OBJECTIVES:

It is the goal of this project 1) to examine in depth and then to analyze the decision-making process involved in the passage of Connecticut's 1967 Water Pollution Act, and 2) to examine the politics of the implementation of this act through the end of the calendar year 1970.

ACHIEVEMENT OF OBJECTIVES:

Data were gathered on the general background of water pollution control in Connecticut, and studies of the city of New Haven's sewage system and the Scovill Manufacturing Co. of Waterbury were carried out.

RESEARCH PROCEDURES USED:

Data relating to water pollution policy making were gathered through two sources: the written record and personal interviews. The files and correspondence of the state Water Resources Commission were
examined, as well as newspaper reports, City of New Haven documents, and materials from The Scovill Co. Interviews using the attached questionnaire were held with 30 respondents in the Water Resources Commission, the Attorney General's office, the state legislature, City of New Haven government, and Scovill Corporation.

CONCLUSIONS:

A majority of the commissioners on the Water Resources Commission (WRC), in existence from 1957 to 1971 represented, directly or indirectly, interests which pollute, including agriculture, municipal government, and industry. These commissioners, rather than representatives of ecological groups, dominated WRC decisions.

It proved difficult to assess the impact of the WRC on control of pollution. Some members felt the WRC initiated pollution control policy, while others did not. Noteworthy is the very heavy reliance of this part-time body on the professional staff of the agency, as well as the strong influence of outside interest groups on agency decisions.

The implementation of agency anti-pollution efforts was hindered by lack of funds and staff. For example, there is an average of one oil spill per day in Connecticut waters, but the polluters often are not apprehended.

Case studies of two polluters -- the city of New Haven, whose sewer system pollutes New Haven harbor, and the Scovill Corporation of Waterbury, which pollutes the Naugatuck River with metal wastes -- lead to the following conclusions:
1) Efforts to end pollution have been delayed by the slowness of the WRC in reviewing plans to reduce pollution put forth by these two polluters.

2) The failure of the federal government to fund pollution abatement grants at levels originally promised have slowed down or stopped abatement.

In conclusion, a great deal has been done under the 1967 Connecticut Clean Waters Act to reduce pollution. Many municipalities and corporations have been required to reduce pollution, and state technical and financial assistance has enabled them to do so. However, the composition of the WRC, the failure of the state government to fund WRC at levels permitting hiring of additional staff, and the failure of the federal government to fund its contribution at levels originally expected, have prevented the attainment of the goals.

PUBLICATIONS:

A manuscript, "The Politics of Water Pollution," has been prepared by D. M. Fox, and will be included in a projected book length manuscript on Connecticut politics.
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ABSTRACT:

A majority of the commissioners on the Water Resources Commission (WRC), in existence from 1957 to 1971 represented, directly or indirectly, interests which pollute, including agriculture, municipal government, and industry. These commissioners, rather than representatives of ecological groups, dominated WRC decisions.

Case studies of two polluters -- the City of New Haven, and the Scovill Corporation of Waterbury -- lead to the following conclusions:

1) Efforts to end pollution have been delayed by the slowness of the WRC in reviewing plans to reduce pollution put forth by these two polluters.

2) The failure of the federal government to fund pollution abatement grants at levels originally promised have slowed down or stopped abatement.

In conclusion, a great deal has been done under the 1967 Connecticut Clean Waters Act to reduce pollution. However, the composition of the WRC, the failure of the state government to fund WRC at levels permitting hiring of additional staff, and the failure of the federal government to fund its contribution at levels originally expected, have prevented the attainment of the goals set forth in the act.
PART I

We are studying the implementation of Connecticut's 1967 Clean Waters Act, and are specifically interested in the cases of Scovill Manufacturers, Waterbury, and the city government of New Haven.

1. Did you actively participate in either of these cases?
   1. Scovill __________________
   2. New Haven __________________

   [(If respondent did not participate in either, go directly to Part II)] Probe there where relevant to get as much data as possible.

2. Let us begin with __________________. Would you characterize your degree of interest as: High________ Medium________ Low________ and your amount of activity as: High________ Medium________ Low________
3. Could you give me an idea of the stand you took on the issue of the original order of compliance – both the specifics of the order and the dates involved? (Give them specifics so you’re sure they know that you’re talking about).

4. At what point did you become involved with this issue and how did that come about? (If not clear, probe: Do you remember who first contacted you about it and when you were contacted?)

5. Would you give me the names of several other people or groups whom you know of first hand who actively participated in this issue and who took the same general stand on it as you?

_________________________ ____________________________ ____________________________

_________________________ ____________________________ ____________________________

_________________________ ____________________________ ____________________________

6. I’d now like to examine further the original order of the WRC in this case. Who initiated the first proposals relating to this original order?

_________________________ ____________________________ ____________________________

_________________________ ____________________________ ____________________________

7. What were some of the different proposals in this case that were made by the participants?
8. Who made these proposals and in what sequence of events were they made? (Don't ask if already made clear in answer to #7).

9. Would you say that among those involved there was any one individual or group particularly influential in getting others involved to support his particular point of view? (You can name more than one person if no one person or group was more important than other persons in getting support for his viewpoint).
10. Next, I'd like to examine the subsequent modifications/extensions of the original order by the WRC. Who initiated the proposals for these? [Give respondent specific information on the modifications which seem to be most important].

11. What were some of the different proposals relating to extensions made by the participants?
12. Who made those proposals and in what sequence of events were they made? (Don't ask if already made clear in answers to #11).

13. Would you say that among those involved there was any one individual or group particularly influential in getting others involved to support his particular point of view? (You can name more than one person if no one person or group was more important than other persons in getting support for his viewpoint)
14. What part did you personally play in the issue? (If not clear, probe). Whom did you contact regarding the issue and what success did you have in presenting your viewpoint to them?

15. Could you give me the names of those people who actively participated in this issue and took a stand opposed to yours?

_________________________________  __________________________________

_________________________________  __________________________________

_________________________________  __________________________________

16. Would you say there were a few people or groups who were most influential in determining the outcome of the issue? (If yes: Who were they?)

_________________________________  __________________________________

_________________________________  __________________________________

17. Do you think the outcome would have been different had these people not participated?

a) Yes ___________  b) No ___________ Why is that?
18. Would you say that there were any undue pressures exerted on you or on others in the course of making this decision?

19. Other related information
PART II
GENERAL INFLUENCE

I now have some general questions to ask you about influence in state water policy formation.

A.
1. Is there a group of people in the State which largely determines state water policies?
   
   Yes_________No_________
   
   IF NO: GO TO QUESTION 6
   
   IF YES: a. What kind of people are they?__________________________
   
   ______________________
   
   ______________________
   
   2. What individuals are examples of this group?
   
   a. Name  b. Occupation  c. Where Employed
   
   ______________________
   
   ______________________
   
   ______________________
   
   ______________________
   
   3. To what extent do they coordinate their efforts?
   
   4. Through what means do they coordinate their efforts?
   
   5. Do you feel that you are part of this group?
   
   Yes_________No_________
   
   (Now go to B.)
B.

6. IF NO TO QUESTION 1: Which groups or individuals have the most influence on state water resource policies?

   IF YES TO 1, DELETE THIS QUESTION
   a. Name
   b. Occupation/Where Employed
   C. On What issues?


7. To what extent do they coordinate their efforts?

    Now?


3. Do you feel that you have significant influence on state water resource policies?

    Yes__________ No________________
C.
1. How satisfied are you with WRC implementation of the 1967 Clean Waters Act in the period up to October 1, 1971?

2. How satisfied are you with the performance of the Attorney General's Office relating to WRC programs during this period?
3. What kind of impact have federal funds available for WRC programs had on these programs? (Probe on availability of funds, magnitude, whether original commitments honored).
EVALUATION SHEET

COOPERATIVENESS OF RESPONDENT

_______ Very Cooperative
_______ Somewhat cooperative
_______ Indifferent
_______ Somewhat uncooperative
_______ Very uncooperative

VALIDITY OF RESPONSES

_______ Truthful Answers with serious thought
_______ Truthful, but with little care
_______ False answers

GENERAL UNDERSTANDING OF QUESTIONS

_______ Understood all questions
_______ Understood most of the questions
_______ Did not understand most of the questions
_______ Hardly understood any questions