



Background Material for 2008 Candidate Survey

DEP Funding

Overview

In 2008, many environmental advocacy groups coalesced around ensuring that the Department of Environmental Protection is adequately funded. Environmental advocates requested \$5 million for Department of Environmental Protection operations as one step toward increasing general operating funds from .02% to .04% of the general fund - an exceedingly modest amount compared to other agency budgets.

During the 2008 legislative session, the Appropriations Committee passed a budget bill that would have increased DEP's overall budget by \$3 million for staffing and operations with funds from the general fund. This amount was the minimum to get the agency on track to carry out the state's environmental goals as embodied in the state's law and policies. The economic downturn led the legislature to abandon its revised budget, leaving the Department of Environmental Protection continuing to be woefully understaffed and underfunded.

For more information, see [Dreams Deferred? An Assessment of the Cost of Attaining Connecticut's Goals for State Parks and Environmental Protection Recent](#), by the Council on Environmental Quality.

Bottle Bill

Overview

One of the priorities of the Department of Environmental Protection's 2006 draft Solid Waste Management Plan (SWMP) is to update Connecticut's beverage container deposit law, enacted in 1978. With the goal of increasing recycling, environmental advocates have also been working to add water bottles, and containers for other non-carbonated beverages, to the state recycling deposit program.

30-Year Old Beverage Deposit Law Needs to be Updated

Originally a litter control measure, the successes of the "bottle bill" have been far-reaching. Connecticut's law helped create a flourishing "after-market" for aluminum and PET (polyethylene terephthalate) plastics nationwide.

DEP's Solid Waste Management Plan Endorses Expanding the Beverage Container Deposit Law

The SWMP proposes to update the beverage container deposit law to include the sports drinks, bottled water, iced teas, and other non-carbonated beverages that were not marketed in 1978. If these beverage container types are not included, more and more recyclable material will be tossed into the garbage and local municipalities will have to pay for cleanup and disposal.

The SWMP also recommends that the state escheat unclaimed deposits as abandoned property. Unclaimed bottle deposits should be treated the same way as bank accounts whose rightful owners cannot be located. Unclaimed deposits amount to about \$25 million a year. In effect, these unclaimed deposits, which are kept by the beer and soda distributors, are a state-initiated subsidy for these companies.

Environmental Advocates Generally Support:

- 1) Requiring deposits on non-carbonated beverage containers;
- 2) Increasing the outdated five-cent deposit;
- 3) Increasing and equalizing the handling fees wholesalers pay to retailers and redemption centers to process empty bottles. These fees have not been increased in twenty years, making it practically impossible to create new redemption businesses; and
- 4) Returning unclaimed bottle and can deposits to the state.

Advantages of Expanding the Scope of Redemption Recycling

Over *1.5 billion* bottles and cans of carbonated beverages are sold annually in Connecticut alone. Of these, nearly 70% are returned for deposit.

- 1) Without redemption recycling, municipalities and the state must fund widespread litter cleanup, disposal, and materials processing, including ever-increasing waste transportation costs.
- 2) The deposit system ensures a steady stream of clean recycled material to end users.
- 3) Because the deposit system is privately funded, recycling is not interrupted when government budgets are cut. The beverage container deposit incentive system pays for itself.
- 4) Municipal budgets are limited and recycling competes with everything else a town must fund, including schools, road maintenance and senior citizen centers.
- 5) Effective solid waste management is in itself sound public policy, but the implications for climate change that are influenced by our solid waste choices make it that much more imperative. We must aggressively pursue options that maximize energy conservation and resource conservation and minimize the emissions of greenhouse gases. Requiring deposits on noncarbonated beverage bottles will induce more people to redeem them, increasing recycling rates and thus reducing the costs to municipalities (and their taxpayers) for solid waste disposal.

Soft Drink Association & Other Opponents Want the State and Towns to Bear the Cost of Recycling and Litter Clean Up

The National Soft Drink Association, grocery stores and the wine and alcoholic beverage industries have fought a relentless battle against expanding the reach of Connecticut's redemption recycling law. Instead of absorbing the costs of managing their container waste, they prefer that taxpayers bear that cost through curbside recycling programs or with increased fees for waste removal. Grocers argue that they should not have to bear the burden and mess of redemption centers.

A redemption recycling program can alleviate budget pressures for municipalities and towns and will help raise Connecticut's recycling levels to suggested Solid Waste Management Plan levels.

For more information, see [Connecticut Recyclers Coalition](#).

Face of Connecticut

Overview

A coalition of groups introduced the *Face of Connecticut* campaign to help Connecticut preserve open space, retain its rural character, keep its waterways clean and revitalize its urban centers. The Face of Connecticut Campaign calls for new policies, as well as comprehensive and consistent funding by the state to support action in four areas that will preserve the unique qualities of Connecticut's diverse landscape for generations to come. Some Face of Connecticut provisions passed in 2007 and 2008.

Funding for the Face of Connecticut is Essential

Provisions for funding the *Face of Connecticut* have yet to be adopted. The Face of Connecticut Fund will embody the state's commitment to invest over the next ten years in preserving Connecticut's distinctive landscapes, historic villages and urban centers.

The Fund will receive and disburse funds consistent with principles of responsible growth and the safeguarding of our natural and manmade landscapes and historic assets. The Fund will operate according to specific directives to preserve our state's natural and cultural heritage for future generations.

The Face of Connecticut campaign is seeking \$100 million lump sum annually for the next ten years. Part of the \$100 million includes existing funding that has been provided in recent state budgets to programs and projects critical to the Face of Connecticut campaign. The remainder of the \$100 million is essential to properly finance existing programs, to meet community needs and to implement critical new programs. The Fund will offer loans that will help to grow its own reserves and act as a rapid response entity to address urgent needs.

The Fund will appear before the Bond Commission once a year for funding, but can also accept donations from federal, corporate and individual donors.

A minimum of 65% or \$65 million will be used to fully fund the following existing programs, which either receive bonding or are funded through earmarks:

- 1) Department of Environmental Protection – \$25 million
Open Space and Watershed Land Acquisition Matching Grants Program
Recreation and Natural Heritage Trust Fund
- 2) Department of Agriculture – \$20 million
Farmland Preservation Program
Joint Town-State Farmland Preservation Program
- 3) Commission on Culture and Tourism, Historic Preservation Division, & the CT Trust for Historic Preservation – \$20 million
Historic Preservation Planning Fund
Historic Landscapes Fund

A minimum of 35% or approximately \$35 million will fund new programs to fill gaps in existing state programs through grants and loans to agencies, qualified non-profits and/or municipalities. The new programs, which will be administered by a 12-member Steering Committee consisting of agency heads and appointees of the Governor and leaders of the Connecticut General Assembly, will consist of the following:

- 1) Historic Villages and Urban Centers
Municipal Planning Grants – Grants to municipalities to pay for expert assistance with land use and historic preservation planning, including help with updating Town Plans

of Conservation and Development and revising land use and historic preservation regulations to meet the objectives of Responsible Growth and town Plans of Conservation and Development. Urban Parks Grant Program – Fund projects to create, renovate, and enhance urban parks; Livable Communities Grant Program – Grants for local initiatives that create links between land conservation, affordable housing and/or historic preservation.

2) Distinctive Landscapes

Greenways and Active Recreation Fund – support the development of greenways and public recreational facilities; Locally Significant Farms Fund – Provide funds for the purchase of development rights or fee acquisition of small, locally important working farms that contribute to education, food security and/or economic development within their communities and/or the region; and for a forgivable loan program for beginner farmers for land acquisition and infrastructure investments in return for operating and stewarding a locally important working farm.

3) Projects of High Importance

Rapid Response Funds - Distributions to existing agency programs based on demonstrated need; Low interest loan program - Provide low interest loans to municipalities and non-profits to assist in purchase of endangered open space, farmland and historic buildings, including restrictive covenants.

For more information, see www.faceofconnecticut.com; [Public Act No. 08-174](#); [Public Act No. 07-131](#); [Benefits to Municipalities](#).

Medical Waste Disposal

Overview

Many drugs and other chemicals enter the environment following ingestion and excretion, application by the user, or application to domestic animals. Rivers and the Long Island Sound are the ultimate recipients of these chemicals.

Although wastewater treatment plants effectively treat solid waste, many pollutants, such as pharmaceuticals and household products, may not be removed as effectively. For example, United States Geological Survey studies across the nation have found that pharmaceuticals exist in a very high percentage of the rivers that were tested. The full effects on the environment are often unknown.

Approximately 85% of the drugs used in a typical hospital are routinely sewered or landfilled. A typical hospital uses an estimated 2,000 to 4,000 pharmaceutical products.

Chemotherapy agents are often sent to a regulated medical waste incinerator due to radioactivity. Federal regulations allow more than 100 toxic chemotherapeutic agents to be sewered or landfilled. The EPA issued new guidelines on Feb 20, 2008. These guidelines suggest individuals should dispose of unused drugs by either mixing them with undesirable substances (like kitty litter or coffee grounds) and depositing them in the garbage, or bringing the drugs to a community pharmaceutical take-back program. The guidelines continue to advise flushing certain controlled substances down the toilet.

Sewage treatment plants receive residential, commercial, industrial, and hospital wastes through sanitary sewers. Connecticut's nine sewage treatment plants discharge up to 35 million gallons of treated wastewater into the state's rivers every day. On balance, these facilities do a very good job of meeting the limits set for them for bacteria nutrients, and

other common pollutants found in solid wastes, but they were not constructed to remove pharmaceuticals or the constituents of many personal care products from the waste stream.

Environmental Effects of Medications in Water

The effects of these substances on the environment are under study internationally. At low levels of exposure, the following problems have emerged. (Keep in mind that Connecticut residents are less susceptible to impacts from substances in public drinking water supplies, because we are the one state that does not allow water that has received a discharge to be offered as potable.) Even low levels of these chemicals are problematic:

- 1) Antibiotics in water supplies are cause for concern because the most frequently used antibiotics are becoming less effective as the infections they are designed to combat become resistant. Resistance increases with heightened exposure to the drugs.
- 2) Research has linked certain endocrine disrupting chemicals to testicular cancer, urinary tract birth defects, low sperm counts, and premature onset of menses in people who regularly drink water containing these compounds.
- 3) Research has shown that pharmaceuticals such as Prozac, a commonly described antidepressant, can interfere with the reproductive cycle of freshwater mussels.
- 4) The naturally-occurring and synthetic estrogen in birth control pills and hormone replacement therapy drugs has been implicated in hindering larval lobster development, shell growth, reproduction and can make them more susceptible to the bacteria that cause shell disease.
- 5) Synthetic estrogen can mimic or blocks hormones and can disrupt normal body functions, evidenced by male fish being taking on female sexual characteristics downstream of STPs.
- 6) Low doses of nonylphenol have profoundly adverse effects on oysters, causing disruption of sexual development, and lowering survival of offspring in the next generation.

What We Can Do

Connecticut can take a variety of actions to reduce the problem:

- 1) Prohibit the disposal of medications by hospitals, nursing homes, and other institutions to wastewater treatment facilities
- 2) Enact legislation to authorize a pilot take-back program for pharmaceuticals that would allow citizens to return unused medications to pharmacies or allow hospitals to return unused medications to pharmaceutical manufacturers for reuse or proper disposal. (Presently, hospitals may return unused and unopened drugs to manufacturers for credit, but once drugs are opened, they become a regulated substance by the Drug Enforcement Agency and must be disposed of as medical waste.)
- 3) Require large sewage treatment facilities to monitor pharmaceuticals being discharged into surface waters and groundwater. Similarly, the Department of Environmental Protection should consider permit limits for pharmaceuticals and personal care products (PPCPs) in sewage treatment facilities.
- 4) Sewage treatment plants should be adapted to filter out new types of contaminants, including pharmaceuticals.

- 5) Adopt pharmaceutical take-back programs for safe disposal of expired and unwanted medications as the legal method of disposal.
- 6) Alter Federal Drug Enforcement Administration rules that prohibit transfer of narcotics, even if being discarded, without the presence of law enforcement officials.
- 7) Update the rules developed in the 1970's governing disposal of pharmaceutical wastes to identify and regulate newly developed hazardous and highly toxic drugs.
- 8) Educate consumers about the environmental hazards of pharmaceutical products and their proper disposal, perhaps through labeling.

For more information, see [CT Department of Environmental Protection fact sheet](#).

Riverfront Protection

Overview

The environmental community advocates addressing the degradation of water quality in the state's rivers and streams by requiring a protective buffer where possible. Buffers prevent polluted runoff from entering rivers. The goal of legislation proposed in 2008 was to provide for 100-foot vegetated buffers along rivers and streams statewide, with exemptions for built-up areas, redevelopment and agriculture.

The environmental community intends to submit legislation to protect riverfronts again in 2009. Proposed legislation will:

- 1) Apply to riverfronts along fresh-water perennial streams.
- 2) Conserve natural vegetation along river banks insofar as possible within a 100-foot corridor on each side of the river by requiring a permit for many activities within the corridor.
- 3) Be administered under the Inland-Wetlands and Water Courses statute.
- 4) Provide exemptions for as-of-right uses, such as agriculture, identified in the Inland-Wetlands and Water Courses statute, which are administered under that statute.
- 5) Encourage redevelopment of brownfields and other distressed areas.
- 6) Allow single-family homes, driveways, and septic systems on small lots, filed with town clerk as of 10/08 and buildable, so long as located as far from riverfront as feasible, lawn is limited to construction area and driveways are permeable;
- 7) Allow single-family homes, driveways, and septic systems on lots that are legal as of October 2008, if their size or shape would make it extremely difficult to protect the corridor, so long as the riverfront is affected as little as possible.
- 8) Permit a variety of ancillary uses within the corridor.
- 9) Provide inter-town consistency by stipulating that any activity requiring a permit and not an "as of right" use must protect 95% of the vegetated riverfront area, and all such activities must be located more than 50' from riverfront/wetlands boundary and must be located outside of important wildlife habitat.
- 10) Protect the waters of the state from further degradation caused by cutting and covering over the natural buffers on river banks.

The Home Builders Association was particularly hostile to the 2008 bill and several legislators contended that it was a regulatory taking of property. Chief defenders of the bill noted that Massachusetts instituted a 200-foot buffer, twice as much as proposed for in Connecticut. This did not stop development, but would put the buffer into a “regulated” area, subject to local zoning decisions.

For more information, see <http://www.riversalliance.org/legislation.cfm>

Transportation and Mass Transit

Enhanced public bus transportation throughout Connecticut can lead to enormous economic, social, and environmental benefits that are complementary. Public transportation provides an alternative to single-occupant automobile travel which is causing ever-increasing congestion on our roadways. Bus transit can offer viable options for improved access to jobs, while benefiting the environment and the economy. Importantly, enhancements to bus transit are most often possible with significantly shorter implementation timeframes than capital-intensive transportation investments and are more adaptable in response to the changing demands of the public.

Making Connecticut’s transportation systems more efficient and intentionally interconnected will help manage overall traffic congestion, reduce environmental impacts, and reap economic benefits.

“Multimodal” connections, such as those between trains and buses, make it easier to use alternatives to the private automobile. Public transit can enhance the efficiency of the overall transportation network as people make fewer individual trips by car, resulting in fewer cars on the roads.

Reduced traffic congestion and fewer vehicle trips reduce pollution. Similarly, clean vehicle technology will further reduce particulate and greenhouse gas emissions. Moreover, transit advances the principles of Responsible Growth and Transit Oriented Development initiatives designed to reduce sprawl.

Compared to single occupant auto use, high-occupancy public transit saves energy, particularly gasoline. Increased transit service supports the goals of the Connecticut Climate Change Action Plan, including the goal of doubling ridership levels statewide by 2020 and a corresponding reduction in vehicle miles traveled (VMT) below the 2020 baseline.

For more information, see www.cfenv.org (go to programs > global warming > transportation); [Moving Forward: Report & Recommendations of Connecticut’s Transportation Strategy Board](#).

Enhancements to Inland Wetlands and Watercourses Act

Overview

Wetlands soak up water in heavy rains and hold it in the ground. This water can then recharge wells and streams in hot, dry weather. Connecticut has already lost approximately 75 percent of its original wetlands, and the recurring cycles of flood and drought make it clear that we cannot afford to lose any more.

Legislation proposed, but not enacted, in 2008 would have:

- 1) Explicitly stated that the purpose of wetlands law is to protect wetlands, thereby helping local wetlands commissions carry out their work;
- 2) Let commissioners give weight in their decision-making process to credible evidence, such as recommendations from water utilities; and
- 3) Confirmed that burden is on the applicant to prove that his or her project will not harm water resources.

This proposal had deep and wide support, including that of numerous environmental organizations, the Connecticut Association of Inland Wetlands Commissioners, and the DEP. It was opposed by the Home Builders Association of Connecticut. Advocates expect the 2008 bill to be brought back in 2009 with even more public support.

Court Decisions Gut Authority and Purpose of Inland Wetlands Commissions

The need for the 2008 bill arose as several court decisions over the last six years determined that wetlands commissions do not have the authorities that most commissioners and others had assumed that they had. For example, the Inland-Wetlands and Watercourses Act (CGS §§ 22a-36 to 22a-45) speaks to regulating wetlands in a protective manner and balancing protection with economic growth. It does not, apparently, fully commit the state to wetlands protection. The 2008 legislation specifically declared it state public policy to prevent inland wetlands and watercourses from being spoiled and destroyed.

Also, courts have begun to shift the burden of proof in a permit application from the applicant to the commission, and to require commissions to find experts to testify to every aspect of the application. Existing law states indirectly that the burden is on the applicant, but the 2008 legislation stated this principle directly and explicitly.

The 2008 legislation also afforded to commissioners some specific examples of the kind of credible evidence they can consider when evaluating the permit. This is a commonsense interpretation of what sort of evidence is credible if not legally and technically "expert." The examples include 1) scientific evidence and expert opinion; 2) direct observations of the proposed regulated activity; 3) environmental reviews, policy letters, and guidance documents provided by, or on behalf of, an environmental review team or the Department of Environmental Protection; 4) written comments or oral testimony submitted by the public health commissioner, or by or on behalf of, a water company responding to written notice it received according to law.

For more information, see <http://www.riversalliance.org/legislation.cfm>.

Municipal Green Fund

Overview

Property taxes underwrite most municipal conservation expenditures, such as land acquisition and protection, diesel retrofitting of municipal vehicles, stormwater management and sewage treatment facilities for clean water, brownfield remediation, and energy conservation initiatives such as "green buildings" and alternative transportation. Thus conservation projects compete with education, infrastructure, and other administrative municipal projects for property tax revenues.

Environmental advocates propose enacting "Municipal Green Fund" enabling legislation that would allow, but not require, municipalities to raise money through a local conveyance tax for conservation purposes. Each municipality would have to adopt the new law for it to take effect.

The Community Investment Act, passed in 2005, levies a \$30 fee on land record filings and dedicates \$26 of the fee to fund farmland, open space, historic preservation and affordable housing. While a positive step in the right direction, this current level of funding is inadequate to the task. Furthermore, the fees are administered by the state through existing programs that often favor projects where local matching grants are available. As a result, many less wealthy communities fail to meet the local matching requirements and lose out to wealthier communities. Property taxes provide limited opportunity for increased funding levels for conservation. A Municipal Green Fund transfer fee of up to 1% would let municipalities raise funds to leverage additional private, state and federal grants for important regional conservation projects in the range of \$300 million.

The homebuilding and realtor interests claim that a land acquisition conveyance tax makes housing unaffordable for lower-income buyers. To limit the effect on the less affluent, it has been proposed that the first \$100,000 of value on a real estate conveyance be exempt from the fee. It has also been proposed that municipalities could use some Municipal Green Fund monies to purchase real estate for affordable housing to meet this need.

The proposed Municipal Green Fund fee is fair to communities because it would be a voluntary choice by the town to adopt such a fund and it would be a fee on real estate buyers. The buyer uses local land and services, and thus benefits from Municipal Green Fund projects that enhance a community.

Recreating a State Department of Energy

Overview

From roughly 1974 to 1977, Connecticut had a "Department of Planning and Energy Policy." At its height, the state energy office employed 88 people in varied aspects of energy. It brought the topic of energy into the mind and actions of Connecticut citizens. Through a general reorganization in 1977, it was merged into the Office of Policy & Management.

According to the Hartford *Courant's* report on a survey conducted by the Institute for Social Inquiry, 80% of the people surveyed said they thought the energy crisis was "serious" or "very serious" in 1980. But by 1984, only 50% of the people surveyed still saw the energy crisis as "serious" or "very serious." (In 1981 -1982, oil rose to \$40 per barrel. The price plummeted in 1984.) With the drop in oil prices, the value of the Energy Office was diminished and its staff was reassigned.

In October 2002, the Legislative Program Review and Investigations Committee undertook a study entitled "Energy Management by State Government." Significantly, the Committee observed that "No single individual or governmental entity has overall responsibility for energy policy in Connecticut; more than a dozen state governmental bodies have specific energy-related responsibilities. In addition, numerous types of private businesses play important roles making energy products and services available. Federal entities also are important participants in setting energy policies."

Some advocates propose resurrecting a centralized Connecticut Department of Energy, mostly to assume the duties of the Energy Division of OPM and some duties of the reconstituted Connecticut Energy Advisory Board, coordinating energy policy and implementation.

Some advocates believe there should be two major energy entities: The Department of Public Utility Control that would deal specifically with regulated electric and gas utilities, and a new Department of Energy to handle general coordination of policy and oversee all other

energy functions not under the purview of the DPUC. There are many other views on how to address energy issues.

For more details on the interrelated topics of energy and global warming, see the next section.

Energy & Global Warming

Overview

2001 was a landmark year for global warming. That was the year the world's main scientific advisory body, the Intergovernmental Panel on Climate Change, issued its report confirming that the earth had warmed significantly over the last 50 years and that human activities explained much of the recent rise in temperatures. 2001 was also the year the United States announced it would no longer participate in the binding international agreement to reduce global warming pollution, known as the Kyoto Protocol.

Since 2001, the science of global warming has become increasingly clear and urgent, and Connecticut and the New England states have emerged as internationally recognized leaders in creating solutions to global warming.

Connecticut's challenge is to implement solutions to global warming that will reduce our contribution to the problem, move us beyond our dependence on fossil fuels, and set an example for other states and the nation to follow.

The global scientific consensus is that burning fossil fuels—oil, coal, and gas—intensifies the atmospheric concentration of carbon dioxide (CO₂), the principal greenhouse gas that contributes significantly to global warming by trapping the sun's heat. Current levels of carbon dioxide in the atmosphere are unprecedented in human history, and a September 2006 NASA study indicated that the earth's temperatures are nearing the highest level in the last 12,000 years, and closing in on the hottest in the last million years. The negative effects of global warming will be felt in Connecticut, as in the rest of the world through heat-related illnesses and deaths, insect-borne diseases and coastal flooding. Financial costs are rising as a result of an increasingly unstable climate. The Reinsurance Association of America reported that insurers paid \$57 billion for weather-related losses in the first half of the 1990s compared with \$17 billion for the entire previous decade, and \$58 billion in claims in 2005 alone. Connecticut, which has over \$400 billion in insured coastal assets, is the sixth most exposed state in the nation, and climate-related damage could risk our economic future.

New England responds to global warming: Faced with inaction at the federal level, states have taken the lead. In 2001, the Conference of New England Governors and Eastern Canadian Premiers (NEG/ECP) agreed on a broad Climate Change Action Plan for reducing greenhouse gas emissions. The plan projects greenhouse gas emissions will be reduced in the region to 1990 levels by 2010, 10% below 1990 levels by 2020, and by 75-85% in the long term, levels that scientists believe are necessary to stabilize the climate. Further, the Climate Change Action Plan identifies the aspects of global warming which are within the region's control to influence.

In Connecticut, transportation and electricity generation are the largest sources of carbon dioxide, with heating and industrial activity accounting for much of the remainder. More than 75% of New England's electricity comes from non-renewable sources such as coal, natural gas, oil, and nuclear power. The heavy reliance on increasingly scarce and expensive fossil fuels threatens Connecticut's environmental and economic stability.

To begin to address this problem, in 2004, the Connecticut General Assembly passed global warming legislation (PA 04-252), making the regional global warming goals Connecticut law and directing the state agencies to develop near- and long-term plans for meeting the goals. Pursuant to this act, on February 15th, 2005 the Governor's Steering Committee on Climate Change released a comprehensive Connecticut Climate Change Action plan with 55 policies for reducing global warming pollution.

In December 2005, Governor Rell committed the state to take part in a seven state program, called the Regional Greenhouse Gas Initiative (RGGI), to cut carbon dioxide pollution from power plants throughout the northeast. Under RGGI, power plants are allowed to meet the reduction requirements by either reducing their own emissions, or by buying pollution credits from a facility that makes reduces carbon emissions more than it is required to.

The urgency of meeting the state's targets is underscored by the recent scientific findings regarding the current pace of warming. While Connecticut has completed the necessary planning and analysis to hit the 2010 target, emissions continue to rise, and many of the key measures of the Climate Change Action Plan have yet to be carried out.

The state and federal governments, as well as community organizations, the scientific community and businesses have acknowledged that global warming exists and it needs to be addressed.

Connecticut corporations, such as United Technologies Corporation, General Electric and Pfizer, seizing the economic opportunities that arise from being the first to bring innovative technologies to the marketplace, are leading the charge to reduce greenhouse gas emissions while increasing their own profitability.

Even though clean and efficient technologies continue to improve, global warming is caused by the burning of fossil fuels in all their applications. Thus, no single solution can prevent the negative effects of global warming. The longer we wait, the more costly it will be to make deep reductions in carbon emissions.

Opponents to taking action stress that since Connecticut is a small state with limited ability to solve a global problem, we should wait for action at the Federal level. Fortunately Connecticut recognizes that a small state can play a significant leadership role by setting an example for other states and the nation to follow. Our successes will help demonstrate the feasibility of reducing greenhouse gases and bring about Federal action much sooner. Only if Connecticut reduces its own contribution to the problem will it have the moral standing to ask other states, Washington D.C., and even other nations to reduce theirs. States have traditionally led the Federal government on environmental policy. Global warming is no different.

To meet the goals set by the Connecticut Climate Change Action Plan the governor and legislature must: 1) Create energy efficiency programs for natural gas and heating oil customers. 2) Participate in the northeastern governors' initiative to reduce carbon pollution from power plants. 3) Double the recycling rate and reuse material to reduce greenhouse gas emissions from waste handling, transport and disposal. 4) Reduce "black carbon" soot from diesel engines. 5) Mandate that ratepayer money go to cost-saving energy efficiency programs before spending money on expensive new power plants or other supply sources.

For more information, see <http://www.ctclimatechange.com>.

Toxics

Overview

Toxic chemicals have become widespread in our air, water, food, schools, workplaces, everyday products, fish and wildlife, and ultimately, our bodies. Scientific studies are increasingly indicating that toxic chemicals contribute to an epidemic of diseases and disorders.

More than one third of the US population is suffering from a range of chronic diseases, including cancers, asthma, infertility, learning and developmental disabilities, birth defects, and neurodegenerative diseases such as Parkinson's disease.

Most people have over one hundred chemicals in their bodies. The chemicals in this "toxic soup" interact with each other in the environment and our bodies, creating unpredictable damage. In addition, preventable illnesses and disabilities impose staggering costs on our economy and overburden scarce health care resources. The European Union has already updated their standards and is requiring the phase out of many of the most hazardous ingredients in consumer products.

We can replace toxic chemicals with safer alternatives. State government can help Connecticut businesses change to a healthy economy based on safer production, safer products and safer jobs.

Connecticut, a frequent leader on environmental health policy and a major trade partner with Europe, can maintain its competitiveness through innovation and leadership in the development of products and practices that protect public health and environmental quality.

Many states are proposing, and two states have already passed, legislation to establish a pragmatic, gradual approach to reducing health impacts from many toxic chemicals we are exposed to in everyday life.