence as it is today, it is, I think, that's categorically true.

We've allowed corporations to grow genetically engineered grains at below production cost thanks to the taxpayers, then fed these grains to millions of factory-farmed animals, dosed on antibiotics and growth hormones to be served to our children on breakfast, lunch and dinner plates across America. Processed foods have gained a exorbitant profits from this subsidized food system.

In the meanwhile, this panacea of a new a food system, this wonderful synergy of biotech and industrial ag, has helped to create a virtual extinction of small family farmers, agricultural self-reliance, the demise of small business owners and retailers across America, unquantifiable environmental costs, obesity, enormous health costs for which we rank the highest in the world and a failing highly vulnerable food structure.

I conclude with one question, what are the gains of not knowing what it is in our food and how

it's made? You, as legislators, should have much trouble answering this question I believe.

Thank you.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you.

Are there any questions?

Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN: Thank you, Madam Chair.

Thank you very much for your testimony.

And since you represent a coalition, and chefs being a part of that coalition group, a thought that has always been in the back of mind and I'm glad you're here this evening to testify in front of us. When customers come to restaurants, how do you envision them ordering or would you have two different menus or how would you think that would play out? You know, me going to a grocery store is one thing, but when I come to your restaurant or your restaurants, how do you -- how do we order the food to make sure it is GMO or non-GMO?

CHRIS EDDY: I think that that question is -- is better answered by Tara Littman, but how I personally envision it, I mean, if you look at Europe, there's really no labeling requirements on menus in certain restaurants. You know, I work with many counterparts who are French and Italian. And well to them, actually, this is a nonissue because, you know, because of the controlled -- it's mandated on this sort of technology, but I think that the Connecticut -- the Coalition of Chefs as -- as we are forming are really group of chefs who are interested in circumventing the use of genetically engineered

food on our menus until -- until the labeling is required.

And I know the Farm Bureau -- I mean one question which has, kind of, perplexes me is that, you know, if we want to, you know, leave labeling to the federal level, fine, understandable. And we have farmers who -- by the way, we represent farmers, too. We have a considerable amount of farmers who are fully supportive of this coalition and this -- this bill initiative.

So how -- you know, how are these farmers supposed to know what to label or not? Well, that's precisely the issue. If -- if they're buying corn syrup that's labeled genetically engineered. There you have it, they know. They can put it on the label.

REP. SRINIVASAN: Thank you.

Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you.

Any other questions?

If not -- oh, I'm sorry -- Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS: Thank you, Madam Chair.

I wonder if you could be a little more specific in terms of what the Farm Bureau said, Mr. Talmage said. Do you think what he said is a real problem for small farms, or do you think he's overstating the situation because --

CHRIS EDDY: Right.

REP. BETTS: I personally have a small farm, and I can assure you labeling would just about put us out of business because we don't have the personnel,

much less the infrastructure, to pay for the costs to do it. I certainly support the education giving people the right to know what's in their food, but there are unintended consequences to it. And I thought what he said was very real. I'm wondering what your reaction is to it, or what you think would help their dilemma?

CHRIS EDDY: Well, no. The -- the only thing that I was trying to point is, you know, as I understood it, the dilemma was not being able to know what is in their food that they're using to fabricate, you know, other things. Well, if they were labeled, they would know.

REP. BETTS: I understand that, but if you do it on a scale, there are a lot of small farms don't have the -- the budgets to be able to do the labeling, much less have people set aside to do it if you're a small --

CHRIS EDDY: Right. And I work with many small farms (inaudible).

REP. BETTS: The primary purpose is to grow and to sell. Okay. That's another part of the operation that is not currently -- unless, you know, you make jams and you're required to put labeling on. That's not something typical, small farms, at least in Connecticut, have the ability to do absorb --

CHRIS EDDY: Well, I -- I certainly think -- and I -- and I hope and I have faith in the legislators that that particular issue would be ironed out in favor of, you know, working something that's going to be tolerable to farmers, small farmers. We work with a lot of dairy farmers: Cato Corner, Beltane Farm. You know, these -- of course, these are concerns and that -- that's your job to come up with the solutions, as far as

the labeling, but the issue itself -- the issue itself is -- is pretty much nonequivocal.

I mean, everybody who we're -- we're talking to is absolutely for this. I think facilitating a labeling process, you know, putting our energy into doing that makes more sense than just out right opposing this because of inconvenience.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you.

I think that is all. Thank you, Chef Eddy.

Next is Lisa Stokke followed by Dave Murphy.

LISA STOKKE: Good evening. My name is Lisa Stokke, and I'm here to testify in support of HB 6519.

I traveled here from Iowa, with three of my four children, to represent 400,000 farmers and citizens from Food Democracy Now, an organization based in Iowa of which I am a cofounder along with my partner Dave Murphy, who is also here with me today.

We have about 7,000 members here in Connecticut. I'm also here to represent the Coalition of States for GMO Labeling that is working for passing strong and consistent language -- legislation -- excuse me -- to label genetically engineered foods for GMO labeling. And I'm here from mothers everywhere who have struggled for years to avoid foods that contain genetically engineered ingredients for the benefit of their children's health.

The problems of genetic engineering for food and feed crops has never been realized. It is now clear to millions of Americans that the broken promises of increased yields to feed a growing population and less pesticides on our land and in our water, more nutritious foods and

environmental stewardship are merely PR stunts on a susceptible public and are quite simply and clearly lies and deception.

Biotech crops have succeeded in the market place only because of lack of government regulations and powerful special interests, who reap billions of dollars in profit annually. There are no benefits to the consumer with genetically engineered food. Currently, there is only risk. Those that are potentially most at risk from poor regulatory oversight of these novel crops and lack transparent labeling on our food are our children.

Children are most susceptible to allergens and novelties in our food. Many studies have indicated that allergens potentially resulting from GMOs in our food supply impact our children's health in significant, varied and untested ways that are significant concerned to scientists, doctors and mothers. Without transparent labels on our foods, it is impossible for mothers and doctors to find potential allergenic sources in our food.

So those advocating that these foods and crops are not special enough to deserve a label, I would say to them, please relinquish your patents on our seeds.

As a mother, myself, I was fortunate to be aware of genetically engineered ingredients in our food from the time they were slipped into our food supply and avoided them in my children's diet for about 15 years. However, I, unfortunately, live in a rural area. We have many -- where we have very limited access to organic food, which prohibits the use of GMOs in production and, therefore, I have experienced limited and challenged access to food that I can feel

confident are free of GMOs. This is due to a lack of transparent labeling.

Everyone deserves the right to know what's in the food they're eating and feeding their families. This right is not restricted by economic status or geographic boundaries. Food companies do not deserve and should not reserve the right to withhold this information from us.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Ms. Stokke -- Stokke, I'm sorry --

LISA STOKKE: Okay. The last sentence was just to say thank you.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Great. Thank you.

LISA STOKKE: So thank you for your time.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Actually, I think, a number of us have questions. First of all, welcome -- welcome from Iowa.

LISA STOKKE: Thank you.

SENATOR GERRATANA: And we thank -- thank you for coming here to give your testimony this evening.

Can you tell me, are there any other states that require GMO labeling?

LISA STOKKE: In the United States, no there are not.

SENATOR GERRATANA: No. Just outside of the United States, there are countries.

LISA STOKKE: Yes, over 60 countries.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Okay, very good.

I think Representative Johnson has some questions for you.

LISA STOKKE: Okay, thank you.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you. Thank you for waiting and coming all this way.

Iowa, to me, sounds like a place where there might be a lot of crops that are GMO modified?

A VOICE: Soy.

REP. JOHNSON: Soy?

Lisa Stokke: Yes.

REP. JOHNSON: And so there must have been something that made you decide to, say, buck the trend in your area. And I just wondered if you could share some of your ideas with us and how this came to be for you?

LISA STOKKE: Yes, thank you.

I was born and raised in -- in Iowa. And you are right. We do have a lot of genetically engineered corn and soy beans. My -- my attention to this issue, primarily, as a person from Iowa, is the attention to how it has affected us socially. Due to these large scale agricultural farming that we have, industrialized farming, we have a lot -- we have a lot less rural communities. You know, our communities have gotten much smaller. Environmentally, our water has been polluted. We have some of the most polluted water in the nation, which, of course, does not support the idea that genetically engineered crops have less pesticides. There are studies now that show that we're actually using more pesticides on our land due to genetically engineered crops. Most genetically engineered crops are genetically engineered to withstand pesticides, such as

You know the saying is, you know, go big or get out.

It's kind of how our agricultural policy works here in the United States, which, you know, we feel from an organizational perspective has been dictated by multinational corporations, you know, such as Monsanto, who have, I would say, intimidated many farmers. And I know many farmers who have intimidated by them. When they are contaminated they find, you know, unintended contamination on their land and farmers are sued, which I probably shouldn't go down that path because it's a very long story. Did I -- did I answer your question?

REP. JOHNSON: Yes, you did. Thank you, thank you so much.

Are there any questions?

Oh, yes, Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER: Thank you, Madam Chairman.

And thank you for your testimony.

My question is since you come from a traditional huge farming state --

LISA STOKKE: Yes.

REP. MILLER: When you were a young child, did you observe your typical corn and soy farmers saving the very best of their seeds to plant next year?

LISA STOKKE: Yes, I did. I would say my -- my strongest memory of that is of my grandparents, you know.

REP. MILLER: And did they save their seeds today or, if not, why not?

LISA STOKKE: Yes. No, they did. They did save their seeds. The reason that they saved their seeds because it was -- it was for security for the next year's crop, you know. They were able to do that.

REP. MILLER: But do they still do that now --

LISA STOKKE: Oh --

REP. MILLER: -- and if not, why not?

LISA STOKKE: Oh, no, I'm sorry. I misunderstood.

Farmers do not save their seeds now, primarily. I'm trying to explain this very short. It's a complex story of how contracts work for farmers. Basically, when a farmer decides to grow genetically engineered crops, like -- such as those that are Roundup Ready.

The -- like I said, the promise of these crops has not held true. So a lot of farmers were told, you know, in the mid nineties that this was -- that Roundup Ready technology was going to be something that was going to allow them to use less pesticides, which, of course, was appealing to farmers because it's less -- less money. Right? And it's better for their land so they moved to the Roundup Ready technology. Roundup Ready makes it so you can spray the Roundup on the corn, you kill the weeds and it won't kill the corn, you know, or the soy beans, which is what we mostly have there in Iowa.

However, when they do this, they have to sign a contract. The contract states that they cannot save their seeds for the following year's crop. Okay. They have to pay Monsanto Corporation.

They're the corporation that owns the patent on the seeds. These companies have patented these seeds. They patented life. Okay?

So if they save their seeds, they can be sued. There are hundreds of farmers that have been sued and over hundred have been taken to court, actually, for doing this. So if they discover this -- this is what they will do to farmers. I know farmers that have been harassed and have been intimidated and are still -- still to this day, you know, where they sit across the road from them and -- and they watch -- they watch their wives, and so on, and so forth.

So this is why farmers don't save their seeds, you know. It's become -- it's become very risky for them to do so.

REP. MILLER: Well, thank you for your answers.

And thank you, Madam Chair.

REP. JOHNSON: Thank you.

Any additional questions?

Thank you so much.

Oh, Representative Zoni, sorry.

REP. ZONI: I'm going to ask one question, since you've come all the way from Iowa --

LISA STOKKE: Yes.

REP. ZONI: I would like to know if the farmers in Iowa believe that their crops have been improved through techniques of modern biotechnology? And I specifically accent the word "improved."

LISA STOKKE: Yes, I understand.

You know that's -- that's a good question. Of course, as with any question, it depends who you ask. Right?

I would say that there are some -- some farmers who at some -- at some point in time would have said that simply for the reasons that I just stated because, in the past, it has made farming easier for them. Of course, now if you've heard about the problems with like superweeds or Roundup-resistant rootworm, which is what eats the roots of the corn plant, makes the plant topple over. Okay. So now that we have been spraying this year after year after year after year after year, the Roundup, the soil has -- well, I'm trying not to get too excited, so I'll leave that -- leave that to the scientists -- but, basically, it is -- it's been -- it's been not beneficial to their soil. Okay, so if you look at the whole picture and it's the -- if the farmer were to look at the whole picture of this technology and -- and not just the seed, okay, if they were to look at the whole picture of technology, they would see that this has actually been very hard, you know, on their land. And I would say that they are farmers that would argue and say that it has probably devalued their land because the land then becomes where it doesn't have as much nutrients. It doesn't have a lot of that beneficial microflora, you know, the soil that has its own ecosystem, you know, when it's given the opportunity to.

The soil that we have in Iowa, there is -- there was a experiment, I guess the kind of experiment that was done wasn't a scientific experiment, but a photographer, he went all over the world -- this is a good example -- he went over the world just to put this red boxes on National Geographic, and he took this red box and he put in all different places of the world and he put a

camera on it. And he just watched how many species came in and out of that box, okay. And in most places in the world, you know, there were hundreds of different, you know, bugs and birds and insects and all kinds of things, you know, that came through. He took it to Iowa, and how many do you think came through that box? Six, six. So what is happening in the Midwest and in Iowa because of industrialized agriculture because of these multi-nationals seed and chemical companies? It's devastating. It's devastating to our water. It's devastating to our food security. It's devastating to our soil. It's devastating to our seed heritage that we are passing on to our children. We're losing a lot. This dust bowl was not that long ago, and we're losing topsoil. And a lot of farmers in America know it, and a lot of them don't know what to do, quite frankly, because they're kind of stuck in this system, but many are trying to get out. And that's what we are doing with our organization at Food Democracy Now.

REP. ZONI: Thank you very much.

LISA STOKKE: Thank you.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Senator Bartolomeo.

SENATOR BARTOLOMEO: Thank you.

How would you respond to what we've heard that we -- without genetically engineered crops that we won't be able to or -- for long be able to feed our country and feed our people and that we need to have genetic engineering in order to have enough food production?

LISA STOKKE: I'm not a scientist, but I will answer from what I have read, and probably the -- the simplest reference that I can give you is there was a U.N. report in 2010 -- I believe it's 2010

-- that determined in looking at food security globally, it wasn't a matter of us here in America transporting food, largely, you know, malnourishment and starvation is due to food distribution, okay. And foods needs to meet -- or countries -- excuse me -- need to maintain their food sovereignty and have the ability to feed themselves and grow the food in their own country. So the U.N. did a study on this, and they determined that it was not, in fact, the promise of biotechnology that was going to feed the planet. It was sustainable agriculture. It was using these practices that return the nutrients to the soil; that put the seeds back in the hands of the farmers to grow and to own and to use as they choose, and to replant year after year, and to pass on -- pass on to their children, and to use them locally. I mean, seeds are locally adapted, you know, so the seeds that we have in America are not likely to do well, you know, like in Kenya, for example. So -- and this is exactly, you know, this is what multinational corporations do when they patent seeds. They make them -- they make them all the same. Right? And so they become very dependent on these corporations to continue to grow these -- these crops with the pesticides that they also own and use. So it's been devastating to -- to farmers around the world, particularly in India, you know, where many, many, many -- and there's been thousands of people, farmers, very sadly have killed themselves because they cannot stay on their land, you know, because they've gone bankrupt, okay, in trying to maintain them. So in many ways we look at socially, if you look at environmentally, if you look at economically, sustainable agriculture, from what I've read and understand is the answer to our global food security.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you.

I have a basic question, I hope you don't mind, and that is are these seeds genetically engineered to make them insect resistant? Is that the main reason why they are genetically engineered or --

LISA STOKKE: The Bt corn is engineered for this purpose, yes, but I think as Michael very well explained --

SENATOR GERRATANA: Are they -- are seeds genetically engineered for some other reason or --

LISA STOKKE: They are primarily genetically engineered to withstand chemicals or herbicides.

SENATOR GERRATANA: I see. And this is why?

LISA STOKKE: Because, you know, our farming history, you know, as we all know is as such that farming was very laborious and was labor -- very labor intensive, so, you know, when the -- when the promise of being able to use herbicides freely that was -- I think that was very appealing to farmers, you know, so that's where the, you know, that's where the genetic engineering came in. So these seeds were genetically engineered solely for the purpose of being able to withstand Roundup, okay. And, of course, Roundup is also a patented technology. It's a patented spray. So whoever owns the patent on that seed and on the chemical stands to make -- make a lot of money. So that's really kind of the history behind this. You know, I think other and, you know, and the scientists here can certainly speak -- speak better to this than I can. You know, Dr. Fagan who was after me can certainly better explain this better than myself.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Okay. Well, thank you very much for that. I don't think anyone else has

questions so thank you. Thank you for coming and giving your testimony.

Next I think is Dave Murphy. Yes, Food Democracy Now.

DAVID MURPHY: Hi, thank you, Madam Chairman.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify today on behalf of the growing number of citizens from across the country that are dedicated to winning the mandatory labeling of genetically engineered food here in the US.

My name is Dave Murphy, and I'm the founder of Food Democracy Now. I'm here with my partner and our three children. We're a grassroots movement of more than 400,000 farmers and citizens dedicated to reforming our food and agricultural system.

Most recently I had the honor of being the co-chair of the Prop 37 campaign in California, where more than 6 million Californians voted to label for genetically engineered foods. Unfortunately, we lost on election night, mainly due to the point that the biotech industry and the large food companies donated \$46 million to defeat us at the ballot box.

I want to thank Tara Cook-Littman and Bill Duesing for their tireless efforts on this bill and this issue here in Connecticut. It's been inspiring to us, for those of us who work on this issue nationally.

And I also want to, you know, talk real quickly about what Connecticut is trying to undertake here with this bill and what it means to millions of Americans waiting for one brave state legislature and one brave governor to do the right thing and pass a GMO labeling bill over the

strong objections of the agricultural biotech industry.

As my partner, Lisa, testified, we live in Iowa, you know, where 97 percent of the soybeans and 91 percent of the corn are genetically engineered. We are literally surrounded by an ocean of GMO corn and pollen.

At -- from the very beginning, Food Democracy Now has stood up for GMO labeling because we believe that Americans have a right to know what's in their food and corporations don't have the right to hide that information. My grandparents were farmers, and Lisa's grandparents were farmers. We are proud to stand with farmers all across the country.

I previously worked for Iowa Farmers Union in 2007, and they have a very basic policy statement where they support GMO labeling. Because of that, I was able to get then Senator Barack Obama to promise to label GMOs because he believed that Americans should have the right to know what they're buying. I still agree with that statement five years later. Connecticut can hold him to that promise.

We are here today because we have helped launch a movement from across the country. Thirty-seven states are banding together -- 25 states -- to push for GMO labeling. Twenty-five states already have either a ballot initiatives or legislation going forward. We firmly believe in America and the United States and a democratic in a free society. Americans are supposed to make informed personal decisions. Without proper labeling, the crop biotech industry is infringing daily on our -- on our basic democratic and economic rights.

Currently, GMO labeling is a basic right already enjoyed by citizens in 62 other countries around the world, including progressive democracies, like the European Union, Russia, China, South Africa and Saudi Arabia. I say if it's good for Saudi Arabia, why not the United States?

I'm here today because I believe Connecticut can lead the way. So I appreciate that Dr. Giddings had some testimony earlier and he said that the biotech industry is afraid of a label. They're afraid to label these products. I find that very curious. Why is an industry afraid of labels? It's basic information to provide for consumers. Mothers want to know this information; people want to know this information. There's a process -- so they already have labels that are voluntary, the USD Organic Standards. That's a process-based standard. Labeling of genetically engineered foods would be a processed-based standard.

And so I want to go back to the origin of why we don't have labeling here in the US. It stems from the fact in the 1990s, when the biotech industry were trying to get a regulatory structure set up here in the U.S., they installed the former Monsanto attorney, Michael Taylor, at the FDA. Michael Taylor, the Monsanto attorney, he helped write the rules to make sure the genetically engineered crops could not be labeled. You know, it's very --

SENATOR GERRATANA: Mr. Murphy, I'm sorry, could you summarize for us please.

DAVID MURPHY: Yeah, real quickly I'll summarize.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you.

DAVID MURPHY: There's just two quotes. So this is a very interesting development. Monsanto set up

To be transparent, actually, New Morning is a natural food store -- natural and organic food store, and I have recently built a 14,000 square foot store and have occupied the new location since May of last year. And we have a very diverse customer base. Our customers -- we have teenagers, we have elders, we have empty-nesters, we have young mothers and families. We represent all trades and professions and, in fact, many of my customers are very influential in their fields. And I'm also very proud that they are critical thinkers; that they are intelligent in what they consider; and that they care and really do want to make a difference, you know, in the world.

So as a good retailer, I want to meet my customers' needs and exceed their expectations. And one of the, you know, very -- it's a daily conversation about genetically engineered ingredients of food. This is, you know, an unequivocal concern for my customers.

I have actually been using the tool, which is the non-GMO Project verified to help and guide customers, and they are very grateful to have that guidance, but the -- with that actually comes even further confusion which has been a, sort of, referred to about labeling, you know, the concern about labeling whether a product is genetically engineered. What I find is our customers are assuming that a product that doesn't have the, you know, isn't certified organic or doesn't have the -- the verified -- the non-GMO Project verified label is actually a product to be avoided. And this actually puts a burden -- it's an uneven playing field that is -- that is set up. That it puts a burden on the small producer who may not even have any at-risk ingredients. They may not have soy or corn or canola or sugar beet.

415
pat/cd/gbr PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

March 15, 2013
10:30 a.m.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Mr. Pittari, could you summarize for us please.

JOHN PITTARI: Sure.

The, you know, the point I'm trying to make there is that the reference to using a voluntary label doesn't necessarily address the issue, as well. A manufacturer would have to differentiate themselves as not containing that -- those ingredients, even though they are choosing not to use them.

So I would really ask you to support 6519 and trust that Connecticut citizens have the intelligence to be able to make the choice and remove, you know, the FDA's decision on it being made on their part.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Thank you. I'm on your website. You're in Woodbury, Connecticut; is that correct?

JOHN PITTARI: That's correct, yes.

SENATOR GERRATANA: Good. And I'm looking at what's on sale?

JOHN PITTARI: You should come on by.

SENATOR GERRATANA: I need almond milk. I'm all out. And heretofore, many years ago, I started eating Ezekiel bread. And -- oh, it's excellent, excellent stuff. And I'm looking here and going 3.99. I pay 5.49 at Whole Foods. That's wonderful.

Does --

A VOICE: (Inaudible.)

SENATOR GERRATANA: There you go.