

CTLCV Candidate Survey

Please complete this survey by July 30, 2016.



First Name: *

Todd

Last Name: *

Brown

Running For: *

House

Senate

District Number: *

29

Party: *

Democrat

Republican

Working Families

Other :

Campaign Mailing Address: *

todd@toddbrown.com

Phone: *

860-466-9224

Website:

ToddBrown.com

Email: *

Tod@ToddBrown.com

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 hate to have to add more legislative hurdles but state land need to be protected. No swapping parcels of land without public input to the "value" of both the property held and the new property being obtained.

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:

I work in an analytical chemistry lab and run tests on waste oils. I understand the risks to ground water. Even if most of central Connecticut's water is MDC surface water, we must not contaminate our resources.

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:

Our state should be able to get water data from the suppliers, again I hate to pass a law, but if the information is needed and the utilities won't provide the information on request then a law is needed.

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:

This should be addressed on a case by case basis. The water company in question is the MDC. The MDC has an excess of capacity, in the 1960s Pratt and Whitney alone used roughly one million gallons a day of water for machining and they now through recycling and different machining techniques use virtually no water. Now with the population of Connecticut roughly stagnant and water saving shower heads and toilets going from 3.5 gallons to 1.6 gallons and now 1.28 gallons, usage of water is down but capacity has not changed. If and it is a big if the capacity is there for this project and there would be no impact on consumers why not sell excess water and possibly reduce rates to homeowners.

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:

I have a photo-voltaic array on the roof of my home. If not for state and federal subsidies it would not have been cost effective to do this installation. This is a win win, less greenhouse gasses being produced and I have a lower electric bill. We use exclusively LED bulbs and most of them purchased were subsidized by a line charge from the utility. Again a lower cost for me and less energy usage by traditional generation sources.

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:

With cheap oil available the target is going to be hard to meet. If the state truly wants to meet its goal then yes interim targets are the way to go.

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:

I live in Rocky Hill, we bonded ten million dollars as seed money for an open space fund. The goal is to maintain at least 20% of the land. It should be up to each town how they fund open space, if a town wants a conveyance fee and needs state legislation to enact such a fee then yes I would support that legislation.

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:

Our household has reusable shopping bags, but we also re-use any plastic shopping bags and eventually our bags are recycled or used in such a way that they end up in the waste stream going to the garbage collector. Is a ban or a tax on the bags the right way to go for Connecticut?

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:

Our town accepts used tires at the transfer facility. Every automotive shop I have bought tires at will for a fee dispose of the used tires. I would need to see if there is a need for a law like this. If there is a problem with used tires being improperly disposed of then I would support the least restrictive legislation to fix the problem.

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:

Is this something the private sector could do without a government program? If this is shown to me to need government involvement and would help meeting the states plan to cut CO2 emissions then I would support it.

11. What environmental concerns are you most passionate about?

I love open space. I run on the Blue Blaze trails across Connecticut. I want to see open space preserved for recreation. I want that open space large enough so that trails seem to be in woods and not in backyards.

I also kayak on the Connecticut River. The river has come back a long way since the worst of the pollution in the 1960s. But more can be done to protect, our waterways.

I hate adding legislation to deter business, but on the other hand business needs to act in a responsible and sustainable manner. If they do not do the "right" thing then I will support legislation to require them to act in a responsible manner.

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?

Our district seems in very good shape from a pollution standpoint. Most of the district is in Rocky Hill. Our biggest goal right now is trying to build a path linking all the various parks. Any state money for a greenway would be great. There are railroad tracks in town that get used once a week. The DOT does not want to give up the right-of-way for a rails to trails. State funding for a fence and widening of the rail bed would be a wonderful way to open up the meadows along the Connecticut River floodplain and then south to River Highlands State Park.

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 or call our office at 860-236-5442. Thank you!



This content is neither created nor endorsed by Google.

Google Forms