



## 2018 Candidate Survey on the Environment

**Ellen Beatty (Democrat)**

House District 119

**1) 100% Clean Energy by 2050:**

**Do you support transitioning to 100% clean energy by 2050 or sooner?**

Yes

I do support this initiative and will examine all policies and legislation through the prism of progress toward this goal. Transitioning to clean energy is a win/win for Connecticut and will help to find solutions to other challenges facing the state. Efforts toward this goal will create jobs and stimulate the local economy. As a Professor Emerita of Public Health and Nursing, I see clean energy as a critical, safety goal for all people and our communities. Congratulations to Ct. League of Conservation Voters for being bold and forward thinking.

**2) State Water Plan:**

**Will you support the plan as submitted to the legislature and affirm that water is a public trust?**

Yes

Absolutely! I consider the management of water as a public trust to be the responsibility of the government. In 2009, I travelled to China and was appalled that the people of China could not rely on the government for a safe water supply. It simply was not considered to be a sacred responsibility of the government. This was prior to Flint, Michigan! Since then, I have become more knowledgeable and committed to water supply as a public utility. I actually am against the privatization of the water supply by corporations and follow the issues of water supply in the state of California. I believe that Connecticut should be proactive in this matter rather than reactive. I will support the Safe Water Plan and vow to consider water as a public trust.

**3) Municipal Funding Pilot for Open Space:**

**Would you support legislation that would allow, but not require, certain municipalities to establish a dedicated fund to protect local open space, farmland and water resources through a limited conveyance fee on buyers of real estate?**

Yes

I support the right (and obligation) of municipalities to create dedicated funds and/or land trusts for the purposes of acquiring and sustaining open space. I am uncertain if municipalities should be or shouldn't be held to a specific conveyance fee. I state this specific uncertainty since I do not wish to create excuses for municipalities to avoid open space/land trust funds. There are powerful lobbying efforts within the real estate community to prevent conveyance fees. Municipalities that can afford other revenue streams such as rainy day or surplus funding or specially designated lock box, land trust funds should be encouraged to move forward. The responsibility is for municipalities to create funding for open space.

**4) Plastic Bag Pollution:**

**Would you support a statewide ban on single-use plastic bags (or a ban/fee hybrid) to significantly reduce plastic bag pollution in our state?**

Yes

I follow the literature on what other states are successfully doing and I support a statewide ban on single use plastic bags. I am a member of the newly formed Recycling Task Force in Milford. As a second term member of the Board of Alders, I have been and continue to support such measures. I am also a member of the Ordinance Committee of the Board of Alders. In this capacity, we are the bridge to public safety in matters affecting the community. Collectively, we were instrumental in passing a ban transport/storage ban on fracking waste transportation and/or storage in Milford.

**5) Gas Pipeline:**

**Will you support the repeal of the pipeline tax established in 2015?**

Yes

I am against measures that impede progress toward sustainability. For profit corporations recoup cost of fossil fuel development while passing along costs to the public. This was one objection to the trans pipeline from Canada to

Mexico. There was little need, no decrease in energy price and little incentive to progress toward sustainability yet corporations remained in favor of the pipeline that had little benefit for those who were to pay for it.

**6) Carbon Pricing:**

**Would you support carbon pricing for Connecticut?**

Yes

Carbon pricing should include the cost of consequences. The energy/conservation advocacy movement can lead the momentum in this direction. This concept should hold true for all endeavors that bring potential and real harm to the public. For example, partial health care costs of consequences for manufacturing sweetened fructose products or other products known to be detrimental to public good should be calculated. The cost should be borne by the manufacturer/distributor rather solely to the end user.

**7) Additional Comments:**