

# CTLCV Candidate Survey

Please complete this survey by July 30, 2016.



First Name: \*

Scott

---

Last Name: \*

Storms

---

Running For: \*

House

Senate

District Number: \*

60th

---

Party: \*

Democrat

Republican

Working Families

Other : .....

Campaign Mailing Address: \*

42 Elm Street, Windsor Locks, CT 06096

---

Phone: \*

860-623-2615

---

Website:

Storms-for-the-60th.com

---

Email: \*

Electstorms2016

---

Do you have a primary?

Yes

No

The issues described below are ongoing and likely to be on the legislative agenda for consideration in 2017. If elected, what position do you expect to take on the following environmental issues?

1. CONSTITUTIONAL AMENDMENT- To place a constitutional amendment measure on the ballot in 2018, the General Assembly must pass a joint resolution for a second time in the 2017-2018 legislative session. Senate Joint Resolution 36/Resolution Act 16-1 was passed by both chambers in 2016. Would you support passing a state Constitutional Amendment to better protect state conservation lands from being sold, swapped or given away without a public hearing and a 2/3rds vote by the General Assembly?

Yes

No

Uncertain

Question 1 Comments:

I believe that conservation of our available state natural resources and conservation lands are important to present and future generations within our state, and that the question of the exchange or sale of those lands is of such significance as to warrant a constitutional amendment of this type.

2. PROTECTION OF CLASS I AND II LANDS- Connecticut has set the highest standard for drinking-water quality in the nation. Maintaining our high water quality relies on the protection of the recharge lands for reservoirs and wellfields, known as Class I and II lands. With increasing frequency, projects and legislation are proposed that would compromise protections for Class I and II lands, such as the legislative effort this year to allow rock mining in 100 acres of Class I and II land in New Britain. Would you oppose legislation that undermines traditional drinking water protections?

- Yes
- No
- Uncertain

Question 2 Comments:

---

3. WATER DATA FREEDOM OF INFORMATION- In 2002-2003, water utilities pushed through three security laws that require officials to redact (black out or delete) large quantities of information in documents, such as water supply plans. Basic data needed for comprehensive, statewide water planning mandated in 2014 (PA 14-163) is now being redacted from water utility records. During the 2016 session, state agencies (DPH, DPUC, DAS, DEEP) and the Governor's office attempted (unsuccessfully) to persuade water companies to cooperate in state water planning by releasing more data. Would you support legislation to allow these state agencies to make water utility data publicly available for planning purposes?

- Yes
- No
- Uncertain

### Question 3 Comments:

The public has a right to know the information, and transparent governance requires such information be available for monitoring and planning purposes.

---

**4. WATER SUPPLY REGULATION-** Privatization of public water for private bottling and sale is happening in communities across the country. In 2015-2016, citizens' groups protested the unilateral decision of a CT regional water utility to sell a huge volume of water to a single new customer (a water bottling company). The volume—1.8 million gallons per day—was approximately equal to total residential water use in the service area. The new customer was given a specially created discount to encourage large water purchases, while at the same time rates for households were increased, and no provision was made for prioritizing supply in droughts.

This question has two parts:

---

a. Would you support a permit requirement on new, supersized water diversions, for all new and existing customers asking for an additional 500,000 gallons per day above current use?

- Yes
- No
- Uncertain

b. Would you be in favor of regulating sales of our public drinking water supply to private for-profit water bottling companies?

- Yes
- No
- Uncertain

#### Question 4 Comments:

I believe that protecting our public water supply is of great importance and that the public should be aware of and made part of the decision process when distribution of such large quantities of public water are under consideration. The regional impact of such an enterprise should also be considered regarding the impact of the company's activities on surrounding towns. Additionally, I believe that creating a special class of discounted user to the detriment of the existing customer base is generally unfair and burdensome to residential and other commercial consumers.

---

**5. REGIONAL GREENHOUSE GAS INITIATIVE- Connecticut receives revenues from auctions for emissions credits conducted by the nine-state Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI). Under Connecticut statutes, these funds are dedicated to energy efficiency programs which help thousands of residents and businesses, and to the Green Bank, which leverages these funds to attract far more in private funding to finance renewable energy installations. Both programs create thousands of Connecticut jobs. Would you oppose any diversion of RGGI funds away from energy efficiency programs and the Green Bank?**

- Yes
- No
- Uncertain

#### Question 5 Comments:

Once placed in the dedicated fund, the monies must be used for the intended purpose. However, great care should be taken not to create additional burdens on limited state general funds at time when the state is in attempting to deal with the ever increasing challenges of balancing the state budget. All programs should be reviewed to insure that monies dedicated to a particular purpose are used to maximize results given our limited resources.

---

6. CLIMATE CHANGE- The 2008 Global Warming Solutions Act (P.A. 08-98) mandates an 80% reduction in CT's greenhouse gas emissions below 2001 levels by the year 2050. The Governor's Council on Climate Change has been charged with developing strategies and interim targets to achieve that goal (Executive Order 46) and will issue a plan by the end of 2016. Would you support the adoption of new interim targets that will ensure CT is on a path to achieve the mandated 2050 emissions reduction goal?

- Yes
- No
- Uncertain

**Question 6 Comments:**

Reasonable SMART benchmarks should be establish to insure compliance.

---

7. PROJECT GREEN SPACE- Municipalities struggle to find adequate funding for open space acquisition and stewardship. Would you support enabling legislation that would allow municipalities to establish, if they choose to do so, a limited conveyance fee on transfers of real estate to provide dedicated local funding for land conservation, including farmland, forests and open space, and to fund land stewardship efforts, including in urban communities/public lands?

- Yes
- No
- Uncertain

### Question 7 Comments:

Adding conveyance fees amount to additional taxation upon those who may be in financial distress or upon the elderly who are selling their homes to insure their future financial well being. I believe that we should eliminate or oppose the additional surcharges and fees wherever possible.

---

**8. PLASTIC BAG POLLUTION-** Plastic pollution is a global environmental problem. Westport, CT and other communities across the country have begun to address this issue by implementing bans on single-use plastic bags, citing their contribution to clogged waterways, damage to marine life, and toxic pollution. Would you support a statewide ban on plastic bags similar to the successful ban in Westport?

- Yes
- No
- Uncertain

### Question 8 Comments:

---

**9. TIRE RECYCLING-** The value of scrap tire is declining and many post-consumer uses are going away. This is a recipe for illegal dumping which puts a financial burden on municipalities and can develop into a public health concern (tires are a breeding ground for mosquitos). Would you support full Expanded Producer Responsibility for tires--that involves producers and advocates--in designing the take-back program?

- Yes
- No
- Uncertain



## Question 9 Comments:

---

10. SOLAR ENERGY- Residential solar energy is rapidly expanding, and is an important source of clean energy and jobs. But CT's residential solar market is limited due to the high percentage (about 80%) of renters and homes shaded by trees. Other states have successful "shared solar" programs that enable people who cannot install rooftop solar panels to purchase a portion of electricity produced by a larger solar installation. Would you support legislation expanding CT's insufficient shared solar pilot to a full-scale, statewide program that allows all CT residents to access clean energy?

- Yes
- No
- Uncertain

## Question 10 Comments:

A voluntary sharing program may prove beneficial for those who wish to use solar energy but for a variety of reasons are unable to install the necessary systems upon their property or avail themselves of the solar alternative.

---

## 11. What environmental concerns are you most passionate about?

Land conservation, open spaces, air/water quality, and insuring future available sources of public water.

12. What are the environmental priorities in your district? Do any require a state legislative solution? If elected/re-elected, what will you do to address these issues in 2017?

See above...I would be receptive to addressing public concerns relative conservation and environmental issues affecting the District given the close proximity to Bradley International Airport , the Windsor Locks Canal, and the Connecticut and Farmington Rivers.

---

**DO NOT LEAVE THIS FORM UNTIL YOU HAVE HIT THE "SUBMIT" BUTTON.** If you have any questions or would like to submit additional information regarding your environmental record or positions, please email us at [ctlcquestionnaire@gmail.com](mailto:ctlcquestionnaire@gmail.com) or call our office at 860-236-5442. Thank you!

---

This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms