

### Rep. Craig Miner Anti-Environment Votes 2001-2016

Year	Bill	Subject	Explanation
2016	SJ 36	Constitutional Amendment	<p>To place a constitutional amendment measure on the ballot, the General Assembly must pass a joint resolution with a two-thirds majority in both chambers or a simple majority in two consecutive legislative sessions.</p> <p>Senate Joint Resolution 36, now Resolution Act 16-1, was passed by both chambers in 2016 but with only a simple majority in the House. If passed again in 2017, the public would vote in a referendum in 2018 to amend the State Constitution to better protect state conservation lands from being sold, swapped, or given away without a public hearing and a two-thirds vote by the General Assembly. The bill is scored in the Government Administration &amp; Elections Committee, Environment Committee, House, and Senate.</p>
2016	HB 5150	Trees	<p>This bill was part of an ongoing effort to protect against unnecessary tree cutting or clearing of vegetation by utilities along town roads. Signed into law as Public Act 16-86, utilities must give notice every January to municipalities where tree work will be done. Each town must post that information online within 15 days of receiving it. In addition, utilities are responsible for removing debris after all planned tree work occurs. The bill is scored in the Transportation Committee, Environment Committee, House, and Senate.</p>
2016	HB 5315	Snapping Turtles	<p>A provision in this bill would have extended to snapping turtles the same protections afforded all other Connecticut animals in the rules for commercial trade. Snappers alone are excluded from these protections. Despite the important role they play in Connecticut's ecosystems, their value was not considered and the important snapping turtle provision was removed before final passage of the bill. Only the Environment Committee vote is scored when the provision was included.</p>
2016	SB 231	Pollinators	<p>This legislation, now Public Act 16-17, was a significant win toward reducing the use of pesticides that are particularly harmful for pollinators like bees, butterflies, and hummingbirds. The new law restricts the use of neonicotinoids, a category of pesticide that is linked to pollinator die-offs and is also extremely toxic to aquatic organisms. Additionally, a program will be established to expand and protect habitats that are important for pollinators. The bill and one hostile amendment are scored in the Environment Committee, Planning &amp; Development</p>

2016	HB 5299	Flame Retardants	This bill sought to protect Connecticut's children from exposure to carcinogens and other harmful chemicals contained in flame retardants. Similar to laws in several other states, it would have banned five chemical flame retardants used in children's products and upholstered residential furniture, and prohibited manufacturers from replacing them with other harmful chemicals. This bill was scored in the Children's Committee and the House, where it gained broad bipartisan support as an important measure to protect the health and safety of our youngest citizens, as well as firefighters, who suffer health consequences when they are exposed to these burning chemicals. The bill was blocked in the Senate by one legislator, Senator Robert Kane, putting the interests of a chemical manufacturer in his district above public health concerns.
2016	SB 233	Consumer Packaging	Consumer packaging materials, or the materials used in shipping commercial items, are becoming one of the largest sources of waste in our state. This bill, now Special Act 16-6, establishes a task force to study methods for reducing, through source reduction, reuse and recycling, consumer packaging that generates solid waste in the state. Although the bill was significantly weakened before final passage, it is the first effort by our state to focus specifically on the problem of consumer packaging. Votes are scored in the Environment Committee, House, and Senate.
2016	HB 5500	First Time Violators	This bill would have authorized state agencies to suspend civil punishments against businesses for first-time violations. If this bill had been passed, it would have undermined the authority of DEEP to enforce air, water, and waste programs. The bill is scored in the Government Administration & Elections Committee and the House. It died without a vote in the Senate.
2015	HB 6839	Long Island Sound Blue	All too often, we don't recognize the complex marine diversity that exists in our waters, particularly in Long Island Sound. This bill, now Public Act 15-66, will begin to create a marine inventory. The Long Island Sound Blue Plan will establish a bi-state, multi-stakeholder process for assessing the Sound's natural resources and uses, and planning for their protection. Connecticut and New York will coordinate their efforts to better manage this shared resource, and to provide science-based guidance on the placement and appropriateness of new or expanded projects. The plan will also provide an ongoing forum for identifying, discussing and developing solutions for issues of joint concern.
2015	HB 6035	Pesticides	This bill imposed restrictions on applying non-emergency pesticide, including lawn care pesticide, to state agency property, but not the University of Connecticut Research Farm. The bill somewhat tightened the standards for emergency exemptions, and required electronic public notice for pesticide applications on state agency property. It required that a pesticide applicator working on state agency property be certified by DEEP. The bill also authorized the use of certain non-toxic lawn-care products, both on state agency property and elementary and middle schools, where the referenced products were previously banned.

2015	SB 1063	Pesticides	This bill addressed the use of lawn-care pesticides on municipal properties where children and families may gather. It prohibited application of any lawn-care pesticide on municipal athletic fields, greens, parks, and playgrounds. It authorized the use of certain non-toxic agents primarily for grub control. This authorization was also extended to elementary and middle schools where use of lawn-care pesticides, including the referenced non-toxic agents, is generally banned under current law. Note, the original bill raised in the Environment Committee also banned the use of lawn-care pesticides in high schools (lawn-care pesticides are already banned in elementary and middle schools). Unfortunately, the inclusion of PAGE 22 Visit us on Facebook <a href="http://www.facebook.com/ctlcv">www.facebook.com/ctlcv</a> high schools was deleted, and the bill was further weakened in the Planning and Development Committee to apply restrictions only to municipal playgrounds.
2015	HB 6838	Residential Solar	This year's major energy effort revolved around solar power. This bill, now Public Act 15-194, was proposed by Governor Malloy to create new markets in this fast growing industry. For the average homeowner, however, converting to solar power can be cost-prohibitive. This new law provides incentives that could assist as many as 40,000 homes with state-backed financing. This opportunity will not only create jobs in the solar industry and help homeowners shift to solar power, it will help reduce Connecticut's greenhouse gas emissions.
2014	SB 443	Extended Pesticides Ban	The original aim was to expand the existing pesticide ban at pre-K through 8th grade schools to include parks, playgrounds, municipal town greens and high schools. The bill was altered in the Senate to ban the use and sale of genetically-engineered grass seed, but was summarily killed by leadership in the House.
2014	SB 237	Fracking Waste	This bill, now Public Act 14-200, creates a three year moratorium to keep toxic fracking waste out of our state temporarily, provides time to analyze the rapidly-developing science around its impacts and partially closes the federal loophole that would otherwise let fracking waste slip through Connecticut's hazardous waste laws.
2014	HB 5431	Environmental Violations	This bill would have endangered the environment and public health and safety by waiving fines for first-time violations of regulations.
2014	SB 443	Extended Pesticides Ban	The original aim was to expand the existing pesticide ban at pre-K through 8th grade schools to include parks, playgrounds, municipal town greens and high schools. The bill was altered in the Senate to ban the use and sale of genetically-engineered grass seed, but was summarily killed by leadership in the House.

2013	SB 1138	Clean Energy Goals	Under Connecticut's Renewable Portfolio Standard (RPS), utilities must get a rising percentage of the electricity they supply from new, clean, renewable sources such as wind and solar. The goal is that Class I (as designated by the RPS) clean renewable sources will account for 20% of Connecticut's electricity output by 2020, making Connecticut a national leader in clean energy. However, this new law, Public Act 13-303, allows utilities in some circumstances to permanently fill a percentage of their mandated clean energy portfolio using power from large environmentally damaging hydropower facilities like HydroQuébec and discourages investment into the development of local renewable sources.
2013	SB 814	CT Environmental Protection Act	The Connecticut Environmental Protection Act (CEPA) is a vital instrument in protecting the state's clean air, water, and open space. CEPA allows citizens to take legal action, usually as intervenors in administrative proceedings, to oppose unreasonable threats to the environment. This legislation aimed to revise CEPA in order to block or discourage baseless, vexatious suits. But the bill would have seriously weakened CEPA's usefulness as a fundamental defense against harm to the environment. Eventually a compromise was reached on a relatively modest revision that reflected recent court decisions with respect to the evidence required for a citizen to take action but that left CEPA substantially intact and still useful. Votes that supported the anti-environment version of the language before the compromise are counted negatively
2013	SB 1134	Outdoor Woodburning Furnaces	Although wood smoke from outdoor wood furnaces contains many of the same hazardous components as cigarette smoke, it lacks the same strict regulations meant to protect public health. This bill aimed to reduce air pollution resulting from outdoor wood furnaces by banning the sale of all furnaces after October 1, 2013 that do not meet Phase II emissions standards as specified by the U.S. Environmental Protection Agency. In addition, it required all outdoor wood-burning furnaces to burn only "clean wood," eliminating the burning of wood that has a paint or stain coating or has been chemically treated."
2013	HB 6441	Dam Safety	This new law, Public Act 13-197, requires dam owners to have their dams inspected periodically depending on the hazard presented by potential failure. A similar initiative in Massachusetts has enhanced both awareness and remediation of hazardous conditions and of fish habitat by inducing more dam owners to remove dams. The law also streamlines permits for dam removals that improve ecological conditions. A last minute amendment added language to ban spraying of two types of pesticides, resmethrin and methoprene, in coastal zones linked to lobster die-offs in Long Island Sound making the bill even better.

2013	HB 6538	Arborists & Tree Wardens	Passed into law, Public Act 13-203, establishes requirements for both arborist businesses and tree wardens with the purpose of ensuring the proper care and management of the state's urban forests. The law requires that arborist businesses register annually with DEEP and employ at least one licensed arborist. This law also requires municipal tree wardens to be professionally certified.
2013	HB 6437	Mattress Recycling	Connecticut alone disposes of 300,000 - 400,000 mattresses annually, at a cost to towns of over \$1 million. The law implements a mattress stewardship program to regulate post-consumer mattress disposal, encouraging recycling of mattress components. The law requires mattress producers to join a nonprofit mattress recycling council, and failure to do so prohibits them from selling mattresses in the state. This program will be funded by a mattress stewardship fee on mattresses sold in Connecticut, and should greatly reduce illegal dumping by offering disposal at no cost.
2012	SB 89	Mattress Recycling	This was a first attempt to require that manufacturers create a system whereby mattresses would be sent for component recycling, remanufacture, or other appropriate post-consumer disposal at the end of their useful life. This program would have operated in a similar fashion to programs for the disposal of electronic waste and unused paint. There would have been no cost to the municipalities or state to dispose of a mattress, and it would have reduced illegal dumping. This bill was raised by the Environment Committee, passed by the Senate, but failed to be called in the House.
2012	SB 274	Chemicals of High Concern	This bill would have required a collaborative effort by Department of Public Health, Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, and Department of Consumer Protection to prepare a report with regard to chemicals of high concern to children. The report would have compared Connecticut with other states and made recommendations on how to identify chemicals of concern and reduce exposure. This bill was raised by the Public Health Committee but died on the Senate calendar.
2012	SB 376	Coastal Zone Management	This bill would have placed an unprecedented burden on municipal zoning commissions concerning all coastal zone erosion control structures. It would have required commissions to either approve an applicant's proposal or spend money to develop an alternate engineering plan for the applicant. At the same time, it would have put serious constraints on the alternate plan. This bill was raised by the Environment Committee and passed the Planning and Development Committee. No was a pro-environment vote.
2012	SB 440	Phosphorus Reduction In Water	Following intense negotiations with the Speaker's staff, DEEP, environmental advocates, and municipal advocates, the anti-environmental provisions were softened, all affected municipalities were invited to the table, and a negotiated statement of legislative intent stipulated that nothing in the act would compromise DEEP's authority to regulate water quality under the Clean Water Act. This bill passed the Senate and House unanimously, and is now Public Act 12-155.

2012	HB 5121	Pesticides Preemption	This legislation attempted to remove the Connecticut lawn-care pesticide preemption statute and give local control by allowing towns to decide whether or not they wanted to adopt stricter lawn care methods than the state. This bill originated in the Environment Committee but died in the Planning and Development Committee. We also scored an amendment in the Environment Committee that would have killed this initiative.
2012	HB 5121	Amendment B	This legislation attempted to remove the Connecticut lawn-care pesticide preemption statute and give local control by allowing towns to decide whether or not they wanted to adopt stricter lawn care methods than the state. This bill originated in the Environment Committee but died in the Planning and Development Committee. We also scored an amendment in the Environment Committee that would have killed this initiative.
2011	SB 210	BPA in Receipts	and baby formula cans, food packaging and thermal receipt paper. This toxic chemical is associated with cancers, reproductive disorders, obesity, and diabetes, and adversely affects development of the infant brain and nervous system. The bill originally would have also required Connecticut's Chemical Innovations Institute to report annually on toxic chemicals and alternatives, but the General Law Committee removed that provision. The bill had bipartisan support.
2011	SB 866 & SB 1019	Green Fund	The Community Green Fund bill would have allowed, but not required, cities and towns to collect a real estate conveyance tax from real estate buyers to create a Community Green Fund for a variety of municipal environmental projects, such as investments in open space, farmland, parks, brownfield cleanup, energy conservation, alternative transportation, clean air and water, or affordable housing. The Community Green Fund would have created an alternative to funding conservation with local property taxes, resulting in stronger conservation and local control. The Community Green Fund was proposed at the start of the session as Senate Bill 834, which died without a vote. It was later reincarnated as Senate Bill 866. That version was struck down in the House, but resurrected once again as Bill 1019. Environment Committee Co-Chairs Senator Edward Meyer and Representative Richard Roy led a heroic effort to keep the Community Green Fund concept alive during the legislative session, but the realtors' and builders' short-sighted opposition prevailed and the bill died. Similar legislation was proposed in each of the last two years, but has not passed despite being implemented in other states with positive results for the environment and property values.

2011	SB 1196	Haddam Land Swap	<p>The passage of this legislation allows for a widely opposed land transfer in the town of Haddam from the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection (DEEP) to a private developer without environmental review, effectively violating the official Land Exchange Policy of DEEP. For the third consecutive year, Senator Eileen Daily has pressed forward with this controversial measure to transfer these 17 acres overlooking the Connecticut River from the state to a private developer. In exchange, the private developer will transfer an 87-acre tract adjacent to the Cockaponset State Forest in Higganum. Because the property that will be transferred to the developers was sold to the state expressly for the purpose of preserving it in its undeveloped, natural state, this legislation is bad public policy. It undermines the public's already diminished faith in government, and discourages future gifts or sales of land to the state for conservation purposes. If the land is going to be developed anyway, sellers have no incentive to donate or sell to the state and every incentive to sell to the highest bidder. Senators Edward Meyer, John McKinney, and Joe Markley, and Representatives Chris Donovan, Phil Miller, Diana Urban, and Terrie Wood were among the champions who worked with environmental advocates to oppose this provision—albeit unsuccessfully—until the last minutes of the legislative session.</p>
2011	SB 832	River Buffers	<p>This bill would have protected river and shoreline buffers by saving natural vegetation along Connecticut's rivers. Buffers consisting of natural vegetation and other low-impact development strategies are the best and cheapest approach to avoiding water pollution from storm water runoff, because they enhance natural filtration and control flooding by slowing flows and decreasing the volume of the runoff. Had this legislation passed, it would have protected inland wetlands and watercourses by requiring a 100-foot buffer between the water and buildings. This bill died because the Planning and Development Committee did not vote on it. A similar bill is expected to be raised again next year.</p>
2010	SB 120	DEP Guidance	<p>Bill 120 would have required the policies and guidance statements of the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) to be treated as regulations, and to be approved by the Legislative Regulations Review Committee. This legislative veto power over agency regulations is highly unusual, and an approach that many regarded as over-reaching and without constitutional validity. Bill 120 died on the Senate calendar.</p>

2010	SB 453	Regulatory Environment	<p>Bill 453 claimed to be designed to boost the economy and stimulate jobs through faster permitting, better compliance assistance and special attention to the challenges of small businesses. However, it would have accomplished this at the expense of the environment by rolling back the enforcement of environmental protections. The consequences of the bill, perhaps unintended, would have been to sacrifice clean water, air, and Connecticut's landscapes to expediency, for example, by setting tight deadlines for DEP action on permits and then requiring automatic approvals of applications if DEP missed the deadlines. SB-453 became the base for anti-environment provisions, to the point that it was dubbed the mother rat. To be fair, some of those who voted for it acknowledged that the bill was flawed and should not pass, and, in fact, it did die.</p>
------	--------	---------------------------	-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------



2010	SB 463 & SB 493	Energy Reform	<p>Bill 493 contained landmark energy reform provisions. It passed on the last day of the legislative session but ultimately was vetoed by the governor. Bill 463 became Bill 493 as part of an emergency-certification process late in the legislative session. Emergency certification (e-cert) is designed to enable a bill that has not been through committees to come to a vote. The process is intended to provide for the possibility of quick action in emergencies. The process does, however, limit public participation and debate. This large, omnibus bill resulted from negotiations with and between the two chairs of the Energy and Technology Committee. In 2009, the two had a poor working relationship, resulting in no significant energy legislation. This year brought welcome progress. Bill 493 would have bolstered the state's renewable energy industry, particularly solar power, and promoted energy efficiency. The bill detailed multiple programs to support solar energy, fuel cells, and energy efficiency; it allowed municipalities to establish loan programs for energy improvements to private property; it set energy efficiency standards for certain electronic devices. The bill was designed to reduce electric rates for Connecticut ratepayers, to provide relief for low-income customers, and to provide incentives for purchasing Connecticut products. The most original and controversial feature of the bill made a substantial change in energy management. The bill would have established a major new division in the Department of Public Utility Control (DPUC) responsible for power procurement, conservation and renewable energy, and research. Most of the details as to how this division would attain the goals of the bill were assigned to a working group consisting of the Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management (OPM), the Consumer Counsel, the DPUC chair, the Attorney General, the Executive Director of Connecticut Innovations—or their designees—and the Chairpersons and Ranking Members of the Energy and Technology Committee. This bill passed in the Senate by a 20-14 vote and in the House of Representatives by an 81-40 vote. Governor M. Jodi Rell's reasons for her veto included assertions that the bill would most likely raise, not lower, costs to consumers, and that it was not adequately vetted through a public hearing process. Others countered that a significant number of provisions in the energy bill were previously included in other bills, which had public hearings. Most of the environmental community deplored the veto, maintaining that the law would have provided urgently needed support for clean energy industries and moved the state toward more rational and efficient energy management. YES was the pro-environment vote"</p>
------	--------------------	---------------	-------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------

2010	HB 5418	Integrated Pest Management	Bill 5418, as originally proposed, would have required towns to adopt Integrated Pest Management (IPM) according to model plans to be developed by the DEP. IPM, which has no official, legal definition, aims to minimize the use of pesticides and herbicides. The requirement is already in place at state facilities. The bill, however, became a vehicle for rolling back the present total ban on the use of lawn care pesticides on the fields of nursery, elementary, and middle schools. There were also concerns that the bill would have discouraged further progress toward banning pesticides in other public areas (with exceptions for emergencies). The Environmental Committee voted on a version of the bill that specifically continued the protections for school grounds. The Planning and Development Committee proposed and voted on a change that would have weakened protections for schools. Thereafter, the bill died.
2009	SB 569	Inland Wetlands	This bill, championed by Rep. Mary Mushinsky and Sen. Ed Meyer, would have reaffirmed the state's mission in preserving and preventing the despoliation of inland wetlands and watercourses, thus guaranteeing them the same protection as tidal wetlands. Despite passing unanimously in the Senate after lengthy discussion, and lacking any state/municipal fiscal impact, this bill was withdrawn without a vote after both Democratic and Republican legislators began to filibuster the discussion during the last hours of session.
2009	SB 735	Complete Streets	The passing of the complete streets bill is one of the environmental successes of the 2009 legislative session. The bill, introduced by Sen. Gary Lebeau and championed by Rep. Tom Kehoe, requires at least 1% of all highway/street construction/rehabilitation funding to go toward transportation infrastructure for pedestrians and cyclists. It creates an 11-member Pedestrian and Bicycle Transportation Advisory Board charged with furthering bicycle/pedestrian friendly programs. Despite compromises that weakened the final bill, it substantially raises funding for non-motorized transportation that will help lower our Vehicle Miles Traveled (VMT), and consequently our impact on air quality and global warming.
2009	SB 747	Alt Sewage Systems	This bill originally aimed to reform permit rules for packaged sewage treatment units to take into account smart growth principles. Unfortunately, an anti-environment legislative rat proffered by Rep. David Labriola and Sen. Bob Kane, incorporated language from another Bill (SB 264) which would have exempted an expansion project at Oxford airport from the state-mandated environmental review process. A divided Environment Committee approved the amendment. Negotiations led to a satisfactory resolution, and the bill died without a vote.

2009	SB 871	DEP Enforcement	This bill would have imposed stricter fines, fees, and penalties linked to violations of environmental laws. It would have strengthened the DEP's ability to enforce laws already on the books. This bill passed in the Environment, Judiciary, and Planning and Development committees, but never made it to the Senate for a vote due to staunch opposition by business and industry representatives.
2009	SB 919	PBDEs	Polybrominated diphenyl ether (PBDE) is a flame retardant found in many household products. Types of PBDE are known to impact human health and advocates have been working for several years to pass legislation banning products with PBDE where there are safer alternatives.
2009	SB 1020	Pesticides@Day CareCtrs	This bill protects children from exposure to harmful chemicals by tightening restrictions on pesticide applications in day care facilities and schools.
2009	SB 1033	LEED Incentives	This bill will promote sustainable development by creating a transferable tax credit for green buildings meeting or exceeding LEED Gold standards. The size of each tax credit will be dependent on each direct cost involved in construction and structural rehabilitation. The bill passed nearly unanimously in both House and Senate.
2009	HB 5474	Recycling	This bill, championed by Rep. Linda Schofield, could have greatly improved recycling across the state by changing certain zoning restrictions, mandating municipalities to pick up recycling wherever they offer garbage pickup, directing school boards to develop and implement recycling plans, and by requiring recycling receptacles at common gathering places such as stadiums and parks. Passing nearly unanimously in the Environment Committee, Planning and Development Committee, and the House, this essential piece of legislation never made it to the Senate for a vote.
2009	HB 5934	Wetlands	The failure of the river bill marks one of the most troubling losses for Connecticut's environmental community. While in its final form the bill would have protected and preserved vegetation within 100 feet of a wetland or watercourse, concern from developers and home builders generated substantial confusion. This translated into questionable compromises in bill language, a divided Planning and Development Committee, and finally—the bill died on the House calendar without formal debate. The buffers would have prevented water pollution, protected our communities from floods, increased opportunities for recreation, controlled erosion, and provided vital habitats for Connecticut's increasingly displaced plants and animals.

2009	HB 6397	Green Fund	In its third year before the legislature, this bill would have allowed municipalities to create green funds to be used for local environmental projects of the town's choosing, such as purchasing open space, remediating brownfields, or increasing energy efficiency. These funds would be financed in their entirety by a buyer's fee on certain real property transactions. After passing the Environment Committee by a wide margin, the bill was referred to the Finance Committee where it died when leadership failed to raise the bill for a vote.
2009	HB 6496	Green Clean	This law will protect the health of Connecticut's children by mandating that local and regional school boards adopt nationally or internationally certified green cleaning programs that minimize effects on public health and the environment. The bill passed the Education and Appropriations committees, then unanimously in the Senate, and finally with a split vote in the House.
2009	HB 6572	BPA	This bill was a significant win for the environment. It bans the sale, manufacture, and distribution of reusable food containers and baby food/formula containers that include bisphenol-A, amid concerns that the chemical might harm the health of infants. The final bill passed nearly unanimously in both the Senate and House
2008	SB 357	Bottle Bill	This bill would have added bottles for water and other non-carbonated beverages to the state recycling deposit program. This initiative has been defeated for many years due to industry opposition and unwillingness by House leadership to bring the legislation to a vote despite overwhelming support by the public and most legislators.
2008	HB 5603	Inland Wetlands	This bill would have strengthened the authority of local wetlands commissions by explicitly stating that the goal of wetlands law is to protect wetlands, by allowing commissioners to give weight to credible experts and by placing the burden on the applicant to prove that the project will not harm water resources.
2008	SB 118 & HB 5145	Env. Justice	The Environmental Justice bill will help ensure that environmentally-stressed communities don't get burdened with more than their share of polluting facilities. The new law requires that an applicant seeking approval to site polluting facilities in an environmentally-stressed community: hold an informal public meeting; consult with officials of the town or towns where the facility will be located or expanded to evaluate the need for a community environmental benefit agreement; and file a meaningful public participation plan subject to the approval of DEP or the Connecticut Siting Council. Votes cast for SB 118, also addressing Environmental Justice, are included in the score. SB 118 was a parallel bill that only passed two committees.

2008	HB 5600	Global Warming	The global warming bill is widely regarded as this year's overwhelming winner. The bill caps emissions of global warming pollution and requires emissions cuts to 10% below 1990 levels by 2020 and 80% emissions reductions from 2001 levels by 2050. Connecticut is the fifth state, after California, New Jersey, Hawaii and Washington, to adopt mandatory limits on global warming pollution. Several anti-environmental amendments to the global warming bill were raised, and votes on those amendments are counted in legislators' scores.
2008	SB 136	On-Site Sewage Trtmt.	The on-site sewage treatment bill would have set a two-year moratorium for building advanced onsite sewage treatment systems processing more than 5000 gallons of sewage per day. The moratorium would have allowed more time to research the effectiveness, potential risks and proper oversight of these systems—uncertain issues at this time.
2008	HB 5601	Toxins, Lead, Phthal., BPA	The second of three bills addressing toxic chemicals in consumer products, this bill sought 1) to expand the list of hazardous substances that toys and other children's products may not contain if sold in Connecticut, 2) to require the Commissioner of Environmental Protection to compile a list of chemicals of concern, and 3) to create an Innovation Institute at The University of Connecticut to help Connecticut industries evaluate hazardous substances.
2008	HB 5805	Toxins: Flame Retardants	The third of the toxins trio, this bill also addressed toxic chemicals in consumer products. This bill sought to phase out the class of chemicals known as alkylphenol ethoxylates and certain toxic flame retardants. It also would have let the Commissioner of Environmental Protection ban additional flame retardants once a safer alternative exists.
2007	SB1084	Land Use Commissions	Advocates strongly opposed this legislation which would have undermined effective inland wetlands commissions. This bill sought to give municipalities the ability to create a land use commission to replace planning and zoning commissions and inland wetland agencies. Combining these two existing agencies diminishes a town's ability to focus resources specifically needed for wetlands protection. The resources that are presently designated for wetlands protection would be removed, and placed in a general fund shared by the other combined agencies. This bill originated in the Planning and Development Committee and passed the Senate with misinformation that the wetlands provisions had been removed. We applaud Committee co-chair Senator Coleman for responding to environmental concerns and not pursuing the bill after the Senate had voted. We were disappointed that co-chair Representative Feltman refused to discuss the issue with concerned groups. Senator Harris' regular communication with environmental leaders helped them pursue and defeat the bill. We have counted both the committee vote and the Senate vote to recognize those legislators who challenged the measure.

2007	SB 1182	State Surplus Land Review	<p>This represents a two-year effort championed by Senator Slossberg in the Senate, and Representatives Spallone and Floren in the House, to bring more attention to the natural, open spaces owned by the state that are sold or transferred as surplus land without adequate environmental review. With passage of this bill, before any public land of ten acres or more is transferred to a municipality, there must be an opportunity for public notice and comment. This bill passed six committees with a mixture of support, and so all are counted. After lengthy, but successful negotiations with relevant agencies, Senator Gaffey stepped in at the last moment and tied up the bill with provisions that weakened it. Both chamber votes were unanimous and are not tallied, but the important committee votes are included.</p>
2007	SB 1215	Smart Growth	<p>With a focus on economic growth, this Smart Growth bill sought to encourage responsible development throughout the state. An important focus of the bill would have brought about property tax reform to encourage better cooperation between towns on development. It also had provisions to establish a state economic development plan to address and resolve issues pertaining to development, transportation, and environmental protection in Connecticut. The bill passed the Senate, but died on the House calendar. Instead, a similar bill, 7090, became the primary Smart Growth bill and the one to successfully pass both Chambers. It lacked the property tax reform provision contained in 1215. All four committee votes on 1215 were scored.</p>
2007	SB 1289	Bottle Bill	<p>Co-Chairs of the Environment Committee, Senator Bill Finch and Representative Richard Roy led the campaign to expand Connecticut's bottle deposit recycling law. If passed, this long-overdue update to the "Bottle Bill" would allow Connecticut residents to recycle and receive a deposit refund on plastic water bottles, juice containers, flavored tea and sports drink containers. Passage of this bill would preserved resources and energy by recycling containers into new products, provide incentives for reducing litter and ultimately reduce greenhouse gas emissions because less energy is consumed when containers are recycled into new products and emissions caused by their incineration are eliminated. Manufacturers and grocers continue to be the primary opponents year after year despite the bill's increase in the handling fee paid to stores to offset their costs. The bill easily passed multiple committees and the Senate, but without the necessary support from Speaker Amann to bring the bill to a vote in the House, it was intentionally sent to the General Law Committee in the last days of session where leadership knew it would be killed. All Committee votes and Senate votes were scored. A second vote in the Finance Committee (Amendment B) was also scored as it would have turned the bill into a study. The gutting amendment in Finance was supported by individuals, such as David McCluskey, who even though he had indicated on his LCV questionnaire that he would support expansion of the bottle bill, instead worked to block it this session.</p>

2007	SB 1341	Mining	A last minute amendment to this otherwise environmentally benign bill was a major assault on long-standing protections for ecologically sensitive watershed land. The amendment allows a 40-year lease for a gravel mining operation on Class I and II water company lands now owned by New Britain Water Company. This legislative “rat” had no public or environmental review and was purposely placed in 1341 on the last night of session because current law forbids the sale of watershed lands for commercial use. Led by Representative Sayers and Senator DeFronzo, this amendment exempts the city of New Britain from this law. Not only is this a terrible precedent for watershed lands, it is a discreditable way for the legislature to do business.
2007	SB 1432	Global Warming	The goal of this legislation championed by Environment Committee co-chair Senator Bill Finch was to lessen Connecticut’s ecological footprint by conserving energy and preserving open space. An important provision in the bill was enabling legislation to allow towns to add 0.5% to the conveyance fee on the purchase of real estate to fund environmental needs. This Municipal Green Fund would have provided much needed funds without raising property taxes. Two votes in the Environment Committee were the only ones scored: the original committee vote, and a vote on a negative amendment that would have removed the Green Fund entirely. The bill was severely undermined in the Planning and Development Committee without a clear vote on the weakening amendment, and was finally referred to the Judiciary Committee by Senate leaders on the last day of session where it died without a vote.
2007	SB 1432	Global Warming (A)	
2007	HB 5234	Pesticide Use	A law currently exists that will ban the use of lawn care pesticides on preschool and elementary school grounds after a period of time when Integrated Pest Management may be used. This bill expands the ban (which will begin on July 1, 2009 after two more years of permissible Integrated Pest Management) to include playing fields, playgrounds, and school grounds through grade eight. This is a significant victory that will help protect children from the negative health effects associated with longterm exposure to these toxins. Senator Meyer introduced and shepherded the bill through the process. The final Senate and House votes were scored.
2007	HB 7040	Wetland Decisions	Although wetlands are supposed to be protected by strict planning and zoning laws, this bill (which originated in the Planning and Development Committee) undermines “due consideration” that should be given to recommendations of Inland Wetland Commissions. It calls for both the permitting process and the Inland Wetland review to begin at the same time, instead of starting with the Wetlands review. It is not clear how this will impact permit conditions that are established by a town Planning and Zoning board, but this appears to be a recipe for litigation between developers and towns. The final votes in the House and the Senate were scored.

2007	HB 7090	Smart Growth	Senator Coleman and Representative Sharkey were essential in passage of this important land use planning legislation. Representative Feltman proved to be a major obstacle during the negotiations. The bill created a Responsible Growth Task Force to monitor land use policies and programs and identify criteria for responsible development. It also requires that towns maintain updated development plans that parallel the state's Plan of Conservation and Development. Most importantly, the bill calls for the preparation of a state economic plan that will direct state investment consistent with the State Conservation and Development Plan. An important provision that was NOT contained in 7090 would have brought about property tax reform to encourage better cooperation between towns on development. Two committee votes are included in the score. All other votes were unanimous in favor of the bill and were not scored.
2007	HB 7249	Electronic Devices	In the past ten years, electronic waste recycling (E-waste) opportunities have been sporadic and inconsistent. A bill failed last year due to disagreement about who would be financially responsible. Since then, Representative Widlitz successfully worked to negotiate a bill to establish a statewide system to recycle computers and televisions. One of the major successes of the session, passage of this bill promotes a "producer financed, producer-run system." This is an important step toward reducing toxic materials such as lead and mercury that enter the environment when electronics are not disposed of properly. All six committee, House and Senate votes are scored.
2006	SB 313	Public Water	This act requires that the public health (DPH) commissioner receive notice of applications submitted to local agencies about activities on public water supply watersheds. It allows the DPH commissioner to adopt regulations that incorporate federal drinking water regulations, and requires DEP and DPH to study the use of ethanol as a gasoline additive.
2005	SB 410	Farmland	SB 410 provides approximately \$27 million in new funding for open space, historic preservation, affordable housing and farmland preservation. Towns will collect a \$30 document fee for each new land record filed and keep \$3 of the fee to administer the program. Many lawmakers on both sides of the aisle fought for this legislation. Special recognition goes to Sen. Don Williams, who ensured this would be an environmental priority this session, and to Rep. Dick Beldon and Rep. Lew Wallace for leading this effort in the House.



2005	SB 1294	Stream Flow Regs.	HB 1294 requires the DEP to revise outdated stream flow regulations. Over 60 of the State's rivers have unnaturally low flow and some even run dry in the summer due to a lack of science-based standards for allowing water diversion. This adversely affects both people and wildlife. A lower quantity of water often means a higher concentration of wastes and pollutants. Passage of SB 1294 is a first step toward raising the minimum flow levels to acceptable standards for Connecticut rivers and streams. The original concept was introduced by Sen. Andrew Roraback, and later championed by Sen. Andrea Stillman and Rep. Mary Mushinsky. Rep. Len Fasano attached a weakening amendment in the P&D Committee, which was successfully removed by Representative Lew Wallace in the House.
2005	HB 6393	Comm Pres. \$ Invest	HB 6393 would have allowed municipalities—if they chose to do so—to raise funds for farmland, forest and water resource protection and recreation areas by applying a conveyance tax up to 1% on real estate transactions over \$100,000. Rep. James Spallone deserves credit for championing this worthwhile legislation.
2005	HB 6570	Plans of C & D	HB 6570 requires the OPM to identify Priority Funding Areas, develop management plans for key corridors, and encourage consistency between local, regional and state plans of Conservation and Development. State funding would be focused on designated priority areas. Although the final version contained troubling exemptions for municipalities, the bill as a whole is a first step toward better land use planning in Connecticut. Rep. Lew Wallace did a tremendous job of shepherding this highly complex and controversial bill through the legislature. Rep. Craig Miner led the opposition on this bill. Status:Passed,
2005	HB 6906	Energy	HB 6906 died during the regular session because of utility opposition to the removal of a provision that would have allowed them to keep millions of ratepayer dollars. Nevertheless, the bill was passed in the special session under a new number, HB 7501. The bill contains a range of new incentives and programs that were developed in response to high energy prices and federally imposed congestion charges. Environmental provisions of the bill include incentives for conservation and energy efficiency, distributed generation, natural gas conservation, and development of clean energy sources to reduce air pollution. Senator John Fonfara championed this bill.
2005	HB 6908	Clean Cars II	HB 6908 requires DEP to study and recommend incentives for Connecticut consumers to purchase vehicles with lower emissions. Areas to study include a ranking system for vehicles based on their greenhousegas emissions, rebates on the sales tax of low-emission vehicles, and higher taxes for higher polluting vehicles.

2004	HB 5044	Plans of C&D	This important land use planning bill would have provided for priority funding areas as well as promote consistency in state and regional plans of conservation and development. It was defeated in a roll call vote in the House, but then reconsidered in the last hours of session, where there was not enough time remaining to debate the merits of the bill. Representative Lew Wallace did a yeoman's job of moving this bill forward.
2003	HB 5165	Light Pollution	Requires state buildings and facilities to maximize energy conservation and minimize light pollution
2003	HB 5686	Light Pollution	Prohibits floodlights intended to illuminate private property from being located in a state right of way unless they meet certain light pollution reduction requirements. Existing lights would need to be in compliance by October 2005
2003	HB 6640	Smart Growth	Would have required state, regional, and local planning bodies to develop land use plans that target development based on certain smart growth principles, including a town's ability to limit permits and tying open space grants to a town's build out plan
2002	HB 5209	Power Plants	After a five-year struggle between environmental advocates, industry interests, and state officials, Connecticut was able to pass legislation requiring on-site cleanup of the "sooty six" power plants. These older power plants, along with some other smaller sources, will be required to meet the same modern clean air standards for sulfur dioxide emissions as other newer plants. A similar bill passed the legislature last year, but was vetoed by the Governor, with no legislative effort to override. This year's legislation contains the same restriction on trading pollution credits as last year, and clarifies a provision to allow for waivers during an energy crisis.
2002	HB 5346	L. I. Sound #1 Veto Override	This bill would have placed a moratorium on all new cables to be constructed across Long Island Sound. This would have also halted a highly controversial project already permitted and set to begin construction across one of Long Island Sound's most productive shellfish beds. The moratorium successfully passed both chambers of the legislature but was vetoed by the Governor. The legislature fell two votes short of the total needed to override the veto. Votes on an unfriendly amendment in the Senate, the final bill in the House, and the veto override are scored.

2001	SB 1068	State Agency Purchases	This bill was amended in the Finance committee to promote state agencies use of recycled products, and of products, services, or practices that are less harmful to human health and the environment than comparable products, services, or practices. While the bill's treatment of fuel efficiency standards is mixed, it does increase the number of vehicles that run on alternative fuels. Also, the bill increases from 10% to 30% the percentage of fiber material in recycled white paper used in the manufacture of state lottery tickets and tax return forms that must come from post-consumer recovered paper. The amendment was the most important vote, and is the only one included in the score.
2001	HB 6365	Power Plant air standards	Aimed at cleaning up the state's worst polluting power plants, this bill would have set the highest air quality standards in the country. Despite amendments offered to weaken provisions of the bill, it successfully passed both chambers, but was later vetoed by Governor Rowland. Both the amendment votes and the final votes are score
2001	HB 6687	Mercury	This legislation is a regional New England initiative. The DEP backed away from strong support for this bill as questions were raised about the lack of actual data on mercury containing items. There was also aggressive opposition by General Electric and the electrical lighting manufacturers trade associations, and no coordinated effort to support the bill's strongest provisions. Alarmed by significant last minute revisions, the bill's supporters halted further action before it could be voted on in the House. The only votes scored are amendments that reflect an effort to weaken the bill in the Environment and Finance committees
2001	HB 6973	Moratorium on new incinerators	Carried forward from last year, this bill would have extended the moratorium on the issuance of air pollution permits for new incinerators and certain industrial facilities. After passing numerous committees, it eventually passed the House. Rather than take up the bill, the Senate sent it to the Planning and Development committee where it was defeated by a 6 to 7 vote. Since there was a full House vote, that vote was included. It should be noted, however, that two Representatives changed their positions to vote against the bill in the Planning and Development committee even though they voted for the bill in the House (see "Bonus/Demerit Points"). This bill is included in the Senate scores by including as many committee votes cast by Senators as possible to reflect their position on the issue.

2001	HB 7000	Water diversion registrations	Connecticut lacks the basic data needed to look holistically at our water-management rules, current uses and demand, and future water needs. This bill requires companies, municipalities, and other entities that withdraw substantial amounts of water from wells or surface waters to provide the Department of Environmental Protection (DEP) with information about their water diversions. The bill was met at first with opposition from water providers and farmers, but successful negotiations between all stakeholders produced enough support to pass the bill in both the House and Senate. Only the full floor votes are scored .
2001	HB 7505	Public Health Budget Implementer	This was one of several omnibus budget implementation bills passed during the Special Session to define some of the state's spending programs and policies. It was also used as a vehicle to carry legislation that did not pass during the regular session. While this bill did contain important items such as the asthma tracking legislation, there were high profile debates on the floors of both chambers about the exemptions being granted for projects that would otherwise have to follow existing environmental laws. Exemptions for a golf course in Wallingford and a sewer line in Middletown were particularly egregious. Several legislators offered amendments to strike these provisions in the House, but were denied a roll call vote. In protest, many of our champions voted against the entire bill, which is why we have scored this vote.