

THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, May 2, 2018

(The House of Representatives was called to order at 11:38 o'clock a.m., Speaker Joe Aresimowicz of the 30th District in the Chair.)

CLERK:

Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives will convene immediately. Members to the Chamber.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

(Gavel) Will the House please come to order? Will members, staff, and guests please rise, direct your attention to the Dais where our good friend, Rabbi Alan Lefkowitz, will lead us in prayer?

HOUSE CHAPLAIN RABBI LEFKOWITZ:

Good morning.

MEMBERS:

Good morning.

HOUSE CHAPLAIN RABBI LEFKOWITZ:

Happy May and thank you for all your prayers in having the weather change [Laughter]. Dear God, our scriptures remind us of the duties of the high priests, which serve us as well, as you encourage us to be enthusiastic in all we do so that we don't burn out and remain glowing in our passion for our responsibilities and our passion and our service to the people and to you, oh God, who created us all. The intent of your blessings were not just intended for the priests or for us as leaders but for all the people so that as we remain passionate about who we serve and our service to you, our people would also remain passionate as well. Just as it takes a few pieced of tinder to ignite a whole group of logs, so to a few passionate people can excite, ignite, and empower an entire nation or even our small communities. If we as a small group of people can serve each other as well as you, oh God, with passion and enthusiasm, it would be just a matter of time before the people we serve, those people around us will also catch our glowing flame. There are many of us who would like to change the world around

us, which can seem daunting, almost too large a task, so let us recall the words of Mahatma Gandhi, "Be the change you want to see in the world." In other words, if we want to change the world, let us start with ourselves by igniting our own souls. When we live with that fire and passion, our flame will spread to those around us and they will pass it on to those around them and this way we can ignite our own corner of the world for you, our God. We say, Amen.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

I'll have to work on that glow today [Laughter]. Would Representative Juleson-Scopino of the 12th district, please come to the Dais and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance?

REP. JULESON-SCOPINO (12TH):

(All) I pledge allegiance to the flag of the United States of America and to the Republic for which it stands, one nation, under God, indivisible, with liberty and justice for all.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Is there any business on the clerk's desk?

CLERK:

Mr. Speaker, the only business I have is the daily Calendar.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Are there any announcements or introductions? My very good friend of the 67th district, Representative Buckbee. You have the floor.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker. How are you this fine, chipper morning?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

I could use a little of that chipperness, Representative Buckbee. Come and hang out with me afterwards and see if we can perk up.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

You got it, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of introduction.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

So, last year, I brought these wonderful

visitors we had from the New Milford Youth Agency into the Chamber to meet with you. If you remember, just a couple of weeks ago I brought in one of the valuable resources of the town of New Milford and showing the agriculture and a baby goat. I think maybe the strongest asset that we have in the town of New Milford is the youth in the town of New Milford, represented by the Youth Agency here. We hosted a wonderful anti-bullying campaign at the Youth Agency, a number activities. These kids are involved in everything we do within the town and the community, and they wanted to stop in here and say hello, and I would ask the Chamber to give them our usual accord in greeting.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Let's give them a round of applause {Applause}. Gentleman, thank you very much for your community involvement. It really is greatly appreciated. It helps you make your town a better place. Thank you.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Abercrombie of the 83rd, you
have the floor, madam.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good morning.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

For the purpose of an announcement.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like
to take this opportunity to thank my colleagues who
have contributed to dress-down day this Friday, May
4, but we all know there's some of you that haven't
given your money, so please come and see myself or
Representative Zupkus. And the money is going to
the Home of the Braves in Bridgeport, which is a
housing development that works with homeless women
vets and their children, so please come and see us.
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Abercrombie, just one question.
That is extended to staff, lobbyist, executive
branch, all others that are in this building also?
REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for clarifying that.
This year staff is included. I know normally we've
had some disagreements as if they should or not, but
yes, staff and lobbyist, so thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Representative
Zupkus of the 89th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. ZUPKUS (89TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to -- I was
gonna say what Representative Abercrombie said, so
thank you to the people that have already donated
and for the ones that will be, but I did want to add
onto that thank you, Mr. Speaker, for always
starting on time. We are grateful and hopefully, we
will be out on time. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

My fingers are crossed also, madam.
Representative Hennessy of the 127th.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an introduction.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today, we have with us in the Chamber Tammy Papa, who is the Director of the Lighthouse Program in Bridgeport. She is the director of the Department of Youth Services, so what she does is take the kids after they get out of school and give them programs that -- that help them to be successful in school and also, we have with us Dana Forry, who is the Director of the Bridgeport Juvenile Review Board, and Dana helps children that may have difficulties at some point, so she -- her department integrates them with -- with -- with services so that they also can be successful. They're up here lobbying for us to ensure that our kids are taken care of and that the funds remain in place, and so at this point, I would ask the Chamber to all rise and give Tammy and

Dana our usual warm welcome. [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, representative.

Representative Wood of the 141st. Madam, I felt terrible for you last night. You looked so tired, so I'm glad to see you back here bright-eyed, bushytailed, ready for the day.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

[Laughing] Are you providing the multiple caffeine infusions? [Laughter]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

We'll have them throughout today, madam.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise in a point of introduction.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

[Crying] My son came to visit me as a surprise.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Aw.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

And, I'm so grateful [Members Aw} to welcome him to the Chamber. {Applause} [Cheering]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Wood, and your son's name is?

REP. WOOD (141ST):

[Crying] Yeah, sorry. I'll get through it. I just lump up easily, especially on little sleep. It's pretty easy -- [Laughing] -- easy target. Andrew is a rising senior at Fairfield University. This is the first day of finals, didn't have a final obviously, and a political junky, and I'm thrilled to welcome him. Thank you very much. [Cheering] [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Andrew, I saw this many times from the Dais anytime we have family members here. The 151 members in here make great sacrifice and a lot of the time we sacrifice our time with our family, so on behalf of the entire Chamber, thank you for sharing your mom with us. Thanks for letting her out of things to be up here to serve the people. We greatly appreciate it. Thank you, sir [Applause].

Representative LeGeyt of the 17th district, sir, you now have the floor.

REP. LEGEYT (17TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of an announcement and an introduction, if I may?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Of course, sir.

REP. LEGEYT (17TH):

I would like to announce that having served 5 terms in the House I am not running for reelection in the Fall, and I want to say how much it has meant to me to be here for 10 years and how much I have gained from the process and from my colleagues on both sides of the aisle, and how much of a better person I think I am for the -- for the experience. I would also like to introduce Leslie Hill to the House. Leslie is the first selectperson in Canton, and prior to her 3 years of being the first selectperson, she was chairman of the Board of Ed for 4 years, and a practicing litigator before that, and oh by the way, she's running for my seat, so if the -- if the House could give her the most warm and

cordial welcome, I'd appreciate it. [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Ritter of the 1st district, sir,
you have the floor.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker -- Representative LeGeyt, we just
want to acknowledge you from this side. We'll have
a chance maybe in the coming -- next week it will
be to do all of the retirements, but we do
appreciate your service to the state. Help us get
out of here early tonight too, okay?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

[Laughing] Representative Godfrey of the 110th
district, sir, you have the floor.

REP. GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, Co-Chair Aresimowicz, I have an
introduction.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

It looks like a team, so go ahead,
Representative Godfrey.

REP. GODFREY (110TH):

It is indeed a team, coach [Laughter]. I'm

delighted to have these young -- and I'm gonna ask these young men to stand up. This is the Immaculate High School boys' basketball team. Full disclosure, I'm a graduate of Immaculate High School long ago. We won't talk about how long ago -- but they had a great season this year. They won the Division 2 Championship in the SWC basketball tournament down in Uncasville just a few -- few weeks ago. I'm extremely proud of these young men and their coach, Nelson Mingachos, who is also here today. They -- they're a surprise. They admit that they're a surprise. I'm actually taller than most of them, which is kind of weird considering they're a basketball team, but I do want to recognize them, thank them for coming up here, thank them for the stellar season, and the great job that you did in the SWC Championship tournament. Please, join me in congratulating the Immaculate High School boys' basketball team. [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Gentleman, congratulations on your accomplishment. As Representative Godfrey said, I'm

also a high school but I'm a high school football coach. I know the amount of time that goes into it and the dedication and -- and -- and being a team rather than individuals, you can overcome anything, and I think you guys have proven that. But, just for the record, the majority leader who just spoke and I have a basketball here -- team here too, two-time defending champs. I don't know if you want to get into a little pick-up game later but let us know [Laughter]. Seriously, thank you very much for everything and congratulations gentleman [Applause]. Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of an announcement.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, lots of times news moves a bit slowly around the Capitol and it happened that at the time that the Education Committee was finishing its work I was not aware

that someone who has severed every minute of his tenure in the General Assembly, Representative Tim LeGeyt, on the Education Committee was indeed announcing that he would not be coming back.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

(Gavel) (Gavel) (Gavel) I know folks are getting settle into their day trying to get all the business set up for the day, but if we could just keep the conversations to a minimum. Representative Fleischmann has the floor.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, I'm simply trying to rectify a wrong that I inadvertently committed on the last day of our committee meeting because when a stellar member of your committee announces that he will not be returning, he deserves the recognition and not having been aware at that moment that that was the - - the situation for Representative Tim LeGeyt, I didn't say anything then, but I just wanted to say a few words now because it's very rare in this Chamber that we get to serve with people like Tim LeGeyt.

He's a phenomenal legislator and he's a phenomenal human being, and I just want to mention two quick stories that illustrate that.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

(Gavel) (Gavel) (Gavel) We have a long-term member that's not seeking reelection. While folks have the opportunity on the Dais next week, Representative Fleischmann would like the opportunity to speak of Representative LeGeyt. Representative Fleischmann, please proceed.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, two brief stories that give some sense of why Representative LeGeyt is truly unique, special, and someone who we will miss profoundly. First, how he operates as a legislator, so when Representative LeGeyt first came to the Education Committee, he attended everything, he took notes, and he said not a word. He was at every public hearing until the end. He occasionally would ask a question but basically, took notes. He was at every meeting, took note, didn't say a word. Finally, at one of our last meetings of his first

year, he sought to be recognized and he spoke. He spoke in his normal gentle tones raising some questions about a section of a bill that no one had paid much attention to, and as a former lawyer and a former educator, he had picked up on a mistake that our screening team on the Education Committee had missed, so after he made his thoughtful remarks, we held the bill, quickly drafted an amendment to address the concerns that Representative LeGeyt had caught and everyone had missed and moved it ahead, but I will never forget the silence that came when - - when Tim was recognized because he had spent so much time listening to others and taking notes and so little time seeking attention or drawing attention to his concerns that when he finally did so, the entire room paid attention, and it's essentially been that way ever since cause that's the kind of person he is. He doesn't raise his voice and he doesn't raise his hand unless there's a need, and when he does, you know that he's put a lot of thought and care and attention to it. The other thing I wanted to mention related to what he's like

as a person -- so before you became speaker, Mr. Speaker, there were often times when the House was going to come into session and the start time might be 15, 20, 30, 45 minutes away from what was announced and the same with end-times, of course -- so on one of those mornings where the House hadn't yet come into session, I started to talk to Tim and I had just finished reading a boog that was about Buddhist philosophy and just apropos nothing, I brought up something from that book, and Tim -- for those who don't know it -- happens to be a person who is extremely conversant not only in Christian theology but in theologies of many religions, so we had a conversation on the floor of the House that was maybe 20 minutes long in which we were comparing what goes on in different world religions and agreeing that certain basic notions of empathy, caring, and compassion are common ground for all religions, and it was -- it was an amazing conversation that you might expect when you encounter your favorite theology professor but that you might not expect when you're talking to a friend

and colleague who you've served with. It's going to be a loss for this Chamber not to have Tim here, but I am happy for him. Another last point about Tim is he's a person who -- who takes things on in a very quiet way, and -- and never complaints, and he's had health challenges that he's overcome with barely a word to anyone, but he's overcome them beautifully, and now, he wants to spend more time with his family, and he has a lovely wife. They have two sons. One of those boys, I believe, is in Switzerland with two grandchildren who live there, and he'll have more time to go to Switzerland to visit those Swiss grandchildren, along with more time for his grandchild who's in the U.S., so I'm very happy -- I'm sad for this Chamber, but I'm happy for Tim, and I appreciate you're giving me a couple minutes just to -- just to shine a spotlight on someone who never ever sought a spotlight for himself, a phenomenal colleague, Tim LeGeyt. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir [Applause].

Representative Wood of the 141st, you have the floor, madam.

REP. WOOD (141ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would also like to recognize Tim LeGeyt. We came in together as freshman, and I think what Representative Fleischmann said is absolutely accurate. He is not someone who asks for the spotlight. He's a man of honor, integrity, intelligence, common sense, always practical. When something needs to be said, he says it. If he doesn't, he listens. He's a problem solver and very gracious man, and we will miss him very much.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, representative [Applause]. Representative Gresko of the 121st, you have the floor.

REP. GRESKO (121ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of an introduction.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. GRESKO (121ST):

If we could all take a look up at the gallery, we could say a welcome to Chapel Street School from Stratford. Everybody wave [Applause] and thank you for taking the trek up here and taking the tour with the League of Women Voters, and please, I ask my colleagues to give them our normal warm welcome.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Let's give them a warm welcome [Applause]. Representative Porter of the 94th district, madam, you now have the floor.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It would be remiss of me not to stand up and sing some sort of accolades for Representative LeGeyt, and I think it's all been said. There's not much that I could add to that, but I just wanted to stand this morning to acknowledge him and to say that I am very saddened to hear that he will be leaving, but I do respect his decision to retire, and I just wish him all the best going forward. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. My fellow coach, Representative Gibson, of the 15th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

How are you today?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

A little tired but I'll come around.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

You don't look tired, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Aw, you're the best.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make an announcement.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Tomorrow, the Alliance for Bloomfield's

Children, one of my constituents, are -- is having a diaper drive downstairs in the hall of the flags, 1st floor, so I want to ask my constituents to please bring in diapers or make a monetary contribution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. That's a cause we all can support, and I will be making a contribution, sir. Representative Dillon of the 92nd district way up there in the back row. You have the floor.

REP. DILLON (92ND):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I simply wanted to add my voice to the -- to the praise of Representative LeGeyt. We served together for years on the Higher Education Committee, and when we discussed the fact that he was thinking of leaving, I told him what I'm about to say now and that is that he is extraordinarily level headed and open and civil. There are many times that sometimes all of us don't agree with each other, either between parties, between Chambers, or within, but there --

but incivility is -- is -- doesn't have to go with disagreement, and I -- I just want to thank Representative LeGeyt for his service and his consistent courtesy to his fellow members.

[Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you, representative. Representative LeGeyt, we have yet another person that wants to sing your praises. Representative Albis of the 99th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Thank you, MR. Speaker, and I too would like to rise to recognize Representative LeGeyt and his contributions to this Chamber, and I think we came in around the same time and I -- I always thought that you were not only one of the nicest people in this Chamber but -- but somebody that I could always count on for -- for a good laugh when we were getting frustrated with -- with the goings on in the Chamber, and I always had a great deal of respect for you, and I have an additional level of appreciation because you represent my in-laws, so I

want to thank you for -- for doing that very ably as well, so thank you again, Representative LeGeyt.

We're sorry to see you go.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Diana Urban of the 43rd district, madam, you have the floor.

REP. URBAN (43RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, for the purpose of an introduction.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. URBAN (43RD):

Mr. Speaker, you'll see that I have someone standing here with me, Kathleen Tracey, today. She seems to be -- I'm not gonna use the word crazy but maybe enough to think that she might want to be here with us, so today, she'll be job shadowing me, so please everybody be nice to me today, don't make me -- ask me hard questions, don't get on your computer and come up with stuff that I don't know. Mr. Speaker, I'm so happy to have her here with me

today, and she will get a real view of what it is that we do here -- the very important work. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Welcome to our Chamber, madam [Applause]. Representative Hennessy, getting a lot of mic time today [Laughter}. You have the floor, sir.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, it is my honor to introduce members of the Civil Air Patrol that are behind me. Also, with us is Lieutenant Colonel Travis, who is the Deputy Chief of Staff of the Civil Air Patrol. I'd like you all to -- if you don't know, you're all members of the Civil Air Patrol by being in the legislature, and you're all Majors -- Honorary Majors. They will be out in the concourse after this. If anyone has any questions to them, please feel free to speak with them, but for now, I'd ask everyone to all rise and give a -- give them our customary warm welcome. [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Welcome to our Chamber. I'd ask the indulgence

of the Chamber for myself. I'm going to be turning it over to one of the deputy speakers, but I also have a special guest here today from the town of Berlin, very interested in government so she's come up to shadow myself and Liz Conley for the day. We have Emma Rosky with us, so if we can give her a great greeting, please? [Applause] Stand up.

[Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Devlin of the 134th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Good morning to you.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

It is my pleasure I rise for a moment of introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

I have a surprise visitor today that has

absolutely made my day. I'd like to introduce to the House floor my nephew, Scott Thurston. Scott has just -- is passing through his hometown of Wallingford, Connecticut. He is the ski patrol and has been in Vermont, is soon to be headed to New Zealand to continue on that venture, before ending up back for the winter season in Colorado A-Basin, so please welcome my oldest nephew to the House, please, Scott Thurston. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Welcome -- welcome. Representative Sanchez, for what purpose do you rise?

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For the purpose of an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

And, before I do the introduction, though, I would also like to say -- say good things about my friend over here, Representative Tim LeGeyt, who serves with me on the Education Committee. He's an

-- he's an outstanding representative, has done some great work in the Education Committee, and I want to also wish him good luck in the future and best wishes always. For the introduction piece, I have next to me Board of Education member, Yvonne Muniz. She's -- she was recently appointed to the Board of Education. Yvonne's family goes way back in the city of New Britain. Actually, they were one of the first families in the city of New Britain -- Latino families in the city of New Britain, and they had a little bodega in the city for almost 20 years. Since then, her family has retired from the business, but there's other people that have taken up the business, and Yvonne is here today, and she'll be overshadowing Santiago because she is part of this Women's Leadership Training that they are having, and as well, Yvonne, I think will be up here to have one of our seats. I don't think I want to give up my seat yet, but maybe she'll want Tercyak or Rick Lope's seat.

MEMBERS:

Oh.

REP. SANCHEZ (25TH):

Anyway, [Laughing] please give a round of
applause for Yvonne Muniz. Thank you. [Applause]
[Cheering]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you and welcome and thank you for your
service. And, for those who don't know, bodega is a
little market -- right corner market, so. And, not
many people recognize the word bodega [Laughing].
Thank you, sir. Representative Johnson, for what
purpose do you rise, madam?

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of
an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, before as well --
before I speak about the introduction, I also want
to wish Representative LeGeyt very well. He has
been wonderful to work with on the Education
Committee, and so I have appreciated talking to him

about the issues and serving with him as well, so he -- we came in at the same time. We were in the same freshman class, and so thank you so much and best of luck. Now, for the introduction, I have here with me today Vanita Bhalla, and she is a natural citizen from India. She is working on Women's Leadership issues and the Emerge Campaign, and so I'd love to have the House give her a wonderful warm welcome. Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you so much and welcome [Applause]. Welcome to the people's house. Representative Rojas, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ROJAS (9TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed.

REP. ROJAS (9TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of Representative Currey, Representative Genga -- who I believe is making his way in in the East Hartford delegation -- we wanted to welcome some 8th-grade

students from Sunset Ridge. The students here are from the Student Ambassador Program, as well as the National Honor's Society, and they are here participating in Youth Service Day, and I would ask everybody in the Chamber to please give them a warm welcome. [Applause] [Cheering]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Welcome and I see future state reps and senators up there, so welcome to your House. Representative Kupchick, you have the floor, madam.

REP. KUPCHICK (132ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just was surprised by a wonderful visitor who participated in a bio-science meeting this morning but is a beloved and wonderful human being in our community who -- who he and his wife are huge supporters and hard-working on St. Baldrick's every year in our community, and they raised \$1 million -- over \$1 million dollars for cancer research -- for pediatric cancer research, so we have a whole lot of respect in our community for the Gerber family, so Bill Gerber is here with us and Senator Hwang actually shaved his head for St.

Baldrick's this past March, so kudos to Senator Hwang [Interruption] and so we would just like if you could -- would join us in welcoming [Interruption] -- and Representative Vahey [Laughing] is also a big supporter of St. Baldrick's, and I wish you would joint me in welcoming Bill Gerber to the House. Thank you. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Welcome and thank you for all you do for the community. Representative Porter, you have the floor ma'am. {Cross Talking}.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have with me this morning two outstanding young women who are part of the inaugural class of Emerge CT, and on my left, I have Kara Rachelle from Derby, Connecticut, who is

actually the executive vice-president for the Connecticut Young Dems who manage 14 chapters across the state, and she is also running for the 104th district seat, so I have to my right Veronica Delandro out of New Britain, Connecticut, who is also a member of Emerge and who actually has already ran for office and unfortunately, lost but I told her that's just good grounds for coming back and getting it right the next time. So, would you please join me in giving them a warm welcome?
[Applause] [Cheering] Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam, and welcome. So, we'll return to the call of the Calendar. Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 187?

CLERK:

House of Rep -- Connecticut General Assembly
House of Representatives, Wednesday, May 2, 2018.
On page 19, House Calendar 187, Substitute House Bill No. 5405, AN ACT CONCERNING CONNECTICUT CREDIT UNIONS. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Banking.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Lesser, you have the floor, sir.

REP. LESSER (100TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question is on acceptance of Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Representative Lesser, you have the floor.

REP. LESSER (100TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the members of this Chamber know, Connecticut charter banks and credit unions provide a valuable role in extending credit throughout communities across this state. This bill seeks to expand the power of Connecticut chartered credit unions to do their business in the state by allowing them to do many of the functions currently allowed by their competitors, out-of-state chartered credit unions and federally chartered credit unions and engage in policies and procedures allowed by the National Credit Union Association. Mr. Speaker, the

clerk is in possession of Amendment LCO No. 4008. I ask that the clerk please call the amendment and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO 4008, which will be designated House Amendment "A"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO 4008 offered by Representative Lesser, Representative Simanski.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The representative leave for the Chamber for summarize the amendment. Is there any objection to summarization? Is there any objection? Hearing none. Representative Lesser, you may proceed with summarization.

REP. LESSER (100TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this amendment is the result of a great deal of conversation between a variety of stakeholders including the Department of Banking, the Credit Union League, the banking industry, and other stakeholders to make sure that this bill reflects

the best possible compromise. It does a number of things. It removes the ability of credit unions to provide member business loans, increases the amount of real estate holdings up to 20 percent that a credit union may possess, and it requires that credit unions adopt additional controls to assure their safety and soundness. Mr. Speaker, I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will you remark further on the amendment before? Representative Simanski, you have the floor, sir.

REP. SIMANSKI (62ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I obviously rise in support of this amendment. It is a bipartisan amendment. Both the good chairman and myself are signatories to it, and he did a good description of what the amendment does. I would also like to point out that there are safety factors in here and as much as expanding the power of the credit unions, they are still under the supervision of the commissioner of banking, so that's good for the

public. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Those opposed. Nays. The aye's have it. The amendment is adopted (Gavel). Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Lesser.

REP. LESSER (100TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the bill as amended attempts to strike the critical balance that we have to in this building between assuring the safety and soundness of our financial system and also assuring the ability of Connecticut chartered credit unions to compete with their out-of-state competitors. I believe this is a reasonable compromise. I do want to highlight a couple of

areas where I had concerns, specifically the part that increases the amount of a credit union may invest in real estate holdings, but in my conversations with the Connecticut Department of Banking, they assured me that increasing that threshold from 5 percent, as it exists today, to 20 percent will not jeopardize the safety and soundness of Connecticut chartered credit unions. I hope, and I trust that that is the case, and with that, I do believe that this is a commonsense, pro-consumer but also pro-business bill. I do want to also just make a personal note. Many of us in this Chamber have a longstanding friendship and professional relationship with a representative of the Connecticut Union of Credit Unions, Ms. Kelly Fuhlbrigge. Kelly has had some health issues recently and I hope the rest of the Chamber will join me and wish Kelly a thorough and speedy recovery.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Simanski, you have

the floor, sir.

REP. SIMANSKI (62ND):

Once again, thank you, Mr. Speaker. The chairman did a good job of describing all that this bill does, and it brings our state credit -- state chartered credit unions basically in parity with those federal chartered credit unions, but I did want to point out that this bill is the result of four individual bills that came before the Banking Committee, and we decided rather than have four individual bills we would compile them all into this one bill. It makes a lot of sense and the Speaker did -- excuse me -- the chairman did a good job of explaining about the increase of 20 percent that the amount that credit unions may invest in real estate, and I want the Chamber to understand that the reason that they are looking to increase the amount that they could invest in real estate, which was previously 5 percent, that they are -- credit unions are expanding and in order for them to expand, they need space, and what they are seeking to do here is buy bigger buildings, expand into those buildings

eventually, but rather than buy a small building and incrementally add to it. They want to buy larger buildings and that they would then allow -- be under this, allowed to have some tenants occupy that space until they grow and they need it, so this is a good bill and I would highly recommend all members of the Chamber to support it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the bill that's amended? Representative Cheeseman, you have the floor, madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And, just a few comments on the bill. I want to thank the good chairman and the ranking member. Credit unions play such a vital part in our communities. I'm lucky in my part of the state with my Charter Oak Federal Credit Union. They are not only a wonderful lender with whom to deal both on a business basis at my Children's Museum, as a personal banker, and provide incredible support to the community through their philanthropic efforts, so again, I want to thank the

-- the chairman and the ranking member, and I urge support of this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further? Representative Wilson, you have the floor, sir.

REP. WILSON (66TH):

Good morning, Mr. Chairman. Just a very brief statement. Serving on the Banking Committee, I felt that this was a very collaborative effort on the part of the members of that committee, and the services that credit unions offer are vital to their communities, and this bill certainly facilitates the expansion of that, and I think it's a good bill. It ought to pass. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House, members please take your seats, the machine will be open.

[Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.
Members to the Chamber. The House of
Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the
Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Have all members voted? have all members
voted? Please check the board to assure that your
vote has been properly cast. If all members have
voted, the machine will lock, and the clerk will
take a tally. Will the clerk please announce the
tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 5405 as amended by House "A"

Total number Voting	147
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	147
Those voting Nay	0
Absent not Voting	3

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The bill as amended passes (Gavel).
Representative Ritter, you have the floor, sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to wish happy birthday to the chairman of our Judiciary Committee, my good friend, William Tong. Happy birthday, William. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Happy, happy birthday! Representative Polletta, you have the floor.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

All right, this afternoon I have with me the Watertown High School Delta Club, specific members along with their teachers, administrators that are here. The Delta Club is an amazingly popular club here in Watertown High School promoting anti-bullying. These fine students are the future of our town. A lot of them have an interest in politics and some of them visited our Capitol for the first time, so if you could please joint me in giving them

a nice warm introduction? Thank you. [Applause]

[Whistling]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Welcome to the people's house. Representative Ohler, you have the floor.

REP. OHLER (64TH):

Thank you, Mr. Chair. For purpose of an announcement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. OHLER (64TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. On behalf of the fire and EMS caucus and my good colleague, Representative Boyd, we wanted to let everyone know that the brave men and women of the New Haven and Stamford firefighters are down in the hall of flags. They would like to meet you, speak with you, and they also brought a brick-oven pizza truck for all of us to enjoy, so please take some time and spot down in the hall of flags and say hello. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Will definitely have to go

down for that pizza. Representative Case, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, what Representative Ohler and Representative Boyd failed to mention, that they were both just recognized by the Stamford Firefighters and the New Haven Firefighters for their great public service in making public safety first. I'd like to give them a big round of applause. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you and congratulations on the recognition. Representative McGee, you have the floor, sir.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

I stand for the purpose of an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed.

REP. MCGEE (5TH):

Today -- if you don't know or unaware, today is Youth Service Bureau Day, and I am delighted to welcome the City of Hartford Department of Families, Children, Youth, and Recreation. Kristina, she runs that particular department there, and then also an organization that's funded by the city of Hartford through her department, Compass Peace Builders, managed by Manny. I'm also here by our colleagues as well, and I just want this -- this -- this body of -- of all of my colleagues to stand to their feet and give these young people a round of applause for being here today and understanding what we do and all that good stuff, so if you don't mind, please stand and welcome them to the Chamber. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Welcome. Representative O'Dea, you have the floor, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an announcement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Well, we have a birthday boy in the group. Ben McGorty is 29? [Hollers 29] Twenty-nine-years-old today, so I would like to -- the House to give him a round of applause for his birthday. [Applause] [Cheering]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Happy birthday, sir!

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

And, Mr. speaker, if I may? I think the best present could be getting out of here at 6 p.m. What do you say? [Cheering]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Well, that's up to our majority leader but --

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

All right [Laughing].

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

That could be arranged.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

[Laughing] Thank you, sir. Representative Miller, you have the floor, madam.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Good morning.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Oh, I'm sorry. Good afternoon. [Cross Talking].

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Oh, good afternoon.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Yeah, sorry. This is the same day that we left at 1:30 this morning. I got home at quarter to 3.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Yeah, we're all sleepy.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

So, thank you. Mr. Speaker, I have with me -- unfortunately, my mic doesn't reach that far so I have to bend over -- I have with me Marcy Taliceo from Enfield. She's a part of the Emerge Group --

Emerge Connecticut that's here today shadowing some of the female legislators. Emerge Connecticut is an organization that's empowering women to get involved in politics, so I would like the Chamber to give her a warm welcome. [Applause] [Cheering]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Welcome. Thank you for taking the time to come and visit us.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. We will return to the call of the Calendar. Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 344?

CLERK:

On page 49, House Calendar 344, House Bill No. 5515, AN ACT CONCERNING THE AUTHORITY OF A ZONING COMMISSION TO REGULATE THE BRIGHTNESS AND ILLUMINATION OF ADVERTISING SIGNS AND BILLBOARDS. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Planning and Development.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom, you have the floor,
sir.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon, sir.
Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint
Committee's favorable report and passage of the
bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before the Chamber is on
acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report
and passage of the bill. Representative Stafstrom,
you still have the floor, sir.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the bill
before us is a fairly short one, fairly straight-
forward one, which specifically authorized
municipalities through their local zoning
regulations to regulate the brightness and
illumination of advertising signs and billboards.
The authorization would apply to municipalities
existing zoning powers under chapter -- under
section 8-2 of our general statutes and it comes to

us from an incident out of New Haven, which has highlighted the fact that unfortunately, our statutes are fairly ambiguous on whether a local zoning authority has the authority to regulate the brightness and illumination of an advertising sign and billboard in addition to its existing authority to regulate the location of those advertising signs and billboards. I would ask for support of the Chamber for this bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on this bill? Representative Rebimbas, you have the floor, madam.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon to you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Good afternoon to you.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of the legislation before us but certainly, in committee, we did have at least two people who opposed it for

some clarity questions in that regard, so if I could for legislative intent, through you Mr. Speaker, a few questions for the good vice-chairman?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom, please prepare yourself. Please proceed, madam.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you, what is the -- I mean you highlighted what this bill essentially is going to do, but why do we have it here if municipalities already have the ability to regulate these billboards?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom. Thank you, Mr. Speaker and Mr. Speaker, I thank the good ranking member for that question. It's an important one and one that certainly was addressed both in the Judiciary Committee, as well as the Planning and Development Committee. Both committees this bill went through and I had the privilege of serving on both. I think to answer the representative's

question directly right now in our statute, if you look at the bill -- line 11 of the bill. It makes clear in existing law that a local zoning authority has the ability to regulate the height, size, and location of advertising signs and billboards. That remains unchanged under the bill. What this bill does is just provide clarity that in addition to being able to regular the height, size, and location of the advertising sign and billboard, the zoning authority additionally has the ability to regular the brightness and illumination of that billboard. In other words, not just where the billboard can be placed, how high it can be, how big it can be, but how much light it can produce.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the good vice-chairman for his response. Is there a specific incident that led to the proposal before us?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you, certainly during the public hearing process we heard significant testimony from folks in New Haven regarding a particular billboard in New Haven that they had some concern with, but I do believe this legislation is appropriate and broader than just the instance in New Haven. Certainly, as we've seen the advent and continued expansion of lighted billboards, the flashing ones, the ones that project images and change that have started to pop up throughout the state that I don't think when probably section 8-2 was originally drafted or probably last amended was as much of a concern and was as prevalent throughout the state. As those lighted billboards have become more prevalent, I think our statute, as so often happens, has to evolve and adapt to keep up with changing technology.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMABS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the good vice-chairman for that response and I understand as these billboards are evolving there is certainly different kind of characteristics and one could be brightness that comes with that and it may or may not have the ability to be regulated, so one of my concerns are for those billboards that may have been in existence for many years that are not digital and have lighting mechanisms that shines on the billboards. If a municipality or city then determines that it's too bright or -- or let's just say too dim -- I doubt that -- but most often it will be too bright, does that prevent the user from being able to use the billboard if they don't have the ability or mechanism to diminish that light?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you, not if this bill were to become law. This -- this statute before us -- the bill before us is merely an enabling statute that would allow the local municipality the express authority to adopt local regulations and local ordinances that may or may not be appropriate for that town or municipality regarding the brightness of a billboard. It's our intent through this bill that those towns that are interested in updating their zoning regulations to include the brightness or illumination power of a billboard will do so working with those existing billboard owners and companies in their district, as well as the Billboard Association, which has certainly submitted testimony and has been involved in this endeavor.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, as I look at the legislation before us, this is something

that already allows towns and municipalities to regulate, and I guess we're simply providing a clarification that in addition to what's already enumerated in the current statute that then they could potentially regulate the brightness and illumination of it. My concern though is if we give them that specific ability and it renders that billboard inoperable, so let's say that that city -- let's take New Haven for example -- says that a specific billboard is too bright, and that billboard does not have the ability to diminish the lighting, essentially then it could be in violation of a local ordinance and could prevent the user from being able to conduct the business of renting that out. Is the intent to do that or is it only if it has the option -- the billboard itself physically -- without an additional cost of replacing the billboard or putting some other technology on there, if it even exists, on the person or the business who owns the billboard? Is the intent not to do that or are we opening ourselves up for literally allowing a city or municipality to deem something inoperable if it's

against the local rules and regulations?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker, through you, I think the -- the ranking member raises a very valid concern and one that cuts to the heart of zoning law altogether, not just this bill, but stepping out of the context of this bill and that's the issue of spot zoning. Certainly, if a municipality would go in and single out a particular billboard and say that particular billboard is too bright, that would likely be an instance of spot zoning and -- and would subject that municipality likely to litigation as a result of that. As with any zoning regulation, the municipality has the opportunity to set general standards for the community or for different zones within the community, be that a residential zone, a commercial zone, an industrial zone, and set those broad standards and certainly, to the extent, it's at a

maximum brightness for billboards within that city altogether or within certain areas of that city. Billboard operators would have to comply with that to the extent they have a dial and can -- can dial down the brightness. Then, that would obviously be the -- be the preferred way to do that, and like I said, I think the municipality is sort of consistent with any of its other zoning powers and with any of its other zoning regulations would need to be cognizant not to run a foul of spot zoning prohibitions.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to thank the vice-chairman for his response regarding spot zoning, and I understand and actually, that was one of the concerns that the ACLU had regarding this legislation. They actually opposed it and it was based on freedom of speech with the concern that maybe specific billboards would be targeted because

someone disagreed with the message on that billboard, so I certainly understand the spot zoning. My concern is if that billboard does not have the capability of diminishing the brightness and then the city says that's too bright, you can't have it, you're in violation, therefore, cut it off. That's my concern. In that situation, what happens?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, through you, I believe the billboard owner or operator would need to come in compliance with the zoning ordinance that's put in place. Like I suggested, I think that as long as the zoning ordinance is properly in place, there is a set timeframe, for example, on when the billboard can be illuminated, how bright it can be, to the extent those are properly adopted through the zoning process and remember -- I'd remind the ranking member and the Chamber that, you know, these zoning regulations don't just get adopted sort of willy nilly. They need to go through a public hearing process. They need to go through the board or

commission in that town that's responsible for adopting those ordinances consistent with its own zoning process, but through you Mr. Speaker, I do believe that if there was a billboard that was too bright after regulations are properly adopted and assuming those regulations are adopted in a uniform standard way consistent with our law on how zoning regulations are adopted in the state, then a billboard owner may have to incur whatever cost there is to turn down the brightness, maybe that is un -- unscrewing some of the bulbs or covering some of the bulbs or replacing them with a lower wattage, whatever that might be, but to stay consistent with that.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Rebimbas, you have the floor.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well, unfortunately, that highlights a concern then in that regard regarding the billboards and a concern that certainly I may have because if we're going to be

making this retroactive and not grandfathering some of the older billboards that are already in existence, the owners have already a) purchased the billboard, probably already have contracts with advertisers moving forward, and if they get affected by change in the law after the fact, that could be a considerable amount of loss of income regarding the advertisers and now an additional burden of potentially having to replace a billboard. Now, I haven't looked into, you know, financial analysis of who owns these billboards but again, I'm assuming it's either individuals or businesses and this would be one more negative affect on current existing businesses, so that is, Mr. Speaker, a concern of mine. Maybe as the debate continues on if there could be some kind of understanding or ability to address that in this legislation before it passes that at the very least those billboards from the date of enactment, if the have the ability -- let's say that the zoning regulations passes something that says it's too bright -- if they have the ability currently to do that, to diminish it,

wonderful, but if they don't --

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

(Gavel) (Gavel) (Gavel) Members are having a hard time hearing the debate. Can you please keep your conversations to a low? If not, please take them outside of the Chamber. Thank you. Please proceed, madam.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, but if they don't have the ability, we don't want to put an additional burden on a business to have to replace completely a billboard to suit post new regulations or quite frankly give up those contracts for advertisers that they may already have in advance months or potentially years, so I think again the intent of the legislation is good. At this time, I actually waiver whether or not I'm going to be able to support it on that one issue but if it's something that could be corrected, I think it's something that deserves a little bit more attention.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and Mr. Speaker, I certainly understand the ranking member's concerns and maybe to put her and others at ease slightly on this issue, I will represent that I know the proponent of this bill -- the main proponent of this bill, Representative Dillon, as well as some of the leaders of the Judiciary Committee and the Planning and Development Committee have been approached by the Outdoor Advertising Association of Connecticut, which is the industry group that represents many, but not all, but many of the billboard owners in the state of Connecticut, and they have actually pledged to work with local municipalities on adopting zoning regulations. Those municipalities that wish to do so. They in fact have their own sort of internal policies and procedures regulating the brightness and illumination of -- of billboards and sort of have an industry standard for their members. Unfortunately, not everyone is a member of that Association, so I think why this bill is before us is those few billboard owners who are not members of

the association, who are not abiding by the association's guidelines that they've promulgated as in terms of illumination and brightness and are going above and beyond that, that have created some of the issues, so I think some -- I think the intent of the industry, as well as the proponent of this, would be to take some of those industry standards that the trade organization is doing in self-policing itself and write some of that into the actual zoning legislation, so I don't believe that this would have a broad affect on the vast majority of billboard owners and billboards who are abiding by the existing industry standard. It would only be those few who may be above and beyond the industry standard.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to thank the vice-chairman for that response. Certainly, you know, whenever there is changes in local ordinances

regarding even size, whether it's billboards or other signs, typically, they don't go back and make those who are then out of compliance -- they usually grandfather it in, so hopefully, they'll look at the legislative intent of this proposal and at least listen to the dialogue or debate in that regard and take into consideration that we don't want to hurt those businesses or individuals that currently right now may have billboards that may be deemed out of compliance but through no fault of their own and without additional financial burdens, they wouldn't be able to equip that billboard in order to meet the new standards, so thank you Mr. Speaker and I thank the good vice-chairman for his responses.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on this bill? Representative Dubitsky, you have the floor, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions for the proponent, if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you. Now, this bill -- my understanding actually I know this bill came first through Judiciary and then through Planning and Development. Through you, Mr. Speaker, could I ask the proponent why this started in Judiciary since it's a zoning bill? Why it didn't start in Planning and Development?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the representative for that question. I know he -- he raised that at the committee level as well. My understanding is that when the bill was originally proposed -- the idea was originally proposed there was some financial penalties involved in -- in the original concept and -- and certainly, the Judiciary Committee has cognizance over fines over and above \$5 thousand dollars, and so that's why the bill

originated there. As it worked its way through the public hearing process and also I believe discussions between the proponent of the bill and the -- the lead introducer of the bill, Representative Dillon, and members of the committee, those financial penalties were removed; hence, the reason the bill had its public hearing in Judiciary, but then ultimately was referred to Planning and Development out of Judiciary in order for that committee that -- that would simultaneously have cognizance over this issue to vet it.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the proponent for that answer. I would just suggest that zoning bills are a bit unique and really need to start in Planning and Development, and I'll -- I'll -- with a couple of questions, I think it will become clear why this is really a zoning issue and should be handled initially by Planning and

Development. There was some -- there was discussion between the ranking member and Representative Stafstrom about the -- about what happens to a sign that's already existing and will a sign owner be able to come into compliance, so the concepts of zoning are very important to this very discussion, and I would ask -- through you Mr. Speaker, I would ask the proponent if the -- about the concept of a preexisting, nonconforming use of a sign that is already there and is already illuminated.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, our existing law I believe as the ranking member properly pointed out is not changed by this -- our existing law and precedent in case law on nonconforming use and spot zoning and the ability of a municipality to stop zoning regulations in the like is unchanged by this bill. This bill merely makes sure that municipalities understand they do

have the authority, if they so choose, to regulate the brightness and illumination of a billboard as long as that is done within the existing framework of the ability to adopt such regulations.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the proponent for that answer, and I would -- I would pause at that the concept of the preexisting, nonconforming use is written in our statutes. I believe it's Connecticut General Statutes 8-2 has a provision that an existing use cannot be zoned out of existing, that in the instance that Representative Rebimbas discussed that provision would come into play because a -- if a sign owner already had a sign that was illuminating -- illuminated and the town or city decided to change their regulations, without other facts, it appears that the concept of the preexisting, nonconforming use would come into play and -- and I don't really

think there would be a spot zoning issue. It would really be preexisting use and that owner would likely -- depending on other things -- be able to maintain that, so I think that's important for sign owners to know and to investigate in their specific circumstance. Through you Mr. Speaker, if I may ask the proponent? This bill talks about the brightness and illumination of advertising signs and billboards. If I could ask through you, what is the difference in this bill between brightness and illumination?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you, I believe those are terms of art within the industry. I believe brightness refers to the lights on a nonelectronic billboard, what we might consider a standard billboard that -- that doesn't change pixels, doesn't change picture. The brightness would be the lights that get projected onto that billboard to light it up. I believe illumination

means in the sense of an electronic board similar to our -- our voting boards here or the ones you see up and down the highway that -- that change every few sections. The illumination is the power of the bulb coming out from that screen.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I would not -- I would not dare contradict the proponent of the bill. My understanding, however, is that brightness is the amount of light that's coming off of the sign. Illumination is the type of light that is providing that illumination, whether it be direct or indirect, so for the purpose of legislative intent at least, I think people should investigate that. This is not my bill so I -- you know, I certainly can't give a definitive answer but having worked in the industry -- that industry in my previous life, that's my understanding of how that -- that works. Now, through you Mr. Speaker, I would ask the proponent

if the -- if this bill and the addition of the brightness and illumination language is intended to also allow the regulation of any movement of the signs, such as perhaps a spinning sign or perhaps a sign that's flashing -- you know, some type of perceived movement in the sign, would that be covered by the -- by the term brightness and illumination in this bill?

Through you?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I'm not sure I quite understand the question. Does the representative mean whether the sign can -- the physical sign itself can move up and down, side-to-side, or does he mean whether -- whether the picture on the sign in the instance of an electronic billboard can -- can rotate or change?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll try to clarify. This bill and the -- the existing statute don't say anything about electronic signs. They just say signs and billboards, so a sign or billboard under this -- under the existing statute appears to be any sign or billboard whether it's electronic or just a piece of wood that's got a painting on it or any -- any type of sign or billboard, so we are now in this bill proposing to allow the towns to regulate how bright the sign is going to be and how it's illuminated, so my question is will this also allow the town to regulate any movement of the sign such as flashing lights, which are perceived as some type of movement or maybe some type of rotating sign like car dealerships sometimes have a sign that moves or things like that. Is that intended to be covered by this bill or is it simply how much light comes off of the sign and how -- and how that sign is illuminated?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the intent of the bill is that it is limited to how much light comes off the sign.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the proponent for that answer. Is there any type of standard measurement that we would be imposing on a town or would it be a town's prerogative to choose any type of measurement like -- like a certain number of lumens or footcandles? Is there something in state law that would be -- that we would be requiring on the towns or is that something that the towns had the option to choose?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. speaker, I apologize. Could the representative please repeat the question for me?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dubitsky, can you repeat the question, please?

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Certainly. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm asking if this -- if there's anything in state law that would mandate on the towns how -- how they were to measure brightness coming off of a sign, whether it be in lumens or footcandles or some scale, or how -- how your supposed to measure it? From what distance? At what time of night? Things like that. Is any of that in state law with regard to any other thing that would be incorporated into this by reference or is -- or are we leaving that up to the towns to -- to make those decisions?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, the only thing I am aware of that is -- that might be somewhat related, although somewhat different, would be I do believe DOT has certain regulations involving billboards along state highways. That's -- that's the only other area of state law that I'm aware of that -- that might be related on this topic.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and following up on that answer, so presumably this bill and this statute would not -- would not supersede any regulations that DOT has with regard to signs on state highways. Would it?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I don't believe it would supersede it. I believe that in -- in -- in

the purview of the local municipality and local zoning authority and assuming it acted consistent with our laws and regulations, I think a municipality probably could adopt zoning regulations that might be seen as more restrictive than the DOT regulations, but I do not think it would supersede those DOT restrictions in any way.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, when we talk about brightness and illumination, Representative Stafstrom talked earlier about a specific incident, I believe it was in New Haven?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Mr. speaker. Through you, the Judiciary Committee received significant testimony from residents of a particular community in New Haven who

had concern with a -- a particular billboard there that again as I referenced earlier would be above and beyond sort of the brightness and illumination of a standard sign and the guidelines from which the Outdoor Advertising Association of Connecticut normally operates.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, so since -- since the statute itself doesn't say anything about whether it's an internally lit sign like the video sign that Representative Stafstrom appears to be talking about or a standard old-fashioned billboard with some lights on it, this bill that we're talking about which allows municipalities to regulate brightness and illumination, that would cover both types of signs and any other types of signs that would have some type of lighting?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes. Through you Mr. Speaker, that's my understanding.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, Representative Stafstrom mentioned the regulation of signs and billboards near state roads would be covered in part by the DOT regulations. Now, I'm -- I'm wondering on -- on federal roads -- like on the interstates -- we see extensive billboarding in some areas. My guess -- and I don't know -- is that some of that is controlled by the federal government, and I was wondering if Representative Stafstrom could enlighten us on that.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I confess I'm not up-

to-speed on federal regulation regarding brightness or illumination of billboards along interstate highways. It was my understanding that -- that the majority of that regulation came from the state through the state DOT. I'm not aware of what any federal highway administration regulations may or may not be.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, so -- but presumably if there were such federal highway regulations, a billboard owner would need to comply with that in addition to any state or local regulations including regulations promulgated under this -- this statute that we're debating today?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

Yes, Mr. Speaker. That is correct. Certainly, anyone who is operating a billboard for commercial

use would need to be versed not just in the whatever local zoning regulations may be adopted for that particular municipality but also whatever state DOT regulations or other federal law or federal regulations may be on the books.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, Mr. Speaker, when we're talking about the regulation of billboards, obviously some people get a bit concerned and Representative Rebimbas raised the issue of the -- of the concern of content of -- of towns regulating the content of signs. When we're talking about brightness and illumination, is there any indication that that could touch on what the billboards say or what images are on them or any type of content?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, I thank the representative for the question because this is an important point and I do want to be clear for legislative intent that I do not see this amendment to section 8-2 allowing a municipality to regulate the content, verbiage, images, the like that may be able to put on a billboard. This merely is limited to the brightness and illumination. I believe the representative used before the candle power -- candle with -- as that may or may not be measured. You know, that's not to say there might not be other -- other law or other existing regulation that would allow for certain regulation of content on a billboard. That remains unchanged by the statute, but I do not see this statute as giving any additional power to municipalities to regulate any content of -- of a billboard.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and finally, with --

with regard to brightness and illumination, when I think of the word illumination, I think of the types of lights being used and when -- when I'm looking at a billboard, the type of lights being used is often tied directly to the construction of the billboard itself, whether it's one of those steel poles or in some of the more rural areas, it could be on some telephone poles or something like that. Is there anything in this proposed bill -- in this proposed change of this statute, which would implicate the construction of a billboard in any way?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

No. through you Mr. Speaker, I believe existing law and I am sure there is case law on this, although I confess I haven't -- I haven't researched it thoroughly -- but under existing law at lines 11 and 12 of the bill, I would point the representative to the fact that there is already existing law that a municipality can regulate the

height, size, and location of outdoor signs and billboards, whether that means the type of materials that have to be used or can be used I'm not aware, but that -- that remains unchanged by the proposed language before us.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Well, I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the proponent of the bill, and I will continue to listen to the discussion. Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will you remark further on this bill?

Representative Dillon, you have the floor, madam.

REP. DILLON (92ND):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Speaking in support of the bill, I wanted to first thank the chairs and ranking members of Judiciary and of Planning and Development for taking up this proposal and I've been listening to some of the -- of the back and forth with -- with keen interest. I

did want to mention that this matter was brought to us by the parents of the students at Chapel Haven who were extraordinarily emotional about the safety of their children because the -- we have been expanding at that particular facility for -- for an older population and -- and one of the ways that you mark developmentally whether or not someone really can function in the community is whether or not they can cross that street, and so even though Whalley Avenue is a state road, as well as a local road, and it's controlled by two different sets of rules, it's a densely residential area with apartment buildings and in those apartment buildings, are all of those vulnerable people that we've been talking about for 20 years that were going to live in the community rather than having state operated facilities. Now that they're in the community, we need to make sure that we have very sensitive, sight-specific understanding of what it's like to function in that community. This particular area actually already has a very bright sign, which is above our heads, and it has been blinking without incident. The one

that appeared, and which created so much trauma and anxiety is at eye level. It is technically off premise, even though it's on the same land as a convenient store, and -- and it blinks constantly and it was very, very bright. We were very startled to learn that -- that the state statute was not expressed on the issue of illumination and whether or not the -- the lighting of a billboard is within the four corners so to speak of that particular physical structure or whether it throws its light onto the street, which is part of what causes the anxiety because of distracted driving because people are blinded. Second, it sometimes can trigger seizures and that's very, very important depending on who lives near there and how late that's on, so this -- this really is a new area in a way. The -- the Billboard Association originally testified that they opposed it because it was redundant because some towns have gone ahead and taken the authority without express -- without it being expressly in statutes, but the testimony and support of it was very powerful and the emotional presence of many of

the families was as well, and this obviously any remedy at the local level is going to be controlled by the towns. The application of this broad principle is going to be local, not state, but this really grew out of a community that's very loving and protective if its -- of all of the members of its community and even though it's much more modest than I originally anticipated and it -- and I think it's properly much more modest than I originally anticipated, I think this will go a long way to making certainly the city feel secure that -- that it will have the authority to take a look at some of the illumination and brightness of -- of signs like this, and thank you very much for the questions. They've been very, very thoughtful but the expressed language is needed, so thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Do you remark further on this bill? Representative Skulczyck, you have the floor, sir.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and through you Mr.

Speaker, to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you. Please proceed, sir.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you, sir. And, so hearing a good debate about this, to the proponent, I am a former first selectman in a small town and understand the process of establishing new ordinance -- Sorry, I'm speaking to Mr. Speaker, so I just want to make sure you can hear my comments. Thank you -- or question -- and so understanding the responsibility of local government, being sitting on ordinance committees before and had the luxury of actually sitting there and understanding how it is to build local ordinance, I have some concerns, so I'll start off with some questions. Do we know if there's a fiscal note, through you Mr. Speaker to the proponent, that would be impacted on the local municipality to establish such an ordinance?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate the question. No, I'm not aware of any additional fiscal impact on municipalities. It's my understanding that certainly in my municipality and I believe most of them they already have existing boards and commissions that adopt and can regulate zoning regulations if they so choose. I do believe there are a couple municipalities that don't choose to do so, but the ones that do already have zoning regulations and boards and commissions that would consider it, and this -- any change to the brightness or illumination requirements would go through that existing board and therefore, would not add any additional cost to the municipality.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you for that response and unfortunately, I think I would disagree respectfully. You must not be familiar with the e-book or the filing of an ordinance that have to be filed throughout the state

of Connecticut, but each time you do establish an ordinance, Mr. Speaker through you to the proponent, cost about \$7 hundred dollars locally through the process of going in the newspaper for posting and then to get it actually in the book, so there is a cost and I'm -- I'm estimating about \$7 hundred dollars for one ordinance to be filed. Now, you could file multiple ordinance at one time, save some money that way, but there certainly is a fiscal impact. Again, following up on my question for that to the proponent, has CCM or COST weighed in on this?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, if I could just on the -- on the previous point, this obviously it's permissive of whether the town wants to update its -- its ordinance or regulations on brightness and illumination, so through you, just want to make sure that it is clear that -- that there's no mandate or

requirement on a town that they adopt such zoning regulations or brightness; so therefore, I'm not sure that there's a fiscal impact unless a municipality decides to avail themselves of this. As to the point about CCM, it's my understanding through the chairman of the Planning and Development Committee that CCM has in fact weighed in on this legislation and does support it as it gives towns additional authority to regulate their own zoning.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you and so I appreciate the response to that and I do note that this is a participation process and the municipalities must do that. Sometimes I think the overreaching process of the state can be cumbersome on the local municipalities but with that being said, looking back in testimony, the ACLU was brought up earlier with free speech, if the proponent just could clearly help me understand why he would disagree with the ACLU and their stand

against this, please?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know that I would -- I don't know that I can speak for the ACLU or necessarily state why their opinion is not a valid one but as I understand this legislation and as I've tried to make clear for legislative intent, you know I do believe that a municipality has the proper authority and role to regulate zoning and to regulate what takes place in its town in terms of brightness or illumination of a billboard, but this legislation clearly, in my opinion, would not allow a municipality to regulate the type of content on that billboard and certainly, when you get to speak, I guess the ACLU could draw the line that how bright or how dim something is is a type of speech. I don't necessarily share that concern. To me, the concern would be if we had this legislation that allowed the municipality to regulate the type of

content that said, you know a pizza place can't -- can't advertise on a billboard. We only want hamburger joints to advertise on a particular billboard. That would clearly cross a line and I don't believe that this legislation authorized that.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you for that response from the proponent, again, kind of wrapping it up here. Through you Mr. Speaker to the proponent, if -- and I've heard some great testimony from the previous speaker from New Haven and the concerns for local, and I think it's been stated by the proponent of the bill, through you Mr. Speaker, that this actually -- some municipalities have already established these ordinance. Is that correct?

To the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that's correct. As I said, I think the statute previously was silent on whether a municipality had the authority to regulate brightness and illumination. Some certainly, I believe, thought that they did and have gone ahead and done that. Certainly, for those municipalities that have, this legislation should provide them some comfort in that we've written it into statute that they specifically have that authority, that they cannot be subject to overreaching by adopting those regulations, assuming they otherwise comply with standards of -- of zoning, but for those municipalities that have been hesitant or reticent to wade into the discussion of brightness and illumination of billboards, then this would -- this would provide them the express authority to do so.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Skulczyck.

REP. SKULCZYCK (45TH):

Thank you and I'll -- I'll just finish with a

comment, through you Mr. Speaker. Thank you to the proponent for answering the questions. I strongly feel that we should probably stay out of the local municipality approval process, leave it up to them locally to approve and decide whether or not they want to establish local ordinance that is in place as we speak, and I think there is other cost impact for the municipalities. For example, I as a former first selectman had to deal with a sound engineer and now we'll have to see light engineers when possibly things are contested in court, so for that very reason, I think we leave it up to the locals to decide. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on this bill? Representative Perone, you have the floor, sir.

REP. PERONE (137TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just have a couple of questions for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. PERONE (137TH):

Thank you very much. Yeah, I understand the intent and the purpose of the bill, but I was curious to know about when it comes to the word brightness. I couldn't find any real guidance for municipalities in -- anywhere else in the bill, so would -- is brightness -- is it really -- is it like 10 percent of what the maximum brightness of the sign is or is it really up to the municipalities to decide like say the percentage of brightness that a sign would have?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I believe there -- as Representative Dubitsky had indicated earlier -- there are a few different ways in which brightness can be measured. You know, certainly any -- any type of light. The signs in here would be a good example. I think the terms were either lumens or candle power. It's my understanding that through

this legislation a municipality would be authorized to adopt a local regulation setting a maximum for candle power as it may be and again, as I indicated, we would hope that that would be consistent with and in discussions with the Outdoor Advertising Authority who already has existing regulations for its members, but of course, that is a voluntary membership organization and doesn't apply to those who choose not to be part of that organization.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Perone.

REP. PERONE (137TH):

So, then just about basically though that it's really -- it's gonna be incumbent on the municipalities with guidance of the local marketers, local advertisers, and sign manufacturers?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, that's correct.

REP. PERONE (137TH):

Thank you very much. I have no further questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you. Will you remark further on this bill? Representative Staneski, you have the floor, madam.

REP. STANESKI (119TH):

Thank you. Thank you. Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. How are you?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Good afternoon.

REP. STANESKI (119TH):

A couple of questions to the proponent of the bill, please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. STANESKI (119TH):

In listening to some of the comments here, I certainly can align my thoughts on how we need to start looking at the way that we structure our cities when we are asking for those who live at

Chapel Haven or other places to be involved, be free to walk around, and we have to understand the sensory issues and such, but I do have a question to the proponent because I think this is written -- while it's written loosely, it's written for a specific issue that was mentioned earlier and that is a billboard over near Chapel Haven, and my question is that in reading some testimony my understanding is that the city of New Haven already has a statute that does regulate billboards and signs and even lighting on that and that was part of their -- their testimony?

Through you Mr. Speaker, if the good vice-chair of Judic could respond, please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I'm not -- I'm not sure of the exact regulations in New Haven. As I indicated earlier, I do believe there are some municipalities who have taken upon themselves to enact local regulations and zoning ordinances that

do regulate the brightness and illumination of billboards. Certainly, to the extent there was a challenge to those, a court would first look to whether the municipality has the authority to do so or not, and unfortunately, our statute as it currently exists on the books is silent to that, so to the extent the city of New Haven or any other city has already taken it upon themselves to write into their zoning rules or into ordinance what the brightness or illumination of billboards may be in a particular area, this -- this bill really should provide them some cover -- some legal cover that if those ordinances were challenges that yes, in fact, the municipality does have the statutory authority to adopt those regulations assuming it's doing so within the bounds of -- of our zoning rules.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Staneski.

REP. STANESKI (119TH):

Thank you and I thank the good vice-chair for that answer, so am I to understand that -- I was an

alderwoman in my hometown and I did sit on the Ordinance Committee there, and we passed ordinances that we think have teeth, so through you Mr. Speaker, to the vice-chair of Judic, is he saying that unless we write something at the state that gives the authority to the local municipality that those of us who have sat on or currently sit on ordinance committees are passing ordinances that may not hold -- be held up in court if there's a challenge?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I think -- I think any ordinance that any municipality writes, just like any law that we pass here in this body could be subject to a court challenge and can be struck down if it exceeds certain constitutional or statutory or -- or other authority. Certainly, in the extent of local ordinances, municipalities, of course, are not -- not sovereign entities in the extent that a state

is. They are subdivisions of the sovereign, subdivisions of the state. They derive their power through us as the state and we have the proper authority to regulate what a municipality does or doesn't do, so when a court is determining whether an ordinance should hold up or not, one of the first things that court does is to look to whether there is actually the authority of the municipality to engage in that type of activity, that type of rule making that it chooses to make. Sometimes when our statutes are silent, the court would hold that the municipality can fill in the gap and can fill in the silence. Certainly, where we have expressly designated authority to the municipality, to our political subdivision as it may be, that is a stronger case for the town to make.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Staneski.

REP. STANESKI (119TH):

Thank you and I thank the good gentleman for that explanation not being an attorney myself, but

it does beg the question since -- since we don't have any existing state language around this and there is existing ordinances within at least the city of New Haven where it says that they do have the ability to restrict signs and lighting for public safety reasons, I -- I question whether or not this language is needed. Now, I will say this, that I know my good friends from New Haven and I know that the area -- I know the area they're talking about and it certainly is an area of concern. My -- my issue is that we are putting something in that I think might constrict the other communities. I understand this is an opt-in/opt-out kind of thing and I don't believe there's been any challenges in court to the ordinances there, but it is disturbing to me that a community that has an ordinance that says they can restrict that, that their board of alders is not listening to their community members, and so I'm gonna support this tonight for them but it is a -- it's a concern for me that it is not -- that's it's not being handled at the local level when it does look like they have

an ordinance within their -- their -- their books that would actually allow for them to regulate this billboard and the lighting. Thank you very much, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further? The Chamber -- the Chamber will stand at ease. The Chamber will come back to order. Representative Ritter, you have the floor, sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we pass this item temporarily. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Is there objection? The bill will be passed temporarily. The Chamber will stand at ease. Will the Chamber come back to order? Representative Stafstrom. Oh, new bill. Okay. Will the clerk please call Bill No. 454?

CLERK:

On page 41, House Calendar 454, Senate Bill No. 471, AN ACT CONCERNING A MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENT REPORT FOR AN ACCIDENT IN WHICH A PERSON WAS KILLED.

Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on
Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom, you have the floor,
sir.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move
for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable
report and passage of the bill in concurrence with
the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before the Chamber is acceptance
of the Joint Committee's favorable report and
passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate.
Representative Stafstrom, you have the floor.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a
bill that's come through this Chamber a couple of
times previously and is an important bill, which
addresses a -- a serious concern and -- in those
tragic instances in which an individual is killed in
a motor vehicle accident. Certainly, in those

instances where a loved one is -- is killed in a motor vehicle accident, it's important to find the cause for it, to bring closure to the family, and as well as to adjudicate whatever insurance concerns and legal proceedings there may be. The bill before us requires the police or other agencies -- but is primarily geared towards local police departments -- investigate a fatal motor vehicle accident and cannot find cause they are allowed to refer the case to the state's attorney in the district where the accident took place and the state's attorney is then empowered to refer the matter to the state police for review and further investigation. There is no requirement that upon review of the state police that the state police in fact find cause. The intent merely is to allow the state police to take a second look at the incident to the extent the local police department is unable to find cause. This bill comes to us from the speaker, and I urge support for it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Would you remark further on the bill before us?

Representative Rebimbas, you have the floor, madam.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the legislation -- proposed legislation before us. We have seen this in the past few years in different versions but it relatively trying to accomplish the same thing. Just for clarity, through you Mr. Speaker, to the good vice-chairman, is there any obligation whatsoever on a local police department or any of the other additional referral agencies such as the state's attorney's office or the state police to actually find cause or liability associated with the investigation of a fatal death in an accident?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I thank the ranking member for that question. The answer is unequivocally, no.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and if the good vice-chairman could just confirm, I believe I did read that there is no fiscal impact to the local municipality police department in the investigation of the ordinary course that they do investigations of accidents that occur within their district, so we are not asking them to go above and beyond, higher any type of extra expertise to try to reach a causation for an accident. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to thank the good vice-chairman for those responses. Again,

I do rise in support of this legislation and I think certainly if a local police department for whatever reason can't reach the causation of a fatal accident, if we have other options, those options should certainly be exercised, so this is kind of a guidance along to where those referrals should be made, so I do think that this legislation is appropriate and one that I'm sure people would find very informative in the due diligence of any investigation when there is a fatal accident, so I do rise in support of it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Would you remark further on the bill before us? Would you remark further on the bill before us? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members, please take your seats. The machine will be opened. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Have all members voted? Please check the board to ensure that your vote has been properly cast.

Have all members voted? Please check the board to ensure that your vote has been properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the clerk will take the tally. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

Senate Bill 471

Total number Voting	148
Necessary for Passage	75
Those voting Yea	148
Those voting Nay	0
Absent not Voting	2

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The bill passes in concurrence with the Senate (Gavel). Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 362?

CLERK:

On page 33, House Calendar 362, Substitute House Bill 5563, AN ACT CONCERNING ROBO CALLS AND

SPOOFING. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom, you have the floor, sir.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Question before the Chamber is acceptance and passage of the bill. Would you remark?

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a fairly simple bill which makes it clear that a person is permitted from intentionally using a blocking device or other service to circumvent a customer's caller identification service such as making a robo call and provides a penalty of a Class A misdemeanor for that offense. I urge support.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will you remark further? Representative
Carpino, you have the floor.

REP. CARPINO (32ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If the good vice-chair
of Judiciary could just tell me what the vote total
was coming out of Judiciary?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think
the committee looked very kindly on this. It was
well received by the committee and received a 41 to
nothing vote out of committee.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Carpino.

REP. CARPINO (32ND):

Thank you and I thank the good chairman for
that answer. I think that is important here. The
intent of the bill is to solve a quality-of-life
problem. It's from all of us, sadly. It's a 000-
000-0000 number that's coming to your house or in

fact a number from your own phone dialing you or
sadly, in the case of my district, a phone number
from a deceased relative, so I thank the good
members of the Judiciary Committee for seeing this
favorably, and I urge support.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Would you remark further on
the bill before us? Would you remark further on the
bill before us? If not, will staff and guests
please come to the well of the House? Members
please take your seats. The machine will be open.

[Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.
Members to the Chamber. The House of
Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the
Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Have all members voted? Have all members
voted? Please check the board to ensure that your
vote has been properly cast. If all members have
voted, the machine will be locked, and the clerk

will take a tally. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 5563

Total number Voting	149
Necessary for Passage	75
Those voting Yea	149
Those voting Nay	0
Absent not Voting	1

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The bill passes (Gavel). Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I am thrilled to have with me today Molly and Dana Neale. Molly is an 8th grader at Mystic Middle School, and we met at the March for Our Lives, and after that, Molly sent me a letter telling me how she felt about her safety in schools and gun control, and I asked her if she would like to come up and job shadow me, which is what she's doing, and her dad is with her,

Dana, and he has served our country and our submarines, so I am really pleased to have them here with me today, and I'd like us to give us our welcome to Molly and Dana Neale. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Welcome, Molly. You could have not chosen a better representative to shadow. Thank you for being here today. Are there any other announcements or introductions? Representative Cheeseman, you have the floor, madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much. I have the pleasure of having here with me today my dear friend, Gerri Lewis, who's up for the quarterly meeting of the Connecticut Port Authority. Gerri lives in Old Saybrook. She's a constituent of Representative

Carney's. She is incredibly active in her local community, serving on the Estuary Board, the Zoning Board, the Board of Finance, so I don't even know how she has time to be here with us today, but I would ask you to all join with me in giving her our usual warm welcome. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

[Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you. Welcome and thank you for the service to our communities. Representative O'Dea, you have the floor, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise for a brief announcement, if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

I just found out that we have another birthday in the room. William Tong is now 52. Same age as I am [Whoa] [Laughing], and he doesn't look a day under 55. Happy birthday, Representative Tong!

[Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Happy birthday! Representative Siegrist, you have the floor.

REP. SIEGRIST (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an announcement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. SIEGRIST (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, today, I have constituents from Haddam from the 4th grade in Burr Elementary School, and I would hope that the House would give them a nice introduction -- or welcome. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Welcome! Nice to have you here in your house. Okay, we will return to the call of the Calendar. Will the clerk please call Calendar No. 430?

CLERK:

On page 1, Calendar 430, House Joint Resolution No. 155, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF ROBERT A. D'ANDREA, ESQUIRE, OF LITCHFIELD TO BE A

JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Conley, you have the floor, madam.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and adoption of the resolution in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and adoption of the resolution in concurrence with the Senate. Nothing concurrent.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Robert D'Andrea, of Litchfield, Connecticut, has -- he graduated from University of Hartford and went to Suffolk Law School. He's had a very lucrative career doing many things private practice and working for the state. Most recently, he's been a Worker's Compensation Commissioner for the last year. I believe he's been

-- he was in Hartford for a little bit, and then I believe he's in New Britain, but I could be corrected accurately to another location. He's served very well as a comp commissioner for the last year and is looking to be promoted to the bench. Again, I would urge adoption of Commissioner D'Andrea to become Judge D'Andrea.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you. Will you -- will you care to remark further? Representative Rebimbas, you have the floor, madam.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, a few questions through you to the representative.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Conley, prepare yourself.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Rebimbas, please proceed.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I believe

the nominee before us to be a judge on the superior court. He currently is serving, as the good representative indicated, as a commissioner in Worker's Compensation. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Conley.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you Mr. Speaker, I believe the good representative had some information she provided previously on another date regarding how the Worker's Compensation is funded. If she wouldn't mind sharing that with the Chamber?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Conley.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, the Comp Commission is

funded by employer contributions. Each employer does get a bill that they have to pay and that funds the entire system, so it's not funded through the general fund.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

(Gavel) (Gavel) (Gavel) Would you please take the conversations outside of the Chamber? Thank you. Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to thank the representative for her response in that regard, and so this nominee is now being nominated to the superior court, so he essentially if he were to be confirmed through the Chambers, then he would be serving as a new judge on the superior court of the state of Connecticut. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Conley.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I'd like to thank the representative for those responses. Certainly, I have the ability as ranking member to be during the public hearing listening to the testimony provided by Attorney D'Andrea and had the ability to certainly review his questionnaire and most recently some of the additional information that we received since the public hearing. I do find Attorney D'Andrea to be a qualified nominee to sit on the superior court, but just as we have noted previously since the last time we had nominees come before us in this Chamber, we don't have the money for it, so since that time, we still have not dealt with our \$321-million-dollar proposed deficit for 2018. I still haven't seen any figures as to how we are going to support. This would be 1 of the 31 new nominees that we're facing. I still have not received any additional information that counters the representations and testimony that had been previously provided in conjunction to the

nominations that were previously made that the judicial branch is not in need of additional judges. We can't afford it. We don't have the need for it, and we haven't dealt with the current deficit that we have. Nothing has changed, except additional judges that this Chamber is asked to vote on. Mr. Speaker, I cannot at this time in good faith support any nominees that we have not appropriately budgeted for, have a budget for, or most importantly have a need for at this time, so I will be voting in the negative.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Do you care to remark further? Representative Wilson, you have the floor.

REP. WILSON (66TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to speak regarding Attorney D'Andrea, who I've known for many, many years as an active member in our community and know that his report through the Judiciary Committee was excellent. Unfortunately, I'm not going to be able to support this because of the financial condition of the state of Connecticut.

I had a conversation with Mr. D'Andrea earlier and apologized to him for this because under any other circumstances, if we didn't have the financial quagmire that we're dealing with, I would have voted whole-heartedly for his appointment. I'm sorry to say I can't do that today. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further? Representative Ziobron, you have the floor, madam.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you -- thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon to you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Good afternoon.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Mr. Speaker, I get up for what I feel like is the 50th time in this Chamber talking about the process of putting all of these items within a budget document so that we can prioritize effectively on behalf of our constituents. The good ranking member of Judic just spoke a little bit

about why our caucus is now looking at these issues from a budgetary standpoint because just last week, as you know, both sides presented budgets. One was a full spending and revenue plan, and my friends across the aisle presented a spending plan with no revenue. What has changed though is today I'm very proud to share that my caucus in fact updated our budget. We released that this morning, and we were able to find the additional money to do a full appropriation as the request from the Judicial Department and Judge Carroll, so while our version 1 of our budget only was able to put back \$2 million dollars so that we could in fact hire the much needed court marshals and others and our friends across the aisle you guys put back \$2.3 million dollars, and this version of the budget that the republicans have presented just fully balanced revenue and spending package, we have been able to prioritize all of the money that the Judiciary Department requested through the appropriations process, and I encourage my colleagues to take a look at our documents. And, until we pass a budget,

an updated budget that is balanced, I just don't know how we can continue to prioritize new programs, new judges, new spending, new contracts without showing where is the money coming from to pay for all these things very well intentioned, probably good policies, but as a famous movie line once said, "Show me the money." Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Care to remark further.
Representative Smith, you have the floor.

REP. SMITH (108TH):

Mr. Speaker, what's interesting this morning on the way in I happened to run into Judge Carroll as he was coming out of the elevator, and I've known Judge Carroll for probably about 15 years. He used to sit in the Danbury Superior Court where I practice, and we've gotten to know each other quite well over the years and especially up here, and he had a look on his face. I said, "What's the matter Judge" and he indicated to me -- he goes, "Rich, I don't know what I'm gonna do?" "What do you mean?" "I don't know what I'm going to do with all of these

judges. I have no room. I do not have a need. They may have to sit in small claims court. I don't need the judges." That's the frustration coming from the Chief Court Administrator from the State of Connecticut, and here we are once again giving them more judges -- a gift that he doesn't need. So, I spoke all last week against the judges. It's nothing to do with the quality. It's nothing to do with the character. It's nothing to do with the experience of this particular candidate -- or nominee. He would be a fine judge on a different day of the state had the money. So, for the reasons expressed previously and again reiterated this morning -- this very morning -- first thing out of the judge's mouth was "I do not need more judges", I would have to vote no. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further? Do you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members please take your seats. The machine will be opened.

[Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Have all members voted? Have all the members voted? Please make sure that your vote has been properly cast. If all members have been voted, the machine will be locked, and the clerk will take a tally. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Joint Resolution 155

Total number Voting	149
Necessary for Adoption	75
Those voting Yea	76
Those voting Nay	73
Absent not Voting	1

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Resolution is adopted (Gavel). Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 436?

CLERK:

On page 2, Calendar 436, House Joint Resolution 161, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF BARBARA A. HOFFMAN, ESQUIRE, OF CLINTON TO BE A JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Conley, you have the floor, madam.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and adoption of the resolution in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before this Chamber I on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and adoption of the resolution. Representative Conley.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Barbara Hoffman currently lives in Clinton, Connecticut. She has been employed in the State's Attorney's Office for

many, many years, starting her career there in the Derby State's Attorney's Office back in 1989. She is a graduate of the University of Steubenville -- I probably pronounced that wrong -- and went to law school at Oral Roberts University O.W. Coburn School of Law. She has done very good work with the State's Attorney's Office, and I would urge her adoption as a judge.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Care to remark further?
Representative Rebimbas, you have the floor, madam.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, certainly, based on the qualification of this nominee before us having gone through the Judiciary Committee process public hearing and reviewed all the information provided, I do find that this individual would be a qualified jurist or to serve as a jurist in the superior court. Once again, this is a -- a new appointment, 1 of the 37 -- 31, that we continuously have repeated in this Chamber. Since the last, I believe, last 5 minutes, nothing's

changed. So, unfortunately, again, Mr. Speaker, for all the reasons previously stated, I will not be able to vote in favor of this nominee. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Do you care to remark further? Do you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members please take your seats. The machine will be open.

[Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Please check the board to ensure that you're vote has been properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the clerk will take a tally. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Joint Resolution 161

Total number Voting	149
Necessary for Adoption	75
Those voting Yea	76
Those voting Nay	73
Absent not Voting	1

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The resolution is adopted (Gavel). Will the Clerk please call Calendar 444?

CLERK:

On page 2, Calendar 444, House Joint Resolution 169, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF DONNA M. WILKERSON BRILLANT, ESQUIRE, OF CROMWELL TO BE A JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT. The favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Conley, you're on a roll today. You have the floor, madam.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and adoption

of the resolution in concurrence with the Senate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and adoption of the resolution. Representative Conley.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Attorney Wilkerson Brilliant, she attended Connecticut -- Central Connecticut State University. She also went to WNEC, Western New England School of Law, -- WNEC. A great law school might I add. From 1995, she's practiced in her own firm, The Law Office of Donna Wilkerson. She has practiced in criminal, juvenile, real estate, family, contract, and personal injury law. Since 2004, she has also done arbitration hearings in areas of contract and employment law. She's had quite a varied career that would serve the bench, and I would urge adoption of Attorney Wilkerson Brilliant as a judge.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Care to remark further?

Representative Rebimbas, you have the floor, madam.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, once again, unfortunately, we find ourselves with another 1 of the 31 nominees that we have to vote for. I mean after a while this almost becomes -- in my humble opinion -- disrespectful to the nominees. This is a situation where we should all be rejoicing and looking at their qualifications and supporting them on the adventure -- for many of these individuals their dream of wanting to give back and serve the state of Connecticut in a capacity as a jurist serving the state of Connecticut and its people, but instead, what we have to do is once again remind everyone here in the Chamber that we have no actual information that we have a need for 31 judges in the state of Connecticut. We have no information that we have the funding for 31 judges and their support staff in order to conduct the jobs that we're asking these individuals to take on. I don't want to oversimplify this, but these are the same conversations I have with my 3-year-old. When

we go to the store and she asks me to purchase something and if it's something she already has, I say, "Honey, you already have this at home. You don't need this" and I remind her that she already has it at home. She actually understands that, so she doesn't ask again. There's other times that that conversation's slightly different. When asked for something, I may not have the money on me, so I simply say, "Honey, mommy doesn't have money at this time." She understands that and says, "Okay, mommy." Here we are asking to vote on nominees -- 31 we don't need, and we have no money for. It's a mandate. You can paint it at any way shape you'd like. It's a mandate. It's a mandate on the residents of the state of Connecticut. I can't support this mandate, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Do you care to remark further? Do you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members please take your seats. The machine will be open.

[Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Please make sure that your vote has been properly cast. If all members have been voted, the machine will be locked, and the clerk will take a tally. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Joint Resolution 169

Total number Voting	149
Necessary for Adoption	75
Those voting Yea	77
Those voting Nay	72
Absent not Voting	1

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The resolution is adopted (Gavel). Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative

O'Neill, you have the floor, sir.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to rise for the purpose of an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. O'NEILL (69TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With me today is Jack Roush, he is a senior at the Shepaug High School in my district in Washington. He is a member of the Roxbury Wetlands Commission. He is going to be going after his senior year in high school to the University of St. Andrews in Scotland where he will be majoring in international relations, geography, and either Russian or Farsi, so I would ask the House to please give him a warm welcome as our custom. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Welcome -- welcome to the Chamber.

Representative Ritter, you have the floor, sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We're gonna do one

more bill, and then we're gonna have a House democratic caucus. We will be done no later than 3:30 with said caucus. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Will the clerk please call calendar 180?

CLERK:

On page 18, Calendar 180, House Bill 5356, AN ACT CONCERNING EMERGENCY ACTION PLANS FOR DAMS. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Environment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Borer, you have the floor, madam.

REP. BORER (115TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before this Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Representative Porter --

Representative Borer.

REP. BORER (115TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's my pleasure to bring this dam bill out. By way of background, currently, there is a requirement that an emergency plan for high hazard dams be completed in its entirety every 2 years to prevent the loss of lives in homes. This plan is required to be updated every 2 years in full capacity. Often, this plan can cost the municipality or the lake association owning the dam upwards of tens of thousands of dollars when sometimes nothing in the plan has changed. This bill supported by DEEP will allow those municipalities or those lake associations to only be required to submit the changes in the plan such as contact numbers or minor changes without having to go through the expense to pull together a plan in its entirety. The cost to this bill is zero. The cost to the municipalities and the taxpayers is zero, and in fact, it's a cost saving to the municipalities and the taxpayers. This is a commonsense bill, and Mr. Speaker, I ask and urge my

colleagues to pass this dam bill. [Laughter]

[Hollering]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. [Laughing] Will you remark further on the bill before us? Representative Harding, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't think I could top that, but I just want to echo the words of the good proponent on this particular bill. It is commonsense. It is a good measure to limit the mandate currently placed on individuals that own or have an obligation to -- to file these reports every two years. I urge my colleagues to support this measure. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Care to remark further? Representative Ferraro, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of the bill. It is a commonsense bill and like the good representative across the aisle said, it's

about time we pass this dam bill. [Laughter]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Care to remark further? Care to remark further on the bill before us? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members please take your seats. The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Have all members voted? [Phone Ringing] Have all members voted? Please check the board to ensure that your vote has been properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the clerk will take a tally. The machine will be locked, and the clerk will take a tally. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 5356

Total number Voting	149
Necessary for Passage	75
Those voting Yea	149
Those voting Nay	0
Absent not Voting	1

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The bill passes (Gavel). Representative O'Dea, you have the floor, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just real quick. The republicans are caucusing immediately in Room 110. All republicans caucus Room 110. Thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The democrats will be caucusing in Room 207A, and I move that we recess subject to the Call of the Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Are there any objections? I'm hearing none. The Chamber will stand at recess.

(On motion of Representative Albis of the 99th District, the House recessed at 3:04 o'clock p.m., to reconvene at the Call of the Chair.)

(The House reconvened at 3:37 o'clock p.m., Deputy Speaker Candelaria in the Chair.)

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will the clerk please call Calendar 159?

CLERK:

On page 46, Calendar 159, Substitute House Bill No. 5460, AN ACT CONCERNING MINIMUM EMPLOYEE WAGES FOR PROVIDERS OF STATE-CONTRACTED HUMAN SERVICES. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Appropriations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino, you have the floor, sir.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the

bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before the Chamber is on the Joint Committee favorable report and passage of the bill. Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Mr. Speaker, the clerk has an amendment. It's LCO No. 4798. I'd ask that the amendment be called, and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will the clerk please call Amendment No. 4798, which will be designated House Amendment "A"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 4798, offered by Representative Abercrombie, Representative D'Agostino.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino, you have the floor, sir.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this amendment does is it allows OPM to reallocate funds that are

currently available in this fiscal year to DDS and DSS to cover increased wages at more than 170 agencies who provide services to more than 12,000 high-need individuals in the state of Connecticut, folks with developmental disabilities. There are more than 19,000 full-time employees at these 170 providers and none of them have had a raise since 2004. That's a long time obviously for the services they provide, an intimate level of services. We've discussed this session the kinds of services that are provided to our communities with developmental disabilities, and these are some of the most difficult and demanding tasks imaginable and many of these workers make below minimum wage, so what the amendment will do -- and I'll -- I'll move adoption of it shortly -- is that it would allow these providers to increase the minimum wage paid, set a floor, set a minimum wage for these workers at \$14.75 an hour or if they are currently making more than that, a one time 5 percent salary increase, and again, this would go into effect January 1, 2019, and it would be paid for by the current lapses in

the Medicaid account, and then we'd have to deal with it going forward, obviously. I want to again mention that we're talking about 19,000 workers. That's a significant employment force in the state of Connecticut, if you will. Only about 3300 of them are unionized, but this is being precipitated by the fact that about 2500 of those employees are going to go on strike shortly, and therefore, cost us with respect to not only the deprivation of the services that they provide but because we must account for those services to be provided. We're talking about replacements workers at a cost of about \$1 million dollars a day for professional replacements, so I would certainly urge adoption of the amendment. It is -- if nothing else -- an economic incentive package because the modest increases that this amendment would allow are going to go directly into the Connecticut economy, and they're gonna help stabilize this workforce -- this workforce that provides just a -- a traumatically powerful set of services to the people of Connecticut, not just the thousands with

developmental disabilities but their families, their friends, their relatives as well, so I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Question for the Chamber is on adoption of the House Amendment Schedule "A". Would you remark on the amendment? Representative Ziobron, you have the floor, madam.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I was thinking about what I was going to say today on the floor here, and movie themes started running through my head. Movie themes like *Groundhog Day*. That really sums up how I feel at this moment. It is *Groundhog Day* because once again we are putting forward plans with no ability to pay for them because we don't know the revenue package from my good friends on the other side of the aisle, but we know their spending plan, and surprisingly, just a few days ago their spending plan -- the one that the good representative is talking about that is somehow mysteriously gonna have extra money in it even

though we're looking at a \$320-million-dollar budget deficit. On that spending plan that was just submitted by my friends on the other side of the aisle, page 46 under office and policy management, I see a private provider COLA for 0.5 percent.

Through you to the proponent, could you please explain to me how a budget document that's fresh off the presses, only a few weeks, maybe 10 days old, went from having a private provider COLA at 0.5 percent to now feeling so generous as to try to find tens of millions of dollars of lapse money that we know, in leadership was talked about, making sure would be able to fully fund the Medicare Savings Program?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that those are apples and oranges, that that 0.5 is -- is something different. This -- the funding mechanism here for at least the rest of the biennium

budget starting January 1, 2019, is taken care of through lapses in the Medicaid account, not an -- not any kind of additional appropriation or -- or separate moving of other funds as the ranking member of appropriations just referenced, so two different mechanism, if you will. The mechanism here is not an additional appropriation but rather freeze OPM if they're able to do so. I should note that the language of the amendment is couched in terms of "may," not "shall," and "within available appropriations," so they will take lapses in that \$2.6-million-dollar line item, which we understand are a number of those, and use that to fund this in this -- the rest of this fiscal year. Separate conversation entirely, of course, with respect to the next budget cycle but -- but for current purposes, the 0.5 that the ranking member's referencing is separate from the allocation for this amendment -- funding this amendment.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I strongly disagree with the characterization that this is apples and oranges. It's certainly not apples and oranges because when this budget that was put together by the democrats in this building called for a private funding for private providers, 0.5 percent to provide funding of \$9.5 million dollars in FY '19 -- that was the plan, so let's put aside where the money's coming from for just a moment and let's talk about what that budget allocation was for if it wasn't for the salary increases for the same exact people that the proponent is speaking about today.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I may have to defer to, you know, the chair of -- of Appropriations or otherwise, but my understanding is that 0.5 in that separate document is for homecare providers under DSS. This is a separate suite of services primarily

through DDS.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, I'm looking here at the fiscal note, and it clearly says in the fiscal note from nonpartisan staff that this is for both DDS and DSS. The budget that the republicans presented -- the second budget by the way in 3 weeks, fully balanced, both sides of the ledger -- we increase the private provider COLA to 1 percent for everyone. We aren't picking one agency over another. We're saying everyone deserves to have a little bump for the hard work that they do. This amendment is picking certain groups over others. So, through you to the good gentleman, I refer him to the fiscal note and maybe he can clarify his comments that indeed this appropriation is for DSS.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, and it's a -- it's a good question because it sort of cracks open a discussion of the remarkable breath of services that we do provide through DSS and DDS, so the amendment before us deals with a particularized set of direct-care services that we provide. In this case, the DSS reference in the fiscal note dealing with this amendment, that is what -- that is the money dedicated really to what are called community residential services. These group homes, if you will -- and I should note that about, you know, 93 percent of the group home services that the state provides are outsourced via this mechanism. We've really limited the group home work that the state does, and the state pays for. I think we're down to like 41 groups homes on the state side versus 31 -- and that will be down to 31 by the fall. So, the fiscal note here and the reference to DSS here is to those community residential services. They're really the core services that, you know, again where these folks -- we're talking about maybe 4 to 6

people in a home provided through this private provider network. My understanding is the 0.5 percent in the home healthcare side that the ranking member is talking about is, again, a different category of services provided through DSS. These are all Medicaid services, but there's a broad swath of services provided through DSS and DDS, and that home -- homecare piece is different as -- as it obviously indicates. That's homecare. It's similar to what we talked about with the PCA services that are provided. If you recall a few weeks ago when we did a -- a raise for the state workers that provide home healthcare services, so that's what that deals with on that separate budgetary appropriation that the ranking member is referring to. The DSS appropriation here that we're talking about for this amendment is -- through DSS is that core community residential service, again, a different kind of services. Same population but different services that are provided.

Through you.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When I first became ranking member of the Appropriations Committee, I made it my mission to understand the workings of some of these areas, so when I had questions about the inmate medical services and the care provided to our inmate population, I visited 10 prisons. When I was interested to understand how we do care for the very critically folks that frankly our budgets for the last 4 years have provided set amount of services for, I toured several group homes and made a trip down to Southbury Training School and invited several of my colleagues to join me from the Appropriations Committee, and so, it's interesting to me that we are now all of a sudden saying we're going to address these issues but at the same time, we're not going to address the issues that the families of these clients have been begging for, which is to close Southbury Training School and rededicate those dollars to exactly what this does. So, my question through you Mr. Speaker, is has the good proponent visited Southbury Training School and does he understand the desire of the parents of

these clients throughout the system and all of those group homes he just spoke about and how they feel that this money that we are spending of taxpayer dollars for that system and how we're going to [Phone Ringing] find the funding for this system while we continue to pay the high cost to keep Southbury Training School open?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, and I certainly would not even dare to come close to the -- the -- again, the experience and the uh -- the knowledge that the ranking member has developed over time. She and on our side, Representative Abercrombie, have tremendous amount of depth with respect to, again, the various suite of services that DSS and DDS provide. Certainly, what I have done is spoken to dozens of these works both on the public side and the private side, and heard their stories, which are moving, emotional. We talked about some of these on

the PCA side. I mean the -- the intimate level of care here -- I frankly -- I can't even fathom it. I certainly can't fathom it just -- just doing it on an emotional level and a physical level, and then you factor in the fact that you're doing it for, you know, \$10, \$11, \$12 dollars an hour with limited benefits, having to hold down second jobs just to make sure that your bills are paid so you can provide the services to these individuals with severe disabilities. It's -- it's -- that's been a tremendous education for me over the last year speaking to these various workers who do this kind of work, and I'm sure the representative has had this experience as well. It's -- it really is -- it grounds you, and I think we all should talk to those -- those workers and hear about their day-to-day experiences because they're absolutely incredible. You know, what I can say with respect to Southbury and the state side of things and Southbury is, of course, sort of the posterchild of -- of some of those expenses, but those are some of our highest need, highest risk individuals that need real

dedicated professional care. That aside, as I mentioned before on the state side of things with respect to these kinds of residual services like provided at that facility, we have really ratcheted that down so that now almost all of those services are outsourced through this private provider network, and that's what we're talking about with this amendment, making sure the thousands upon thousands of workers and the thousands upon thousands of individuals who are serviced through that network are -- that the workers are paid an adequate wage, they get some stability there, etc., but on the state side, we're down to 41 outsourced -- 41 group homes like that, and that'll be down to 31 in the fall, and you can really see where that is going, which is probably down the road at some point, except for some really specialized institutions, you know, like Southbury, some other facilities. It's going to be closer to 100 percent probably 5 to 10 years from now, so that's -- that's just sort of the color up that my own personal experience can add to this. I do think the numbers

themselves tell -- tell even -- tell a story, and then certainly the members, the workers themselves, and the families tell the most compelling story of all.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and the families are telling some pretty heroic stories, stories about the differences between the union that serves in Southbury Training School and the union that serves in the private providers. It's my understanding it's the same one, but their pay is quite different, which is why Southbury Training School should be and absolutely is relevant to this conversation. But, we talked about apples and oranges. Nothing could be more apples and oranges than comparing the PCA contract and the contracts that we have before us today. The reason why republicans were willing to look at the PCA contract is because the PCAs had no benefits, no Worker's

Comp -- nothing. Is the proponent of this amendment here to tell us that the workers in the unions have the same entry point as the PCA workforce and that's why we should be doing what we're doing today?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So, again, just stepping back in terms of context. We're talking about 19,000 workers across the state who provide these services. Only about 3300 or so are in a union. For those nonunionized members, they have nothing. At will, the benefit packages are either nonexistent or minimal at really the whim of the employer because the way this structure works -- unlike the PCA structure where it's basically through the state -- is we have these various different agencies and each one of them is going to contract, so you've got a number of different mechanism by which they set worker wages and benefits, so the bulk of -- of these workers -- you

know, what's that math work out to? You know, 16 -- 15,000 of them are not unionized. They all -- I want to be very clear about this. This is not a union contract we are voting on. This would raise up those wages for everyone, union and nonunion alike, and the bulk of which are nonunion. For the unionized workforce on the private side -- if we want to compare them to the PCAs -- it's a range. It really is. There are -- there are multiple contracts. You know, most of them do have benefit packages that are in addition to or -- or have supplements to what you would see on the state side, but the range of -- the rate range is roughly comparable. Again, you know, some people are gonna make that minimum wage because of the services they provide. Other -- others, if they've got a particular specialized area of care -- traumatic brain injury for example -- you're gonna be able to demand more in the workplace. At the end of the day, they're all basically at will. There's severe management rights here that they get to control the care, how it's done, when it's done, who does it,

etc., but if -- if the question I take it is comparing the -- the fraction of the workforce that is unionized on a private side -- the 3300 out of the 19,000 -- to the PCA workforce, yeah, there's a -- there's a number of benefits on the private side that do not exist on the public side. If you ask me my opinion, I'd love to see the PCA workers on the state side get those exact same benefits -- healthcare, you know, dental, you know some form of retirement benefit, which we don't do, which some on the private side do get because of the goal here should be stabilization of this workforce. A workforce that on the private side, even with the unionized benefits, suffers from a remarkable 20-30 percent turnover rate. That is not good for anyone. It's not good economically because you have to be continually recruiting and training workers, and it's certainly not good for the individuals with disabilities because you want that continuity of service. That was the whole policy behind trying to raise up the PCA workforce on the state side, and I think we should be encouraging more of that on the

private side. Of course, it's not up to us to negotiate those -- those things. You know, it's been marginal so far with only about 3300 of the 19,000 being unionized, but I think the idea here is a rising tide lifts all boats.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, if I continue to look at the fiscal note for this contract -- let's just make sure everyone understands what we're talking about -- so, the total cost including federal reimbursement in fiscal year '19 is \$21 million dollars -- \$21 million dollars. When we look at fiscal year 2020, where we have by the way -- in case anyone lost track -- a \$5-billion-dollar budget deficit. In 2020, this contract is gonna cost almost \$40 -- a little over \$43 million dollars after federal reimbursement. There's other areas of this contract that uses language I'm very familiar with in Appropriations, and I'm just curious if the

proponent is also familiar with the term "within available appropriations"?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That's probably a trick question but before I answer that, I do want to -- I thought I heard the representative say, and I want to make sure we're both on the same page because she certainly knows appropriations better than almost anybody in this room except Representative Walker [Laughing]. My understanding reading this fiscal note -- and maybe it was just a misstatement -- is that the amounts quoted for fiscal year '19 and '20 or the \$21 million dollars quoted for '19 and the \$43 million dollars for '20, that is a gross, not a net number, and net after the 50 percent federal reimbursement, would be about \$11 million dollars -- \$10 million \$900 hundred dollars for '19 and \$21 million \$825 hundred dollars for fiscal year -- for the fiscal year '20. Through

you, Mr. Speaker, I -- I apologize for ping-ponging back a question but I thought I heard something else said, and I want -- I think it's very important on this point that we both -- that we all be on the same page in terms of the net cost of the state after federal reimbursement.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm pretty sure I said after federal reimbursement, which is what those terms refer to. Because this is such a sensitive population, we do get Medicaid reimbursement, which is exactly what I said, so it's Groundhog Day again for me on this issue, and that's part of the point here is that the full -- the full appropriation is something that we need to think about. Somehow in this building, we have this notion that federal money isn't taxpayer money, and that it just mysteriously appears, and that's not the case. So, your right-hand pocket is paying \$21 million dollars

and it's split in half. You can put the change in the left, but it's all coming from taxpayers, but I did say after federal match. So, through you, I don't believe my second question was answered. Does the good proponent of the amendment ever heard the term "within available appropriations"?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, so certainly and again how this is phrased here with -- "within available appropriations" -- again as I mentioned in my opening remarks -- the idea here is to fund this in the first year, which again the net cost to the state is \$10 million \$913 thousand dollars, through those available appropriations. In this case, empowering OPM to move money around from lapses from that -- you know, massive \$2.6-billion-dollar Medicaid appropriation, and then it's going to be part of the budget cycle obviously in fiscal year '20. In this case with respect to this particular

amendment, it -- there's a couple of pieces of the -
- of the wording here that they may allocate
available funds, so it's embedding that concept of
there needs to be the funds available, and again, we
are -- we are told that there are. And, then the
last part of it is where the "within available
appropriations" come from, so after that is done,
after the initial allocations are made to deal with
the wage increases here through the right structure
that DDS and DSS provide, within available
appropriations, the secretary shall then reimburse
the private providers for the cost of employer
taxes, expansion of benefits, and other costs. So,
it's -- it's a waterfall structure, if you will.
You have the available funds for the wages -- the
wage increase, and then eventually -- from what we
understand from OPM, that will leave about \$2
million dollars of the allocation for potential
benefit increases, taxes and costs to the private
providers "within available appropriations."

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Waterfall is a good analogy for how the taxpayers of this state feel while they stand under it and day after day after day we have new programs, new ideas, more and more without any idea how any of it's gonna be paid for. "Within available appropriations" is code word for those who are on Appropriations for we have no money. It's never gonna happen. That's the code word for "within available appropriations," which is why it's so frustrating to me, especially at the end of session when bills get referred to Approps and says within available appropriations, but on the side, don't worry. That bill's never getting out of committee. We just need to continue on. That's the truth. I'm just gonna tell you like it is. That's exactly what happens. I think the good speaker knows. He is smiling. Serving on that committee is very interesting learning process for sure, but what's crazy about this amendment is even the OLR analysis or the OFA analysis in the fiscal note says

this "The amendment also requires OPM within available appropriations to reimburse providers for the expansions of benefits, which are not specified in the amendment and cannot be estimated at this time." So, once again, we're talking about a program outside of the budget process. It's not specific. We just have to hurry up and do it. No plan. It's a big waterfall taxpayers are standing under, and it's gonna knock us over because it's gonna keep doing this over and over and over again. So, the idea that we would pass a bill, an amendment as important a topic as this one, and not fully understand how we're gonna reimburse the providers. So, are we promising providers some big golden goose egg? That don't worry we're gonna take care of all these things. Do you know who else heard that, Mr. Speaker? The hospital industry. Sounds very, very familiar to the hospital industry across this state. Agreements are made, contracts are signed, and then oops, can't afford it. We gotta pull that money back, and that's the frustration that I have as a member of this legislature for all of us, because I

know when my colleagues on the other side of the aisle go home, they're probably hearing the same things I am. Where is the budget? Where is the fix to the deficit? What's happening with the Medicare Savings Program? What's happening with the Renter's Rebate Program? What's happening with the Transit District Program? What's happening with our hospitals? That's not partisan issues. You're getting the same questions we are, and that's why we should be prioritizing a full budget so that we can show exactly what our priorities are, but we're not doing that, and it started with voting on CBAC outside of a budget, and then trying to do the right thing. We said to the PCAs okay, we understand. We're gonna try and help you. So, to my good colleague across the other side of the aisle, so this now population comes before us with all these promises. Who's next? What contracts are we not amending with this -- with this amendment? Which agencies still provide those kinds of services that are getting left behind? Who are they and will -- will we expect to see them asking for the same

things because we won't do our jobs and prioritize a full budget package?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I guess a couple points. You know, certainly first with -- with respect to the "within available appropriations" portion that the ranking member of Appropriations quoted, again, that -- I appreciate exactly what she said, which is the idea here is if there's money for that and we understand from OPM that there would be about \$2 million dollars of the net \$11-million-dollar application for that, but if it's not there, it's not there. With respect to the larger question, I think we're -- you know, we're making incremental progress here. We're not going to be able to address the needs of this entire community all at once. Keep in mind, we -- we probably spend about \$400 to \$500 million dollars a year on this various range of services for our developmentally

disabled community in the state of Connecticut.
That's -- that's amazing. I mean if you think about the fact that the United States is probably the leader in the world with respect to the services provided to that community and Connecticut's at the forefront of that, that's something to be very proud of, and so we've made some real progress this year helping stabilize that workforce, which helps stabilize the services and strengthen what we provide to that community. I'm very proud of that. I think everybody in this Chamber -- republican and democrat -- should be very proud of that, so we're -- we're making incremental progress. You know, certainly, there are other pieces to that entire puzzle -- other providers, other workers. You know, I can't predict who will be coming before us. There's obviously an acute need here when we're talking about 19,000 workers who haven't seen any kind of increase in almost 14 years, so I think it's a good thing that we're addressing that now and again, nice that it's -- it's within available appropriations this fiscal year (i.e. - no

additional money needed). Who knows what the future holds on that, but I'd like to think that we're going to keep taking these steps because that core suite of services that we provide to this community is something we should be very proud of in the state of Connecticut.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. These are critical services. We have many critical services under the umbrella of a 2-year budget, and the fact that we are once again picking winners and losers, picking people outside that process -- what is that message that we're sending? Is the message we're sending is the ones who rally the most, who have union -- very knowledgeable, well-organized union folks to come up here to the Capitol and make their case? You know who makes their case quietly with me in my office, Mr. Speaker? The parent of somebody who's on the wait list that's 82 years old, that has a child home

with Down Syndrome, that is petrified that they're gonna die and that child will not have a sustainable plan for their future. There's other people within our budget that we help. What about our kids and our school system? What about youth violence in our urban centers? They're all very critical needs. The beauty of a budget document is that you put out a plan and prioritize your available resources to those needs. That's not what we're doing here. We're saying okay, we have this mystery lapse -- even though by the way it's already been committed twice earlier. PCA contract and the Medicaid Savings Plan -- but we'll ignore that because right now on paper we can book it as a savings and now we have all this money to spend and meanwhile, we have seniors chewing their fingernails wondering how in the heck they are gonna schedule doctor's appointments after July 1, or cancer treatments, or buying their prescription drugs. So, that's what we're doing. We are picking winners and losers. Our seniors are at home chewing their fingernails wondering how they're gonna afford all their

medication, whether they're gonna fall in the Quimby Group or another group within MSP. It's so very frustrating, Mr. Speaker. Because, we don't have to do it this way. When we come into the short session, the whole purpose is supposed to be amending the second year of the biennium budget, and for the last 3 days, I have listened to taskforce, working groups, all kinds of things. I'm sure very worthwhile, not a budget. We are doing a disservice to every single one of our constituents -- republicans, democrats, unaffiliates, green party members, and libertarians, which I have a little bit of a streak of, Mr. Speaker. All of our residents in Connecticut are sitting home wondering what are we doing, so when we put forward amendments that say we're going to do this within available appropriations and are of nonpartisan staffers, we can't estimate what it's gonna be because we don't know which benefits are gonna be expanded. It should really make all of us shake our heads. And, then finally, Mr. Speaker, I started saying I was wondering about what I was gonna talk about today

and movie themes came up in my mind, and I'm really hoping I do not burst out with a Jerry McGuire moment and start screaming show me the money. It might happen. It might happen. In the next couple of days, if I see another working group, a study, a taskforce, I may start screaming like Jerry McGuire. Mr. Speaker, I'm gonna continue to listen. We have big problems. Our republic budget solves them, and I'd like to start talking about a full package. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Do you care to remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Case, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Good afternoon to you.

REP. CASE (63RD):

A few comments and hopefully, just a few questions but there might be more to the proponent. This is a very delicate, tough population that we're

working with. As everybody knows, I had a brother [Phone Ringing] in DDS. The services are imperative that they have it. The way we're going about this I have problems with but let me ask a few questions to the proponent of the bill. We talk about -- first of all, how did come to us in this way and only servicing and completing one agency?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I want to make sure I understand the representative's question when he refers to agencies because I've -- I've alternatively referred to the providers as agencies as well, so in this case, we are talking about an amendment that does deal with two agencies, primarily DDS but the Community Residential Services is now through DSS, so it's those two agencies. I just want to, if I can, just ask him, through you Mr. Speaker. When he's referring to agencies, he's talking about the state agencies, and my answer

would be those two agencies, and then I can come back to the question.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case, would you -- [Cross Talking]

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you Mr. Speaker --

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

-- Care to clarify?

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you Mr. Speaker, the proponent is correct. It's -- it's DDS and a portion of DSS. Am I correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, yes. That's correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you Mr. Speaker, then why are we just dealing with this one population?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, and again, I apologize. I do want to make sure I understand. When we're talking about population here, that could mean a number of things, so we're talking about this particular -- um, the individual population. The folks with developmental disabilities, some 12,000 or so of them who are services. That's the underlying population serviced by roughly 19,000 workers at these various "agencies" or what I'll call private providers throughout the state of Connecticut providing a suite of services from the behavioral services, employment and day support services, the community residential services, and that's the -- so that's the overall population, if you will. So, you know, why are we dealing with this particular piece? Well, I think a few reasons.

I mean one it's obviously the right thing to do. These folks have not had -- as I mentioned -- any kind of meaningful increase in 14 years, but certainly, that the discussion today -- to be fair -- has been precipitated by the fact that we face a strike by roughly 2500 of that larger workforce, and that may not seem significant. Again, we're talking about you know maybe 20 percent. A little bit -- 15 percent of the workforce, but there's a massive disruption if that happens, certainly within the services provided because many of those workers that are some of the larger community residential providers, so they serve a larger number of individuals with disabilities -- several thousand of them -- so, imagine tomorrow, you know, they are deprived of those services. Well, we can't let that happen, so if they strike, you have to bring in a workforce to replace them, and it's not as another representative appreciates. You don't just hire somebody off the street to do this work. You know, these are professionals that come in, some of which bounce around from state-to-state to do this, and

that carries a very significant cost as well. So, I think this is our attention. We probably should have addressed this a while ago, but our attention is laser focused on it right now -- to be fair -- because of the threat of that strike, but again, to be clear, what we're doing here with respect to this amendment and this mechanism benefits all those workers, not just the ones in the union and most of them are not.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you Mr. Speaker, and I guess yes, my answer was questioned. The reason why we are doing this -- and I do say population -- but this group of people is because we are threatened with a strike. Through you Mr. Speaker, how much has the state of Connecticut or these nonprofit agencies spent to date to train workers for the anticipation of a strike on Monday?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I do not have an exact number. I believe it has probably started to percolate up to the couple hundred-thousand-dollar range. My understanding is that to effectuate the training to be in effect by Monday, we'd be talking about a net cost of \$670-\$680 thousand dollars, so some fraction of that has obviously already been expended.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, a comment on that. Through our numbers from OFA, it's been over \$520 thousand dollars already spent in training for an anticipated strike. The original bill that was brought out -- or wasn't brought out but that was talked about affected all nonprofit agencies, and it was to help the employees in those agencies through

the human services area. The idea was to put money through with an explanation that the dollars were to go towards increasing the payrates and not just to the agencies, so I'm a little concerned that we're just hitting one now. I know my good representative before says how many more contracts are gonna come before us that are gonna threaten a strike and we're gonna have to raise more. Through you Mr. Speaker, how many more -- how many more contracts are there that are of similar type?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, and again, I want to be very clear on this point. So, this is not a contract. We are not voting on a contract. We are -- this is not CBAC. This is not a PCA contract. This is not a contract. The -- the contracts to the extent they exist, and, in many circumstances, there are none, but there are certain agencies that do have agreements, collectively bargained for

agreements with their particular workforces, again, about 3300 of the 19,000. If I can rephrase the question, I guess -- I think probably where we're going with this is you know down the road when we talk about the people and the services that are provided to this community -- the disabled community -- you know, what other groups are there and how are they funded and is there something more we can do for them? To me, that is a discussion for another day. I do put this all in terms -- in terms of the context I mentioned, which is we've been taking steps to address piecemeal, those particular various groups that service this community, and again, we're talking about thousands upon thousands of Connecticut residents and not just them, of course. Their families as well. Think about what these services do in terms of lifting the burden on family members to care for these -- these members and free them to be in the economy, etc., so there's a larger context to all of this. You know, where do we go next with this? Well, I mean you know we talked early. Representative Ziobron mentioned the 0.5 in

the budget that's for the private side home healthcare piece. That's something that we should probably address, and then you know Representative Case can probably talk even better than I can, certainly, about some of the other various services that are provided that may need to be addressed, but this is the particular strand we're addressing today. It's a significant one given the number of workers and the number of individuals cared for by them.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you Mr. Speaker, and I thank the proponent. So, through you Mr. Speaker, these nonprofit agencies that have "contracts" or agreements, would this supersede that, or do we wait until that contract has expired?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, so we're talking about I think at the end of the day in terms of the potential strike maybe 9 agencies and 9 contracts. My understanding is they have all expired and hence, the -- the workers there can go on strike. Otherwise, there'd be a no-strike provision while the contract would be in effect, typical as you would see in any collectively bargained for agreement. So, the way this will work if we pass this is the new rates will be set -- the rates for services would be set by DDS. Embedded in that will be the increase in the wages. The providers that have collectively bargained for agreements with their particular workforces can then go back to the negotiating table with those particular units and say, okay, here's what we're willing to do. We've got some additional funding available. You've seen what the state has done. Here's what will be now embedded in your contract -- \$14.75 minimum wage, 5 percent increase for those who are above that. That's embedded in the contract and then what I

certainly would expect from both parties at the table is that they're gonna agree to multiyear contracts, again, that embed those wage provisions and anything else that they can negotiate, and I don't -- you know, it's hard for me to say certainly what the give and take is going to be between management and the union in terms of well, if you're getting the wage piece, is there another giveback on management rights, etc., so this will certainly influence that negotiating process, but right now, I think they're all waiting for this to get done so that negotiating process can be -- can happen, and I believe that everybody's still talking. I think this can be done very quickly once we do this, that we can have resolved contracts in place, and the nice thing is that'll give us some stability going forward with this workforce.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you Mr. Speaker, to the good proponent,

can he tell me have all these contracts expired that we're talking about?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, you know I'd hate to say yes off the top of my head, but generally, that would be my assumption. I know a number of them have, I believe, because again you -- that's the whole point of striking. Typically, what these agreements will have -- I've seen a couple of them that have no-stroke clause while the agreements are in effect, so certainly, the ones who are striking, my assumption is that those have expired. Now, keep in mind I believe we're talking about -- I think there's maybe 17 total unionized agencies, 9 of which are striking, so even within the subset -- the universe of unionized direct-care workers -- only a subset of that, about 2500 of them, 9 of the contract at issue are striking, and my assumption would be that all 9 of those have expired.

Otherwise, you wouldn't be able to strike unless, of course, there was a provision in the particular contract that allowed for a strike while the contract was in effect, but that would be a rare thing indeed.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, if we have an agency that does have a contract -- essentially, we're gonna be opening that contract or wait until that contract expires -- and if we do open that, what stops us from not opening any other contract?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, and so again, just to be clear. When we talk about contracts, we're talking about contracts, collectively bargained for agreements between the private provider agency and

their workforce. The state has absolutely no role in negotiating that contract. We're not at the table with respect to that contract. We don't do anything with respect to that contract. The only thing -- what this would do though is say, okay, now your -- your minimum wage is going to be X, and so I'm -- I'm virtually certain that every one of those -- if there are existing contracts that haven't expired -- likely have reopeners and of course, even if they don't have reopener provisions, two sides can always sit down and neutrally agree to reopen for that purpose, and that would be my expectation is that they would do that. In fact, they would frankly have to do that because the way the statute is written, the providers cannot get reimbursement from the state unless they come in and show that they are paying that minimum wage or have accounted for that 5 percent increase for people over the minimum wage, so there would necessarily have to be some sort of reopener, side agreement, however you would do that, and two contracting parties are free to figure that out, that would reflect what we do here today with

respect to those nonexpired private contracts
between the private providers and their workforce.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, so this
new rate that we have. Were we part of the
negotiations to come up with this rate?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, and again, the -- I
don't want to devolve into this too much, but the
rate -- when we talk about rate, there's actually
two different things we're talking about. It's the
rate that the agencies pay on a per-service bases
and embedded in that is a wage piece but stepping
back from that when we talk about the minimum amount
here that the statute provides for and the 5
percent, you know that was not pulled out of thin

air -- to be fair. That my understanding is that the administration has been trying to mediate this to avoid a strike. I think we all appreciate that that's something that we should be doing, and so they've been engaged in conversations with both sides and I think have a high degree of confidence that these amounts embedded in here would resolve the strike, would be enough to give all the workers unionized and nonunionized some -- some additional, obviously remuneration and comfort going forward. So, while we haven't been certainly a part of any kind of collectively bargained for agreements on the private side, in -- in efforts to mediate this, to resolve this, to stabilize the workforce, those numbers it sounds like are -- are going to be what does it.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, getting past the wage increase on the \$14.75, we talk about a 5

percent wage increase for those earning more than \$30-dollars-an-hour. What is the cost of that and do we know how many employees this is going to affect? Through you, Mr. Speaker. Is that part of the bottom line?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, just again to be clear. I think the representative just accidentally misstated. So, the 5 percent increase is for employees who earn \$14.75 and up to \$30-dollars-an-hour, so it's cabined -- that 5 percent is cabined to that rate. If you make more than \$30 dollars, you don't get the 5 percent, and -- and I should note here the -- the goal of that language is obviously that we -- this is meant to give a raise to the frontline workers who have not seen anything in 14 years, not to give any kind of increase to management, CEOs, etc., who obviously are probably salaried and not making that hourly rate, so that's why we cabined it there from \$14.75 to -- to \$30

dollars. I don't have the breakdown of on my fingertips, but I can get it and I will get that for the representative in terms of the numbers of people presumed to be affected by on the \$14.75 increase side versus that 5 percent increase side. I can tell you obviously from OFA the net cost that -- that they've looked at for both of those provisions and the benefit piece that we talked about earlier, is net -- again, net to the state after federal reimbursement, about \$11 million dollars for January 1, 2019 through the end of 2019, and then \$21.22 million dollars for fiscal year '20.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll move on a little bit and I just want to ask the good proponent because there's some language in this bill that came up in a bill a couple years ago and its sort of biting us a little bit right now, and the good representative and myself have a municipality that

is affected by this. Is he comfortable in this language "within available appropriations"?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, so again, that particular piece of the amendment is the last piece of the amendment and what it speaks to is -- okay, if after we've done this particular salary increase for the \$14.75 and the people in that band, within available appropriations, if there's money left, you can use a certain amount to reimburse the providers to try to enhance their benefit packages, again, to stabilize this workforce, keep these people there. yeah, I'm comfortable with that language. I think the idea of having that at the end, in particular in this context, is to make sure that in the first instance the wage piece is taken care of and then if there's anything left (i.e. - within available appropriations) we deal with the benefit piece, so I think that that's a fair phraseology and structure

for this particular amendment. I'll -- I'll note for the representative's sake that obviously I'm not comfortable with that language in that car tax piece, but that's a separate statute and I'm looking at the language in obviously two separate structures here, and in this structure, it -- it works.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I thank the good representative, and just so people know, there's three cities that still have not gotten the full car tax reimbursement, and the bottom line I spoke on two years ago was "within available appropriations," and now, we are working to fight with OPM to try to get those cities to be made whole, and it concerns me whenever I see that in a bill -- "within available appropriations." So, moving on, through you Mr. Speaker. It was mentioned, and it's mentioned multiple times in Appropriations Committee and out here on the floor. How much of that \$65-

million-dollar lapse money is left? Everything we want to do whether it's funding MSP -- we're gonna take it from the \$65-million-dollar lapse. Renter's Rebate -- we're gonna take it from the \$55-million-dollars lapse. Now, we're looking at this. We're gonna take it from the \$65-million-dollars lapse. Do we know how much we've spent of that \$65-million dollars?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, actually, my understanding and I -- I confess this is based on, you know, the OPM analysis of this and where this is coming from, and I may have to defer to my friends in Appropriations, but my understanding is that the lapses we're talking about here are separate and apart from that \$65 million dollars. Again, you know, we're talking about a \$2.6-billion-dollar line item. There are significant lapses and movement within that line over the course of a year, over the

course of every year quite frankly, so I -- I believe we're talking about two separate things. As the representative mentioned, that particular lapse that has been referenced for other things and then within that \$2.6-billion-dollar line item, other lapses to account for this. We're taking both the nonpartisan staff and OPM -- you know their analysis of this -- to say that they've got the -- the money available for this fiscal year to do that. Again, '20 will be a separate creature up to this body.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and the reason I bring that up, cause the previous speaker asked a question and the good proponent says, "We have a \$65-million-dollar lapse that this will be coming out of." So, through you Mr. Speaker, what lapse will this be coming out of? He did mention the \$65-million-dollar lapse.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I -- this is -- this is where the lawyer in me would like the court reporter to read back my -- my testimony because I confess I do not recall saying specifically a \$65-million-dollar lapse. I've -- I've mentioned, certainly, numerous times today lapses in the medical account, but I - I very specifically and deliberately did not point to that specific lapse, because again my understanding is that is indeed a separate lapse and not funding this particular area, so with respect to where else in that \$2.6-billion-dollar line this is coming from, I confess I do not have that. I'm gonna defer to OPM and maybe some of my friends in Appropriations to talk about, you know, how the money frankly flows over the course of the year in a remarkably large line item. I don't think it's a surprise to anybody that you have various lapses in a \$2.6-million-dollar line item over the course of the year. That is something that OPM, the administration, Appropriations are very

adapt at dealing with year after year.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Rep. Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, we are talking here on many different populations. I am concerned myself. As it has been mentioned in this Chamber many times, we would know that \$65-million-dollar lapse or we would know that lapse number if we could get a revenue package into this Chamber. We have a spending package that was passed in Appropriations, but there's no revenue package. We're trying to do things before we have the revenue. How do we do it? How do you buy a car and your house if you don't have the money? But, you might have it next week. So, earlier this week, we also talked about 31 new judges. Did we need them all? Don't know. I believe there's 17 open positions but those extra positions above and beyond what were opened, as far as the calculations in the bill, cost us an extra \$8.7 million dollars above and beyond -- well, I'd

like to say what we have to spend but we don't have a budget -- so, above and beyond what we had last year. When does it stop? What group is gonna come to us in the next few days and either want a raise or want more money or need to change a contract? Cause, I know there's some other bills coming out that cost us money, but let's get a spending package put together with a revenue package, so we all can talk, and we can figure out where this money's coming from to pay this. This is pitting a very difficult population against the dollars that we don't have, but if we do have them, I would love the other side to give us the documents showing us the revenue line items so that we can pay for this stuff. These are the people of the state of Connecticut that we are talking about. These are the most vulnerable people in the state of Connecticut, and I know the good chairwoman of Human Services talks about that all the time, that we need to take care of them. Well, darn it, yes, we do, but why can't we see a revenue package and how we're gonna pay it? Why do we have to guesstimate how

much of the \$65-million-dollar lapse we've already spent? Why do we have to worry about if there's money in another lapse that we have that we can pay for or we're gonna vote on maybe tonight, if we get out of here. Mr. Speaker, it is drawing at my heartstrings at what we're doing. We're doing this right now because we have a threat of a strike on Monday. We spent over \$520 thousand dollars this week in nonprofit private agencies to train people already when there's not a strike, so when we do this, we just threw \$520 thousand dollars out the door when it could have gone to these people for wages. Who's paying for that? We are, but we don't have a revenue package to tell us how we're paying for that. I'd like to know what line item that's coming out of and what agency is paying for that training. Through you Mr. Speaker, I'll end it at that and try to come up a second time if I need to. I know there's some other colleagues that would want to, but darn it, I hate to use another term from my previous colleague, but I think it's gonna come out a lot today. Show me the money! Show me the

revenue package! We just have a spending package.
There is nothing else on the table. Thank you, Mr.
Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you care to remark
further on the amendment before us? Representative
Candelora, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good evening.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Good evening, sir.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

I'm glad you're up there cause you'll be able
to get my name correct on the Dais [Laughing].
[Laughter] And, I'm sure you feel the same way
[Laughter]. Mr. Speaker, if I may just a question
to the proponent of the amendment?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We've had a lot of
discussions over the last ten years of our private

providers that -- that offer all the different services. Has there been discussion or addressing other segments of our population? In particular, you know, our home healthcare segments. Why are we focusing only on the DDS population?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I'm -- I'm sensing a theme with some of these questions. So, you know, again, we're talking about a broad swath of services that are provided to this remarkably challenged population, and you know, we haven't addressed it all at once. We've been -- we've been dealing -- we dealt with the PCAs. There's a separate -- as Representative Ziobron mentioned -- dealing with home healthcare providers. You know, now we're dealing with this group, and -- and as I mentioned in some remarks earlier, certainly, the -- the acuteness of this particular issue within this sort of strand of the services that are provided has bene

precipitated by the -- the threatened strike, but again, what we're dealing with here benefits the entire population service by those 19,000 workers and roughly 12,000 people, and so, you know, these things come to us as they do. I can certainly appreciate it. It would be nice to sit down and hammer out an overall comprehensive plan where we say, okay, the PCAs are gonna get this benefit package and this increase, and we're gonna stabilize, and we're gonna make everything across the board on the private provider side. There's -- there's a number of things that we do in this Chamber and as a legislature and as a state that we probably could do better in that regard. You know, from -- everything from tax policy to education policy, but you know, often times, we do deal with other situations as they arise and that happens to be this particular situation here, again, raised in this context by virtue of the -- the strike. Again, not all 19,000 workers but enough of them -- 2500 or so -- that we'd have such a disruption of services that it -- I think it really compels us to act now

and solve this, and then I think everybody would be happy to sit down and talk about the entire universe of nonprofit providers and what we can do and how those marry with the state services that we provide and what we can do to raise everybody up on the workforce there in terms of salary and benefits. We've got a real stabilized group. We're not doing this piecemeal down the road. That's probably a topic for another day, and -- and we're here to deal with this one because of that particular threat of a strike that's out there and -- and the -- the costs associated with that I think has really brought that to our -- to our forefront now.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Candelora.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I appreciate the answer, and I guess that probably sums up my biggest concern with this underlying amendment. As I read the amendment, in line 4, we're giving OPM really the discretion to make these funds available to

certain employees, and while the underlying bill doesn't specify whether they're union or nonunion employees, very clearly what I'm hearing is that the intent of this legislation is in response to an imminent strike, and while I certainly could appreciate that we have a group of workers that may want to strike, that is their prerogative, and what I think about are those individuals that maybe associated with nonprofits that provide these very same services that aren't necessarily unionized, that aren't gonna receive state aid, and I think it gets to the point of what Representative Ziobron says, this is a bill that's going to pick winners and losers, and then I think of our home healthcare aides. I think of the organizations that provide job placement services for some of our developmentally disabled. I went to a nonprofit association meeting in the town of Guilford, and her testimony from somebody who said to me "You know, we're having trouble with our staff because they're responsible for placing our clientele into jobs, and what we're finding is that they're being

placed into jobs that the clients are being paid more than the job coaches are being paid," and that's a shock and that is certainly a problem. But, what we're doing here today is not globally looking at our situation, but we're attempting to just piecemeal, try to address a eminent union strike, and while I am sympathetic to that strike, I think what we should all recognize is that this is a, you know, the beginning or a continuation of a global problem in the state of Connecticut, and we need to look at it holistically. I think our side of the aisle has put forth a budget to try to address comprehensively the problems in the state of Connecticut. We did it last year as well, and you know, I think back to 10 years ago -- well, 12 years ago when I first entered the building -- in '09, our fiscal issues started to arise, and we started to see rising deficits, and I remember this side of the aisle when we put together budgets. Sometimes we'd sit in a room and say, you know what, our proposals are never gonna pass, so let's just put out something and sort of see what happens. That's sort

of how this amendment is crafted. Because, all of us could vote for this amendment and send it upstairs to the Senate. It's the nice thing to do but it's not the right thing to do. Because, as it's been said, we don't have the ability to pay for this, and in good conscience, I cannot sit here and support bills that have no funding source, and it's only going to get us into a greater crisis. If we need to fund these programs, which I think we do, we need to show where we can get this money from whether it be cutting CEP, taking a look at what our state workers are getting, or looking at different programs to make reductions. I think we have an obligation to the state and the taxpayers to do that before we pass a bill like this out of the Chamber. I'm also concerned that what this bill really essentially does is give the discretion to the governor's office to make the determination of whether or not to provide this funding, and frankly, based on the past year history with working with OPM, the decisions when discretion is provided and what's happened to our hospitals, what's happened to

our towns, I'm not excited about giving OPM any discretion to be issuing this money. And, so while I certainly understand the underlying intent of this amendment, I really need to stand in strong opposition to it. The taxpayers of Connecticut can't afford this bill. We need to show them how we could pay for it. It's not fair to these union workers to even get their hopes up that we could provide some sort of temporary solution to their concerns, but it's certainly not fair to all those other nonprofit, private-provider agencies that are facing the same issues that our DDS providers are facing. So, Mr. Speaker, I do stand in strong opposition. I would hope that we would reject this bill, sit down in a room, and start hammering out a budget, so we could all leave here on May 9, and provide some solutions for the state of Connecticut and our constituencies. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Do you care to remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Abercrombie, you have the floor, madam.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this bill before us, and before I get into details, I have to say that I am really disappointed with my colleagues on the other side of the aisle and let me tell you why. We stand here saying we don't have a budget. We have a 2-year bipartisan budget. What does that mean? We all voted on it. Are there tweaks that we need to be done to it this session? Absolutely, but the republicans in Appropriations came out with their own budget. I would say at least 85 percent of that budget mirrors the bipartisan budget that we worked on through the Appropriations. Do we differ on some of our idears? Absolutely, but you know what, I am so frustrated just like my colleagues are. We sit here saying that we care about people in this state that are less fortunate. We say that year after year after year. Well, let me tell you folks. The tsunami is here. It's time to pay the piper. If people in this building think it's better for us to let this population go on strike, shame on you. How

are we paying for this? We have more than just the Medicaid lapse. In DSS alone, we have \$25 million dollars that's a carried over lapse. That's not counting the \$65 million dollars that we have from the Medicaid line. I'm as frustrated as everyone else is, and let's talk about some factual things that were talked about here. In the republican's budget, there was -- in the democratic budget, there was \$5 million dollars for emergency placement for individuals in the DDS population. In the republican budget, that was cut to \$2 million dollars. Let's talk about Southbury for a minute. All of us would love to see Southbury close tomorrow, but let's be real here people. We are under a court order. The Arc sued the state of Connecticut, and the state came back and said -- and you can all read the transcripts -- "You cannot take individuals out of Southbury without their okay and they get to decide where they want to go." We're down to 200 individuals at Southbury from thousands that we started with, and let's talk about the population of the people that are at Southbury just

for a minute. The average age is 70-75 years old. Most of those people have been there for over 50 years. I, like my colleague, Representative Ziobron, are a fieldtrip girl. I like to go to facilities and see what we're paying for. I have gone to Southbury and let me tell you what I saw. In one house alone, three brothers that have been there most of their life, so if you think it's easy to take those individuals and put them in the community, show me where. You know, we're all in this building trying to do the right thing, but I am really, really tired of people standing up and not being truthful. We have a 2-year budget. Do we need to be -- do tweaks? Absolutely. Do we think that it's better for these people to go on strike and leave all this fundable population with nobody to serve them? No. We didn't see this coming. Nobody saw this coming, but I can tell you that we've been saying on human services for the last four years that the tsunami was coming, and the tsunami is here, and it's time for us to pay the piper. And, that's all I have to say, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Care to remark further?
Representative Body.

REP. BOYD (50TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions for
the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. BOYD (50TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, I
understand that Monday is scheduled for a strike or
at least the -- the process to approve a possible
strike on Monday is going forward. Whom would be
striking on Monday?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, so again, we're
talking about a population of 19,000 total workers
services by these various agencies. Of that
population, [Clearing Throat] about 3300 are

unionized. Of that unionized population, 2500 workers would be striking. They span about 9 of the agencies that provide these services. Some of them are the larger one though, so you're talking about even though it may be 2500 workers, at least that number, if not more, of individuals who are services by them, so several thousand, sort of a disproportionate amount because these are some of the larger providers. As you might expect in terms of who's unionized and who's not, and again as I mentioned out of the 170, only 10 percent -- 17 or so -- of the agencies are actually unionized, but it is a few of the larger ones because obviously they're unionized. You've got a larger workforce, so we're talking about 9 or so affected agencies serving thousands of individuals with developmental disabilities. Mainly, these are community residential level but some also services at the behavioral level, the employment and day services level as well. So, I hope that answers the gentleman's question.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Boyd.

REP. BOYD (50TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I do appreciate -- a lot of times with these contracts there's a lot of moving parts, a lot of different constituencies. Through you Mr. Speaker, so if -- if -- am I to understand correctly -- I'm starting to sound like Mr. -- Representative Fishbein here by using this word [Laughing] -- if I'm to understand correctly that there's about 2000 unionized employees that are looking to strike on Monday?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, about 2500.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Boyd.

REP. BOYD (50TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This affects both

nonunionized and, in many cases, nonprofit employees and unionized, none of which I understand are direct state employees. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, that's well stated.

None of these workers, union or nonunion, none of them are state employees.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Boyd.

REP. BOYD (50TH):

Thank you. I had heard at some point that workers had not received any type of wage increase in 12 years. Is that the nonunion employees or is that the union employees or is that everybody?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, that's -- and it's about 14 years. There was an attempt at an increase in 2013, but a lot of that was clawed back, so really, it's been since about 2004, and it's everybody and the reason that it's everybody -- if I could just digress here for a second, is you know the way these nonprofits work is that they go to the state for reimbursement, and the state pays -- pays them. It's not that the state pays them an hourly rate for workers. The state pays them a rate -- and some confusion there -- a rate for the services they provide, and embedded in that rate things like overhead, administrative costs, costs of maintenance, etc., but the bulk of it obviously is the worker's rate that they are all paid, and that is what the state uses to get reimbursement from the feds, so that rate structure that's embedded in there and that these folks have been paying over time, has not really changes since 2014.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Boyd.

REP. BOYD (50TH):

And, I thank the gentleman, so when the unionized contracts are up individually -- well, let me ask you this. How often -- what is the duration of a typical union contract for those employers?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, four years -- three, four, five years -- but four seems to be the average, and that's congruent with what we've seen on a lot of collectively bargain for agreements. So, for example, as I mentioned before, some questions with respect to these expired contracts -- these nonexpired contracts where the workers are striking. What we would expect if we pass this is that they would all then go to the bargaining table, hammer out new 4-year agreements that would embed those rate structures for four years, static mind you. I think the good representative will appreciate that and may be anticipating his next

questions, which is do we then see an increase year one, year two, year three, year four as we've talked about maybe with other contracts? The answer to that is no. This is static, so in each of those contracts, you will see -- we would expect we will see a minimum rate of \$14.75, and then whatever else was in those contracts for people in that \$14.75 to \$30-dollar range a 5 percent one-time increase carried over year-to-year, not compounded year after year after year. Not -- in other words, not five and then five and then five on top of that year after year.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Boyd.

REP. BOYD (50TH):

And, I again thank the gentleman. Through you Mr. Speaker, so then every four years when a contract is up I know typically wage and working conditions are the biggest piece. Has a wage increase not been negotiated as part of any of the contract renewals in the last -- so there would have

been -- if it's been 14 years, roughly three contracts that have come up during that time period?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, generally, the answer is no, but however, I would note certainly we are talking about a wide range of services. So, for example, a number of these nonunion providers -- you know, if you've got a specialized area of ability and I've mentioned traumatic brain injury as one of those, that is one of those where we've seen some wage inflation over the years because those groups are in demand, so they can go either union or nonunion and probably get closer to the \$20 or \$25-dollars-an-hour range, but when we're talking about the core rates that are embedded in the, again, the rates -- same nomenclature that the state uses -- that has been static for roughly 14 years. Again, some play around the edges, particularly within those specialized services that are provided, but

we're talking about a static, no change, particularly in that minimum wage or minimum floor - - excuse me, it's not really minimum wage -- for 14 years.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Boyd.

REP. BOYD (50TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, I don't want to take too much more floor time, but the last question I have, and the gentleman may or may not know the answer to this. Through you Mr. Speaker, knowing that we have a hard deadline on Wednesday of next week to do budget fixes, had there been any conversation with the negotiators as to why we -- they potentially could put a strike off, not Monday to let's say Friday, so that we can go through the what should be the normal, and I would certainly hope bipartisan, budget fix process?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I mean obviously hard for me to speak for the parties who are at the negotiating table who have been there for quite a while. I think -- I think what we're -- you know, I'd love to be able to say to everybody and I think everybody would love to be able to hear we're gonna have a budget on Wednesday that would take care of this, but I think we all know -- well, while we're all hopeful, this is -- I'm hesitant to say too important -- but because of the services that are provided, because of the cost to replace these workers, if we just sort of hold our breath and hope the budgetary process works out. What if it doesn't? Then, we're done for a session and you've got a strike carrying over into the summer and at a cost of \$1 million dollars a day. Uh, probably just too -- I appreciate the question and what's behind it, but I just -- I think the risks are far -- far away the potential reward of doing it that way where -- where instead we've got a discrete mechanism to handle this where funding is available for this y

ear so that we don't have to play around with different parts of the budget, and then -- I think the representative will appreciate this -- in '20 and '21, this will be part of that budgetary process, so you've got funds available to cover it now, so you don't need an additional budgetary appropriation, and then we're all gonna have to sit down and this will be -- we can -- we'll probably stand up and be talking about this in the next budgetary cycle. You know, how is this embedded in that particular line item?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Boyd.

REP. BOYD (50TH):

I thank the gentleman and I thank the Chamber for their indulgence. Having gotten a bipartisan speed it up, I will yield the floor. Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Case, for the

second time.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the second time. Sort of a comment and a question all at the same. We have the comment about a budget. We do have a biennium budget that was voted on bipartisan. Is this a line item in that budget?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, it's not a specific line item on its own. It's embedded in that Medicaid line item. That significant Medicaid line item.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you Mr. Speaker, so this wage increase was put into the budget when we discussed it and voted on a budget on the biennium?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, no, obviously not. What we're doing here is we're freeing up the administration to say, okay, within available funds, you know, where you find them, most likely in that Medicaid line but they could sweep from other accounts. For this fiscal year, you are empowered to now increase the rates for services provided DSS and DDS pay these providers, so you know, we're doing this now and we're using the funds in the budget that exist to fund it.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll end it with a comment. I just want to make sure that we all know that this was not an increase that was negotiated in the previous biennium bipartisan budget. This is a new expense that we're working on, on the fixed of the biennium budget, and that is what we are waiting

for, for the expenditure and the actual budget to come out. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I neglected to ask that when we vote on the amendment that it be a roll call vote, please?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Question is on a roll call vote. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Those opposed. Nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Nay.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The ayes have it. Over 20 percent has been met. A roll call will be taken. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark

further on the amendment before us? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members please take your seats. The machine will be opened. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? please check the board to ensure that your vote has been properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be -- the machine will be locked, and the clerk will take a tally. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Amendment "A"

Total number Voting	148
Necessary for Adoption	75
Those voting Yea	77
Those voting Nay	71

Absent not Voting

2

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The bill is amended (Gavel). Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Ziobron, you have the floor, madam.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, before I talk about the reason I'm standing here, I just wanted to respond to a couple of the points that really a person I truly respect on the other side of the aisle made about her frustrations, the good chairwoman of the Human Services Committee. I hear you. As a fellow tourist, we want to take things by the horns and solve them, but our frustration is that a --

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

(Gavel) (Gavel) (Gavel) Some members they are having trouble hearing. Will you please take your conversations outside of the Chamber? Thank you. Please proceed, madam.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that. I was talking about my good friend and fellow birthday pal, the chair of the Human Services Committee, and I understand her frustration. I share it as well. While we have a 2-year budget in place that was negotiated in a bipartisan way, it is woolly out of balance. The whole purpose for us to be here in 2019 is to actually make adjustments and make sure those budgets are balanced, so I hear her. I also want to say for the record the republican revised budget number two fully funds the emergency placement at \$5 million dollars that she spoke about earlier, and that's in our updated document that we released today. Earlier, I talked about what our budget proposal does, again, a complete spending and revenue package, and I talked about how we did find a way to prioritize all of the employees in this sector, not just the ones in DDS or DSS, but all of them and we do that within our budget with a 1 percent cost of living increase across the board, and so Mr. Speaker, to follow that up, I would like to align this amendment with our budget that we have

ready to go. So, Mr. Speaker, the clerk has an amendment. It's LCO 4891. Would you please ask the clerk to call it and I be allowed to summarize?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO No. 4891, which will be designated House Amendment "B"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "B", LCO No. 4891, offered by Representative Klarides, Representative Candelora, Representative O'Dea, Representative O'Neill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment. Is there any objection to summarization? Is there any objections? If not, Representative Ziobron, you have the floor, madam.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. So, Mr. Speaker, the amendment that's before you is exactly what I spoke about earlier in this debate. This amendment provides a 1 percent cost of living increase that is fully paid for within the

republican budget proposal. It doesn't pick winners and losers and different agencies. It gives 1 percent across the board, and it does so in Department of Corrections, Department of Housing, Department of Public Health, Department of Social Services, Children's, and Families, DDS, Rehab Services, The Mental Health and Addiction Services, Office of Early Childhood. You can see in my reading it's many more agencies besides the one that the underlying bill has. The fiscal note matches our budget documents. It's an \$18-million-dollar gross with a \$4-million-dollar reimbursement from Medicaid as the underlying bill does as well. Mr. Speaker, I believe that this is actually an implementable -- a proposal that can be implemented very quickly in a bipartisan way. It's something that even the previous budget talked about was a COLA. There's was 0.5. Ours is 1. Clearly, we were thinking along the same lines just a few short weeks ago, and I really hope we can get some additional support from my friends on the other side of the aisle. And, Mr. Speaker, I ask that when the

vote is taken it be taken by roll.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question is on a roll call vote. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Twenty percent has been met. When the vote is taken, it will be taken by roll. Representative D'Agostino, you have the floor, sir.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do have a few questions to the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

First, the way I'm reading this. This is a strike all, so if the proponent would confirm that what this amendment does is it effectively removes the amendment we just voted on and approved and replaces it with this language?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron, you have the --

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. I appreciate that question. It is a strike-all amendment. We seem to have a lot of them flying around the last ten days of session, so that's exactly what this is.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

And, through you Mr. Speaker, then if this was implemented -- just sort of walking through some of the sections -- it would apply to any person employed by a private provider who provides a -- and I'll short-circuit to say -- range of human services to various -- through various state agencies, everything from DDS to DOC, Office of Early Childhood, etc., so it's meant to cover the entire panoply of private service outsource providers through our state agencies?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Yes, in section line -- in section lines 4 and 5, this is directed to folks who provide human services but not limited in such further on. Human services in line 8 means any of the services administrated by the agencies I spoke about earlier.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, and -- and if implemented, that would include workers who are both union and nonunion?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, so we would be replacing the -- if I'm reading this correctly -- the minimum increase of \$14.75 an hour and the 5 percent increase for the subset of 19,000 workers that I talked about earlier on the amendment as it now stands, and instead, everybody in that group and other groups would get a 1 percent cost of living increase for the next fiscal year only, correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

No, that is not correct. I would appoint the good representative to the fiscal note. You'll see that there is a fiscal note for '19 and '20. It would be obviously our intention to have a sustainable, predictable, and reliable source of funding, which is not in the underlying bill in the out years for everyone. Mr. Speaker, we started this session with a lot of talk about fairness. Fairness was the theme of the day from the executive

branch. That's exactly what this amendment does. It provides fairness for all of these folks who are providing such critical services.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, well, I guess I'm gonna quibble with fairness here. One percent, so if you're making \$12 dollars an hour, you're now gonna make \$12.12 an hour. If you're making \$10 dollars an hour, you're gonna make \$10.10 an hour. If you're making \$14 dollars an hour, you're gonna make \$14.14 an hour. No provision as there was in the underlying bill to address other benefit structures, etc. We're talking 1 percent. I can I think say with certainty that that's gonna result in a strike and through you Mr. Speaker, I don't see any analysis in the -- in the OFA report that reflects those potential costs. Is that correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, the good representative just talked about the 1 percent while his budget has a 0.5 percent COLA. This is a promise that is can actually be paid for, so when we're talking about fairness, the underlying bill promises a lot of things to a lot of people with zero ability to pay for it because there is no changes to the underlying budget. Waiting on extra money that was supposed to be used for other programs, so fairness is actually making a contract and then delivering upon that promise, which we would be able to do with this amendment.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, so if I'm looking at section 1b and section 2 -- section 2, section 1b says that OPM shall allocate available funds for the fiscal year to provide a 1 percent cost of living

adjustment to all those employees covered in section 1a. Through you Mr. Speaker, do we know how many employees would be covered by the definition in section 1a?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

No, I do not.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

So, through you Mr. Speaker, so we've got -- we've got obviously a significant number because we were talking about a subset before of 19,000 just within that one strand of DDS, DSS particular services, so I think -- I think we can probably agree that we're talking about much more than that because we're talking about that group and now everybody else, so I read section 1b as saying everybody gets that 1 percent increase, and then I read section 2, which says, "There will be the sum of \$18 million dollars allocated for these purposes,

but section 1b says shall allocate available funds. So, through you Mr. Speaker, what if -- and I think this is probably a safe assumption -- that 1 percent for all those employees cost more than \$18 million dollars?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate that question. For the last month, my side of the aisle's been working very diligently, doing our homework, developing policies with OFA, the Office of Fiscal Analysis, creating a fully implementable budget with not just spending but revenue, implementer language, municipal aide runs, and the whole package. I am very confident in the staff of the House Republican Budget Committee and the Senate Republican Budget folks that we have done our due diligence to identify through the Office of Fiscal Analysis the cost of this 1 percent COLA so that again, when we make promises, we can deliver.

The idea that these folks who are hearing a promise of a potential salary increase and then they might not get it concerns me, it should concern them, and for that reason, we should be supporting this amendment.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I appreciate that answer. I'm just trying to drill down to the cost here because I don't think it's necessarily congruent between the \$18 million dollars that's allocated and then the idea in the proceeding section to say everybody gets 1 percent across those range of services. I'm -- I'm -- I think it's a safe assumption that those two numbers don't match up, and I would note that the OFA report does not delve into that. It just assumes that the \$18 million dollars is all there is to spend, but section 1b says, "OPM shall allocate available funds," so that is a directive. I think it's a

pretty good reading of this to say even if it costs more they shall allocate, which means it's gonna come from somewhere else, so by virtue of this language -- and I would ask the proponent if she agrees -- you would -- you would be empowering OPM. Let's say this thing costs \$50 million dollars to implement, \$100 million dollars to implement. You're directing OPM in section 1b, "shall allocate available funds," not "shall allocate within available funds." "Shall allocate available funds" to do this, to grant that 1 percent increase regardless of the \$18 million dollars that's available in section 2, so I'm assuming -- and I'll ask the question knowing, having heard the Representative Ziobron articulate powerfully in the past about giving too much authority to the administration -- doesn't section 1b do just that? Allows them to "shall allocate within available funds" -- excuse me. Not within available funds -- "shall allocate available funds" to do that, so if this costs more than \$18 million dollars, section 1b -- is it not correct -- empowers OPM to fund the

full boat?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. The good proponent of the bill just used some terminology like fair assumption and yet, the underlying bill has words in it -- has words in it that "within available appropriations" were gonna receive this benefit. Safe assumption? The underlying bill has no assumption that those people are ever gonna get their payment. When you have an underlying bill "within available appropriations," we don't know what the benefits are, the assumption in this amendment has been fully crafted with the Nonpartisan Office of Fiscal Analysis. I'm very confident of these numbers. This is about fairness, not picking winners and losers. The fair assumption here is that this can actually be paid.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate where the representative's coming from. I just -- I just fundamentally disagree and with respect to fairness, I think a 1 percent increase, particularly with the, you know, when we're talking about people. Some people haven't had one since 2004, going from \$10 dollars an hour to \$10.10 an hour is not fair. I appreciate the desire to do this all in one sweeping motion, but we've got before us an amendment now that deals with a very large group -- 19,000 workers -- gives them \$14.75 an hour minimum wage, embeds that 5 percent increase, resolves a strike that is due to happen imminently. That is fairness. That is what we must do now, and then we can have a separate discussion about a cost of an increase for everyone else, and I think everybody here is happy to do that, but in terms of avoiding that strike, avoiding the upheaval, avoiding all of that and being fair -- fair when we talk about getting some more money in these worker's pockets, not 10 cents,

but more than that, and stabilizing this workforce.
This amendment -- to me -- does not do that and I
would urge my colleagues to vote against it.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Do you care to move -- do you
care to remark on the amendment before us?
Representative Walker, you have the floor, madam.

REP. WALKER (93RD):

Good -- good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Good to
see you up there, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through
you, I have a few questions to the proponent of the
-- of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. WALKER (93RD):

Okay, thank you. Mr. Speaker, to my good
friend who has proposed the amendment in front of
us, I'd like to know what is the number base that
she's using for the number of people that are being
calculated for the amount that is in the underlying
amendment that says \$18 million in '19 and \$18

million dollars in '20?

Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the question from my good friend and colleague on the Appropriations Committee. As I answered earlier, we don't have an exact number. This has been a process working through with the Office of Fiscal Analysis, and after much debate and research, this was the number that was recommended for a 1 percent cost of living increase.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93RD):

And, I thank the good gentlelady for her answer. I'm trying to figure out exactly how these numbers were derived because when you look at the -- the first amendment that was proposed by the good gentleman from Hamden, he -- the amount was \$11

million dollar and that was for 24,000 people in the Department of Developmental Services and that was at a 1 percent and the cost was \$11 million dollars, and here we're talking about the Departments of Correction, Housing, Public Health, Social Services, the Children and Families, Rehabilitation, Mental Health and Addiction, Office of Early Childhood, and Judicial. All of these are going to be covered under this -- this increase of \$18 million dollars when there is a difference of only approximately \$6 million dollars to cover the Department of Developmental Services. So, I guess through you Mr. Speaker, if the gentlelady could just give me an estimation of how these numbers came to -- to her.

Through you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and again, they were in collaboration with budget staff from the House Republican Office, the Senate Republican Office, and the Office of Fiscal Analysis over weeks of trying

to put it together, but coincidentally, I just have to look again at my good friend's budget on page 46 where they have a 0.5 percent cost of living increase, which is roughly over \$9 million dollars, so that might be a good place to look for that benchmark.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93RD):

I'm sorry, sir. Could you ask the good gentlelady to repeat that? I couldn't quite hear what she was saying.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron, please --

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I was saying that like I've described earlier the House Republican Budget Staff, the Senate Republican Budget Staff, our leaders in the Appropriation Committee, OFA have been working on trying to drill down to understand how we could create fairness for everyone, and I'll

just expand a little bit by saying that in the first version of the republican proposal, which was delivered just a few days ago -- ten days, whatever it was ago -- we identified that if we had additional money and were able to drill down in our budget document we would do two things. The first, we'd fully fund MSP. The second, we'd provide a 1 percent provider COLA because we'd already done the research to figure out how much money we would need to allocate, and then my second comment just now that my good friend couldn't hear me say was that in the underlying budget from my friends on the other side, there is a 0.5 percent, which is a half percent COLA, which is roughly a little over -- a little bit more than \$9 million dollars, and I was suggesting that that might be a benchmark to understand why 18 percent would equal 1 percent.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I first have to sort

of laugh because I think the proponent of the amendment has stated several times that we did not have a budget that was being presented and yet, now she is quoting from it, but that's okay, and I think the quote that she made was talking about a half a percent increase in the Department of Social Services. It had nothing to do with the number of agencies that the good gentlelady has in her amendment now, which is Department of Corrections, Housing, Public Health, Social -- uh, Children and Families, Rehabilitation, Mental Health Addiction, Office of Childhood, and the Judicial Department, which would have at least ten times the amount that we had and that was \$9 million dollars, and the good lady is absolutely correct, but that \$9 million dollars was also only 6 months of funding because we were doing it as of the beginning of January, so through you, Mr. Speaker, I again want to go back to the underlying amendment and as the good gentlelady talked about, she said that she got -- she has a budget that her caucus has proposed and this is part of it, so I ask the good gentlelady, does she have a

fiscal note off of the Office of Fiscal Analysis that has a evaluated her budget? So, that we can make sure what they are providing is balanced as they have said in the -- several times.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate that question. You know, what happens in this building a lot of time is, you know, the rank and file do a lot of work and then it's left for our leadership to negotiate, discuss, and figure out a pathway to move forward. It's my recollection that about two weeks ago the leadership on this side of the aisle sent a letter to the leadership on that side of the aisle to say, hey, let's see your revenue package. If we had gotten that revenue package, I would think we would have been in those discussions together in a very earnest and sincere way, and then just as the bipartisan budget that was developed and negotiated over months, unfortunately, for most of the

taxpayers, they don't get a real long look and there is an e-certified bill, and as soon as that happens, the fiscal note is created. I will say that our documents are all available online. We're hoping that people will review them, ask questions, whether it's rank and file or leadership. So, as of right now, there is no fiscal note on the whole package.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93RD):

And, again, I thank my good friend on the other side of the aisle for those answers. I think the question that I -- I say as we go through this -- it's hard to use a document that has not been evaluated as a foundation of security to understand that everything is in there because we know also that when Appropriations does their budget, Appropriations is only responsible for the spending, and I do understand what -- what the good gentlelady is saying, but it's very hard right now for me to actually understand exactly the details of her

budget until I can see the fiscal note and I understand exactly what the balance is. So, it's -- it's important that we make sure that all the taxpayers out there hear that this side of the aisle has been working on a budget with the republicans since February, and during that time, we all had several meetings together. We worked on subcommittees. We worked on -- on complete files, and that was something that was participated in by both sides of the aisle, and the sad part is we wanted to do something together, but yet, it was necessary -- I guess -- for that side of the aisle to do one totally on their own and present it in this way. It would be nice for the taxpayers to see us working together in all of these things and we worked -- we tried to do that for quite some time. Things seems to diminish from that and now we are here talking back and forth about underlying budgets that basically the taxpayers have not understood or are not secure about the balancing. So, with that, Mr. Speaker, I think I will take leave, but I will listen to the conversation and I'll be glad to -- to

join back in as we go forward to discuss this important issue because we know that the private providers are so important for the services that we try to provide to everybody here in Connecticut, both the nursing homes, the Department of Developmental Services, Department of Social Services, Children's, making sure that we hold these providers up and make sure that they are getting a fair wage. So, I thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the good gentlelady for those answers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Representative Ritter, you have the floor, sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

[Pause] Thank you, Speaker. Sorry about that. I'm going to stand in opposition and join the chairman of the Appropriations Committee and the chairman of the General Law Committee and others against amendment. We do have one coming that I think maybe is a good compromise, but we'll see what happens when we file it, but there's two problems

with this amendment. It doesn't stop the strike. It doesn't address the concerns that have been raised, and I understand everybody's budgets are really good and they're all really vetted. We think very highly of ours. The other side thinks very highly of theirs. They do everything perfectly and it's the way government should be, and I respect that that's our views, but if we're gonna fund Medicare Savings, only one way it happens. We all work it out or it won't happen. That's it, so we can have all of our budgets. We can have four budgets, the governor's budget. Medicare Savings only gets funded if we all come together and agree. That's it. Only possible option. You show me an alternative, you let me know. Not gonna happen without us coming together, so Medicare Savings is really not something that I can even fathom us talking about when we're talking about separate budgets, everyone going their own way, but here's the real problem with this amendment. I don't think people truly understand what is going to happen in the state of Connecticut on Monday, so let me walk

through what's gonna happen on Monday. We will all have a nice weekend, sunny, come in rested on Monday morning, ties tight, ready to do it -- do our thing legislation wise, and then 2500 people are going to walk off a job, and they will be replaced and those cost are incurring tomorrow for \$1 million dollars a day by people who have never met these workers. So, what do I mean? Mrs. Smith, okay, has a daughter who is severely disabled, and she has had the same homecare person for ten years -- ten years, and that person has never gotten a raise in ten years, and they do the hardest work that I can imagine. The most gut-wrenching emotional or some of the most gut-wrenching emotional work we can imagine, and on Monday, we're gonna walk in here cause we're big time at the state Capitol, and Mrs. Smith's daughter is going to lose that man or woman -- they are mostly woman who do these jobs -- will lose that person because she'll be on strike because she hasn't had a raise in 12 years. She's gone, so this child, Mrs. Smith's child now has a brand-new person taking care of her, providing for her, and she's

never met this person, and the state is spending more money on this than we would if we passed this amendment as House "A". That's what we're gonna do? There's going to be a strike on Monday. Twenty-five hundred people are going to walk off the job because they haven't had a raise in 12 years, and we want to talk about this document and this document and vetting. It's real, it's serious, and it's emotional. You are literally dis -- you are -- you are taking the most vulnerable of our society and saying, sorry, because our document's done a certain way and we want to do it a certain way and it's got to flow a certain way. This is the kind of thing that makes government tough. We like to do everything neat and orderly. It doesn't always happen that way, but I can assure you that if we don't work this out by Monday -- just like Medicare Savings when we came back -- dozens and hundreds of families will see turmoil, upheaval, they will be in tears, and no one will care what we do for three days -- nobody. They won't care about a budget or bills. All those families are gonna care about is

that we let them down. That's why I cannot support this amendment because it does not stop the strike. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Do you care to remark further on the amendment? Representative Klarides.

REP. KLARIDES (114TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The scene that the majority leader just played out was very nice I'm sure, and we all hope it will be a lovely weekend, and we will get some time to ourselves, and I also enjoyed the description of Mrs. Smith and her family. I will tell you as somebody who uses home healthcare workers for my family we do understand how it works. There is not a monopoly in this building for one party to understand what happens with home healthcare workers or with nursing homes, etc. The problem is that I do not agree with the fact that there is only one solution here. The problem is there seems to be in this building a complete and utter disregard for how this state is going to function. I certainly understand the

majority leader's concerns and fears as to what will happen on Monday, and we all have those concerns and fears. But, we have a state that is falling apart. We have a state that doesn't know where their next dime is coming from. We have a state that just spent and agreed to spend \$9 million dollars -- \$9 million dollars on judges that we do not need. When you are going to become serious in this building about where we're getting our money from and start prioritizing where we get that money from, we could consider using that \$9 million dollars for this money that we need. It is not all about pulling on our heartstrings. We all understand how serious this is, and we all understand how important these workers are and the people they take care of. This condescending tone, Mr. Speaker, in regards to how could you possibly not support something like this cause poor people are not going to be taken care of is old, and it's something the state is not going to tolerate. Cause, we cannot sit here three days ago and spend \$9 million dollars on judges we do not need and then sit here and talk about how we don't

care about the people of this state. Once we start prioritizing that, maybe then we'll make better decisions and the state will move forward. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Cheer]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Representative Ritter, you have the floor, sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I oppose this amendment. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you care to remark further on the amendment before us? Do you care to remark further on the amendment before us? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members please take your seats. The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Please check the board to ensure that your vote has been properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the clerk will take a tally. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "B"

Total number Voting	150
Necessary for Adoption	76
Those voting Yea	71
Those voting Nay	79
Absent not Voting	0

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The amendment fails (Gavel). Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Yaccarino, you have the floor, sir.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good evening. A couple questions to the proponent of the bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino, please prepare yourself.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

[Arguing]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you -- through you Mr. Speaker to the good proponent of the bill, the majority leader just mentioned the importance of this to serve the folks in the --

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

(Gavel) (Gavel) (Gavel) Can we keep the volume down or take your conversations outside of the Chamber? (Gavel) [Laughter] Please proceed, sir.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Honestly, I'll be very brief, but this bill of this magnitude the majority leader just mentioned the importance. On Monday, there will be a strike if we don't do this. Has anybody from the

governor's office consulted with the unions to let them know that we're working on this, we'll try to do it bipartisanly, or a way to fund it? Because, it's not funded here.

So, through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, that's a good question, and the short answer is yes, that they have, so the numbers that are embedded in this, the \$14:75, the 5 percent increase, that -- there has been an effort to mediate this all along for the last several weeks, and our understanding is that indeed, those numbers will resolve things.

Through you.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

I thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Thank you for that answer. So, have you

consulted with OPM to give you a guarantee and give these folks a guarantee that the money will be there June 30, 2018? Cause, I don't see that in the language.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I mean we've gotten -- there's the letter that Secretary Barnes sent dated April 20, assuring the leadership of, I believe, both sides that the money is indeed there for these purposes.

Through you --

But, I -- I appreciate that the statute as drafted does say may and there's a "within available appropriations" on that last piece of it, but every -- all the players in this seem to understand where we are on this. For the current fiscal year, the money is there, and then we're -- and then we're back at this through a budgetary process.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

I appreciate the financial, but still there's a possibility that the money won't be there, or I believe it would have been put in the language.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I think we've gotten as much of an assurance as -- as we can. I think the language there -- the "may" -- is more meant to give the flexibility to OPM to take the lapses from the various accounts if need be, but I mean, you know, look, we can't put ourselves in the shoes of the bargaining parties, but every assurance that we've gotten -- this would not be before us and we would not be advocating so vehemently for it if we didn't feel that it resolved exactly those concerns.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Yaccarino.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

I appreciate that answer. I would prefer it being in front of us, but it's not my decision. Thank you for the -- to the proponent and thank you for your time. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Do you care to remark further on the bill as amended? Do you care to remark further on the bill as amended? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members please take your seat. The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Have all members voted? Please make sure that your vote has been properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the

clerk will take a tally. Will the clerk please
announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 5460 as amended by House "A"

Total number Voting	150
Necessary for Passage	76
Those voting Yea	88
Those voting Nay	62
Absent not Voting	0

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The bill as amended passes (Gavel).

Representative Ritter, you have the floor, sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we
immediately transmit Calendar 159 to the Senate.
Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Is there any objections? I'm hearing none. It
will be so ordered. Would the clerk [Coughing] --
would the clerk please call Calendar 252?

CLERK:

On page 48, House Calendar 252, House Bill No.

5503, AN ACT CONCERNING THE KILLING OR INJURING OF
SEEING EYE DOGS AND ASSISTANCE DOGS. Favorable
report on the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Conley, you have the floor,
madam.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of
the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage
of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before the Chamber is on
acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report
and passage of the bill. Representative Conley.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The clerk is in
possession of Amendment LCO No. 4763. I request
that the clerk call the amendment and I request
leave to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Would the clerk please call LCO No. 4763, which
will be designated House Amendment "A"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 4763,
offered by Representative Lemar, Senator Cassano.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The representative seeks leave of the Chamber
to summarize the amendment. Is there any objections
to summarization? Is there any objection. I'm
hearing none. Representative Conley, you have the
floor, madam.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a simple
amendment for economic damages, if a dog who is a
training dog for the blind or an assistance dog for
the deaf or mobility impaired is injured or killed,
that in a damages claim that the cost of training of
a -- training expenses for said specialized animal
can be deemed as damages. It's a good bill and it
ought to pass.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Do you remark further on the
bill -- of the amendment before us? Do you remark
further on the amendment before us? Representative

Zawistowski, you have the floor.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the proponent of the bill said, this is -- does provide additional protections for owners, especially trained dogs, and provides for a special compensation for killing or injuring of the -- of these dogs. If I may, I do have a question for the proponent of the bill, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Through you Mr. Speaker, this -- this bill does -- the amendment does refer to companion animals. I would like to find out whether or not this amendment applies to any kind of therapy dogs. I would just like a better definition of what types of dogs this actually applies to.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Conley.

REP. CONLEY (40TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, the companion animal phrase is just before the new language. That phrase is in a different statute, section 22-351a, and that definition of companion animal means any domesticated dog or cat, so this specialized training in the amendment only applies to guide dogs for folks who are blind and assistance dogs for folks who are deaf or mobility impaired.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I do appreciate that clarification. I think that's an important point to make. This is a good bill. It ought to pass.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the amendment before us? Will you remark further on the amendment before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Those opposed say nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted (Gavel). Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members please take your seats. The machine will be opened. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Please check the board to ensure that your vote has been properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the clerk will take a tally. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 5503 as amended by House "A"

Total number Voting	147
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	147
Those voting Nay	0
Absent not Voting	3

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The bill as amended passes (Gavel). Will the clerk please call Calendar 61?

CLERK:

On page 43, Calendar 61, House Bill No. 5233, AN ACT CONCERNING RECORDKEEPING DUTIES OF THE ADJUTANT GENERAL. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Government Administration and Elections.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Hennessy, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Representative Hennessy, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a military agency bill that seeks to clarify existing law regarding freedom of information requests. The National Guard is a hybrid organization that is both federal and state, and if you seek to have documents through the Freedom of Information Act, you have to know what documents you're requesting; so therefore, if they're state documents, they require a state FOIA, and if they're federal documents, they require a federal FOIA. It's a simple bill and I hope everyone can support it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Do you care to remark further on the bill before us? Representative Ferraro, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I rise just to echo

the comments of my -- uh, my colleague. This is a very simple bill. It just clarifies existing law and puts it into statute. It's a good bill. It ought to pass. Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Do you care to remark further? Do you care to remark further? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members please take your seats. The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all members voted? Please check the board to ensure that your vote has been properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the clerk will take a tally. Will the clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 5233

Total number Voting	148
Necessary for Passage	75
Those voting Yea	148
Those voting Nay	0
Absent not Voting	2

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The bill as amended passes (Gavel).

Representative Baker, for what purpose do you rise?

REP. BAKER (124TH):

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to vote in the affirmative.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The transcript will so note it. Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Good evening everybody. Thanks to Representative O'Dea who is a very good negotiator on that side. We are trying to go home very, very quickly. If people could stay in their seats, we will be rapid fire for these bills the quickest

we've done all session. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you. [Applause] [Cheering]
Representative Cheeseman, you have the floor, madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I rise for the purpose of an introduction.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is a lucky day. I have a bunch of guests, and it's my great pleasure to introduce a member of my Board of Selectmen, Marc Salerno and his son, Alex. Alex is a renowned basketball player in East Lyme, so I would ask you to please give them the customary warm welcome. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Welcome! Thank you for taking the time to come to our Chambers. So, let's get back to the Calendar. Will the clerk please call Calendar No.

401?

CLERK:

On page 36, Calendar 401, Substitute House Bill No. 5579, AN ACT CONCERNING THE RESTORATION OF A MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATOR'S LICENSE. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom, you have the floor, sir.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, the clerk is in possession of an Amendment LCO No. 4916. I'd ask that the amendment be called, and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will the clerk please call LCO NO. 4916, which will be designated House Amendment "A"?

CLERK:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a strike-all amendment, which becomes the bill. This amendment is an agreement of one of those study workgroups that we are so fond of around here that brings together stakeholders from a variety of state agencies and interests including Mother's Against Drunk Driving and the Public Defender's Office. They've negotiated this language, which the Judiciary Committee looked favorably upon, which would help to ensure folks who are indigent or -- or of limited means would have an opportunity to get an interlocking device put on their car should they have been convicted of a DUI offense. The effort is to improve public safety, allow for increased use of interlocking devise. It's a good bill, and I would urge the Chamber's support. I move adoption of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

That would be a good idea. Thank you,
Representative Stafstrom. Representative Rebimbas,
what do you think? [Laughing]

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Mr. Speaker, I think this is a good amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Excellent.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

So, I rise in support. Just a clarification
question, through you, to the good vice-chairman?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Sure.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

To the good vice-chairman, question regarding
we know that this is permissive on the company that
provides these devices. We also know that the court
has to make a finding that the individual is
indigent. If there's a finding that the individual
is indigent, and the individual cannot find a
company that gives it at a low cost or no cost, what
happens?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, in that instance, then they would not be eligible for the discount; however, it's our understanding from the testimony and from the working group that many of the companies who offer this product would offer it at a reduced price in order to get more of these devices on the roads and improve public safety.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that's a great answer as well. This is certainly an option that's well-deserved and needed for our most indigent individuals to have an option to restore their licenses, so I rise in support of this amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, ma'am. Will you remark further on House Amendment "A"? Will you remark further. If

not, let me try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted (Gavel). Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members take your seats, and the machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Just reminding people, as the majority has said, if we could stay close to the Chamber and run through a few of these bills, we can go home all the sooner. Like, while it's still light out. Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted?

Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked, the clerk will take a tally, and Mr. Clerk, kindly announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5579 as amended by House "A"

Total number Voting	149
Necessary for Passage	75
Those voting Yea	149
Those voting Nay	0
Absent not Voting	1

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The bill as amended is passed (Gavel). Mr. Clerk, Calendar 113, please.

CLERK:

On page 12, Calendar 113, Substitute House Bill No. 5171, AN ACT PROHIBITING THE EXECUTIVE BRANCH FROM MAKING RESCISSIONS OR OTHER REDUCTIONS IN THE EDUCATED COST SHARING GRANT DURING THE FISCAL YEAR. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Education.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Fleischmann, just one moment.

(Gavel) (Gavel) Thank you ladies and gentlemen, if we would pay attention. Representative Fleischmann, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Question is on acceptance and passage. Would you explain the bill, please, Representative Fleischmann?

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. As is implied by the title, the measure before us would block the executive branch from making rescissions to the education cost sharing formula after this general assembly has clearly specified the allocations that should occur through our budget process. I think I'm one of many in this Chamber who represents a district that received a rude surprise after we passed last year's budget where there were holdbacks that occurred

shortly after we passed the budget, that were not in line with any formula that legislators in this Chamber or the Senate Chamber had agreed to regarding how we allocate ECS dollars, and that's where -- Mr. Speaker, the clerk is in possession of an Amendment LCO 4585. I ask the clerk to please call it and I be given permission to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Clerk is indeed in possession of LCO No. 4585, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A". Mr. Clerk, kindly call the amendment.

CLERK:

LCO No. 4585, designated House Amendment Schedule "A" and introduced by Representative Fleischmann, Lavielle, Albis, and Candelora.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The gentleman has asked to leave the Chamber to summarize. Without objection, please proceed one more time, Representative Fleischmann. (Gavel)
(Gavel) Thank you. Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment that is

now before us has the same spirit as the underlying bill; however, in my opinion and in the opinion of nonpartisan staff, it is better drafted because in addition to prohibiting rescissions from education cost sharing that might be put in place under general statutes, it also prohibits the holdbacks that were utilized by the governor last fall that hurt so many of our districts. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The question is on adoption. Will you remark further? Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

I'll wait for the bill, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. I support the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you. Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "A"? If not, let me try your minds and all those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment

is adopted (Gavel). Representative Lavielle, on the bill as amended.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad it's quiet in here because this is an excellent bill, and I know that everyone in this Chamber at some time or another has either lived through in their own town or has heard about other towns where the town worked extremely hard, and you know what kind of an exercise that is to do their budget on time, to do all their due diligence, to estimate what they were gonna get from the state, only to find that when they had passed their budget by referendum or some other means, there was a cut by the governor to their education state aid, and then they had to go through all kinds of convulsions to try and meet the requirements and pay for the teachers and others that they had already hired to go to work in that -- that particular school year and to do all the things they had programmed to do. Also, there is that little question of whether the holdbacks or the rescissions by the governor would

count as reductions in state aid for the purposes of the minimum budget requirement, so this bill takes care of that. It doesn't allow the governor to do these things midyear, and I think it's a wonderful bill. I thank our House chair for his role in introducing and supporting it, and I urge everyone to join me in supporting this bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, ma'am. Representative Morris. No. Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, through you, questions to the proponent of the bill, if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed, ma'am.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, what is the difference between the amended bill and the underlying bill?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Fleischmann, do you care to

respond?

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker, through you. As I understand it, the underlying bill would have made it impossible for the governor to make rescissions; however, certain types of holdbacks, which are cuts to education cost sharing in your district or mine that feel the same as rescissions but occur under a different section of statute. In this case, I think under part of the budget we enacted last fall they would have been permitted in the initial bill but now that we've amended it, those two will be disallowed, so in my opinion and in the opinion of staff that we have worked with on this measure, the amended bill would, for example, no longer permit the governor to make this sort of mid-fiscal year reductions that many of us witnessed last November.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you Mr.

Speaker and Mr. Speaker, it was really hard for me to hear the proponents answer, so if I may ask you to quiet the Chambers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Surely. (Gavel) (Gavel)

REP. MILLER (145TH):

So, what options do the governor have if there is a deficit?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, the governor's office would have all of the options that it currently has minus education cost sharing. That would be taken off the table as an area where there could be surprise midyear holdbacks.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (145TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, I want to thank the

proponent of the bill, of the amended bill, for addressing the issues that some of us had in committee because I did vote no on the underlying bill in committee, so I'd like to thank the proponent of the bill for addressing my issues.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill -- Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

Thank you, Mr. Chair, and to the proponent of the bill, I have a couple of questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

What would happen to alliance districts under this bill? Would they be held harmless as well?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

And, what about grants that assist alliance districts, would they also be held harmless?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, there are no separate grants currently to alliance districts. Rather, there are funds that go to alliance districts through our education cost sharing formula that are more generous because our formula has a new wealth factor that drives more dollars to districts with more need, but bottom line is that every alliance district -- like every district in the state of Connecticut would, in my opinion and that of our nonpartisan staff, be safeguarded from mid-fiscal year cuts if this measure is passed.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, what about before and after school programs, what would happen to those? Would they be susceptible to cuts?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, though I am not 100 percent sure, it's my sense that those programs and much of the other things that we do as a state government would not be safeguarded by this measure. My good colleague strikes it a challenge that we have, which is that under our current approach, if it emerges into a fiscal year that there is a deficit, we have empowered and asked our executive branch to take some steps to mitigate that deficit. So, there are things that can happen in the middle of a fiscal year that we won't like. What this bill says is cutting education cost sharing dollars that are key to the functioning of our local school systems will no longer be one of the items on that

menu of possibilities. It's been unfair to our districts. It's caused incredible disruption, and we're taking it off the table.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

Thank you for those answers, and what about circumstances that have -- we've made some changes in the past year or so with respect to the education cost sharing formula. Would those be held harmless as well under this amendment?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, if I understood the question correctly, the formula that this general assembly agreed to when we enacted a budget late October of last year would remain precisely as is and is not touched in any way by the bill before us.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And, finally, what would happen to the education cost sharing grant that incorporated English language learning funding increases for those districts that have a high percentage of students that have a home language that isn't English?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Thank you. Through you Mr. Speaker to my good colleague, so including English language learners and the education cost sharing formula was something that this legislature agreed to in a bipartisan manner last fall. It's an improvement to the education cost sharing formula, in my opinion and hopefully, the opinion of my good colleague, and that would remain in place exactly as is under the bill before us.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Johnson.

REP. JOHNSON (49TH):

Thank you. I thank the gentleman for his answers. I -- I think I will support this measure at this point in time since the -- the districts that are funded at a lower percentage have really been hurt over the years. We have districts such as mine funded only at 72 percent of the actual formula. While in the state of Connecticut, we also have districts that are funded at 100 percent and even more, so I'm hoping that eventually we will be in a circumstance where we will have all the districts funded at around 100 percent of the education cost sharing formula, and I would not like to see anything interfere with that. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, ma'am. Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have a question for to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed.

REP. WALKER (93RD):

Uh, yes. Through you Mr. Speaker, I'd like to know if we are exempting these communities from any type of reduction. If we have to make a reduction of let's say approximately \$50 million dollars in order to balance the budget, what would that look like? What would the result be? Are we saying that we make reductions in different areas?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18TH):

Through you Mr. Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93RD):

I thank the good gentleman for that answer.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, ma'am. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further? If

not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members take your seats. The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? If so, the machine will be locked, clerk will take a tally, and the clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5171 as amended by House "A"

Total number Voting	149
Necessary for Passage	75
Those voting Yea	117
Those voting Nay	32
Absent not Voting	1

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The bill as amended is passed (Gavel). 233,

Mr. Clerk, please.

CLERK:

On page 48, Calendar 233, House Bill No. 5293,
AN ACT CONCERNING THE SALE OF ELECTRONIC NICOTINE
DELIVERY SYSTEMS AND VAPOR PRODUCTS. Favorable
report of the Joint Standing Committee on General
Law.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move
for the acceptance of the Joint Committee's
favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will
you explain the bill please, ma'am?

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Mr. Speaker, the clerk has an Amendment, LCO
3805. I would ask the clerk to please call the
amendment, and that I be granted leave of the
Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Clerk is indeed in the possession of LCO No. 3805, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A" -- Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 3805, offered by Representative Rutigliano, Representative Smith, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The gentlewoman has asked leave of the Chamber to summarize. Is there objection? I'm hearing none. Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the amendment, which is a strike-all amendment, requires direct face-to-face contact for purchase of electronic nicotine delivery devices just like we do for cigarettes and smokeless tobacco. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The question is on adoption. Representative McCarthy Vahey, anything else?

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, ma'am. Representative Lesser, who doesn't appear to be in the Chamber. Representative Rutigliano.

REP. RUTIGLIANO (123RD):

Mr. Speaker -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. I wanted to reassure my colleagues that this amendment represents a compromise with all stakeholders including the businesses and it's -- it's a good bill. It ought to pass. Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just briefly had a question for the proponent --

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

If I may? Are these products available over the internet?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you Mr. Speaker, yes, I believe so and this amendment does not address online sales.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't see an exemption in the language where to understand it's legislative intent not to affect online transactions.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, the intent of this bill is not to address online sales. It is simply for retail establishments and the requirement of face-to-face purchases in retail establishments.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just note that the language does not say retail establishments in Connecticut. I can understand that we only have jurisdiction over Connecticut. I'm just concerned if the intent is to stop minors from utilizing these products that perhaps it doesn't address that, so.

Through you, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "A"? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted (Gavel). Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members take your

seats. The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked, the clerk will take a tally, and the clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5293 as amended by House "A"

Total number Voting	148
Necessary for Passage	75
Those voting Yea	145
Those voting Nay	3
Absent not Voting	2

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Bill as amended is passed (Gavel). Mr. Clerk, 344, please.

CLERK:

On page 49, Calendar 344, House Bill No. 5515,
AN ACT CONCERNING THE AUTHORITY OF A ZONING
COMMISSION TO REGULATE THE BRIGHTNESS AND
ILLUMINATION OF ADVERTISING SIGNS AND BILLBOARDS.

Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on
Planning and Development.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Shedding a little light on this topic,
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move
again for the acceptance of the Joint Committee's
favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Question is on acceptance and passage.
Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, we had a robust debate on this
bill this morning and some concerns were brought to
our attention regarding existing billboards and
whether if those could not be dimmed, whether those
would be grandfathered in under ordinances or

regulations. We've attempted to address that concern. The clerk is in possession of Amendment, LCO No. 4914. I'd ask that the amendment be called, and I be granted leave to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The clerk is in possession of LCO No. 4914, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A" -- Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

House "A", LCO 4914, offered by Representative Stafstrom, Representative Rebimbas, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Is there objection to Representative Stafstrom summarizing? I'm hearing none. Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you. Briefly, Mr. Speaker, I believe this amendment addresses the concerns we heard regarding grandfathering in from regulations those billboards which cannot be dimmed under existing technology. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Question is on adoption. Representative
Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment, and want to take this opportunity to thank the good vice-chairman, as well as the proponent of the amendment for taking the time to PT this in order to address some of the concerns that were raised by individuals, specifically regarding we wanted to make sure that these businesses that have these billboards weren't put out of businesses just because we're clearly now enumerating in the statute that they have the ability -- a municipality, again, has the ability, whether or not they want to pass an ordinance in order to regulate the brightness and illumination of a billboard, so I do thank everyone for the amendment, and I do support the amendment, and I may comment on the underlying bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you. On House Amendment Schedule "A",
Representative Dillon. No. On House "A",

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Quick question to the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you. So, just because the conversation has primarily dealt with billboards, but this legislation actually pertains to any advertising sign in the state of Connecticut. Through you Mr. Speaker, that is on a municipality -- any advertising sign?

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. Whatever the local ordinance designates as an advertising sign or billboard.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, if my business sign had current lighting, that that current lighting would not need to be changed through this legislation since you've grandfathered it?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you to the good proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Dubitsky. Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I -- I thought we had -- I thought I had attempted at least to address this issue in the colloquy earlier. This

amendment I don't think is really necessary. As I indicated before, the -- a billboard that does not have a variable brightness at the time an ordinance is put in place would be considered a pre-existing nonconforming use and would be already exempt from any new zoning regulation that regulated the brightness of a sign, so I -- it really isn't necessary to have this amendment, and frankly, I think what this amendment does is it essentially exempts advertising and billboard signs completely including the location of lamps and things like that, so you know, frankly, I'm not sure that this is necessary and -- and again, I think this is the reason why this bill should have come through Planning and Development first. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the proponent of the amendment, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Proceed.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you to the proponent of the bill, does this pertain to state-owned facilities also?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It does not change existing zoning regulations with respect to state-owned property.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you Mr. Speaker, in my district, we have a community college and there's a lot of complaints on new signs that are very bright and they're digital, so we have no jurisdiction over that through this bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Mr. Speaker, I do not believe that's correct. I believe to the extent the town has the ability to regulate zoning with its town and those zoning regulations are applicable to a state building that may be built. Then, yes, in fact, the town would have the ability should it choose to adopt regulations to govern the brightness or illumination of signs.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "A"? Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "A"? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted (Gavel). Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON (92ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very much for everyone trying to address a very specific issue in our state statutes, and I -- I hope -- I urge the Chamber to support it and pass the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the bill? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members take your seats. The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Once again, I would counsel members to stay close by. Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the clerk will take a tally, and the clerk will

announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5515 as amended by House "A"

Total number Voting	147
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	129
Those voting Nay	18
Absent not Voting	3

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The bill as amended is passed. Mr. Clerk --

CLERK:

On page 21 -- I'm sorry.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

204.

CLERK:

Okay. [Laughing] On page 21, Calendar 204, Substitute House Bill 5204, AN ACT CONCERNING LAW AND ORDINANCE COVERAGE. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Insurance and Real Estate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative de la Cruz.

REP. DE LA CRUZ (41ST):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you explain the bill please, sir?

REP. DE LA CRUZ (41ST):

Mr. Speaker, the clerk has an Amendment, LCO 4399. I ask that it be called and that I be permitted to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The clerk does have LCO NO. 4399, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A" -- Mr. Clerk.

REP. DE LA CRUZ (41ST):

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Just a minute.

DE LA CRUZ (41ST):

I'm going too fast.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Yes. [Laughter] Not that I object. It's just one of those things -- Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 4399, offered by Representative Ziobron, Representative Siegrist, Representative Scanlon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The gentleman seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize. Is there objection? I'm hearing none. Representative de la Cruz.

REP. DE LA CRUZ (41ST):

Speaker, I move adoption of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Question is on adoption?

REP. DE LA CRUZ (41ST):

[Laughing] Yes, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Do you want to give us a hint what it's about, Representative de la Cruz? [Laughing]

REP. DE LA CRUZ (41ST):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The amendment becomes the bill. It changes the effective dates to July 1,

2019. It also has conforming language. The purpose of the amendment is to guarantee that all homeowners property insurance policies will now include law and ordinance coverage. It's intended to cover -- [Laughing] -- it ensures the repair and the property damage to comply with code requirements. The amendment requires that all such policies to contain in this coverage, while allowing the insured and their agent and the insurer to determine the amount of such coverage. I urge adoption of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of the amendment. Very briefly, thank you very much to the proponent for bringing this out. The bill will require coverage, but the consumer gets to decide if they want to purchase it. It's a balanced approach. The prompting of this bill is because we had a World War II Veteran who had his home destroyed by a plane crashing into it at the Goodspeed Opera House Airport near my district, and

I urge support. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, ma'am. Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "A"? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment's adopted (Gavel). Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House.

Members take your seats. The machine will be open.

[Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the

members voted? If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked, clerk will take a tally, and the clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5204 as amended by House "A"

Total number Voting	147
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	147
Those voting Nay	0
Absent not Voting	3

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The bill as amended is passed (Gavel). I have three people on the board and since there's nothing before us, I'm puzzled. Representative Young. Representative Smith. Representative Genga. No? In which case, we'll continue to move on to Calendar 447, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 40, House Calendar 447, Senate Bill No. 105, AN ACT ENSURING CONTINUING WATER SERVICE FOR CERTAIN MUNICIPALITIES. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Environment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Demicco.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move for the -- for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Question is on acceptance and passage. Explain the bill please, sir.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this bill extends for a year the town of Durham's water diversion permit waiver, which allows the town to annually draw -- withdraw up to 100-thousand gallons of water per day for three consecutive days associated with the Durham Fair. This -- the legislature ten years ago passed a Special Act. The Special Act is effective until October 1 of this year.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Excuse me, representative. (Gavel) (Gavel)
Thank you. Representative Demicco.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. So, the Special Act, which was passed ten years ago, was effective until October 1 of this year, and the bill would extend that waiver for -- for one more year. So, Mr. Speaker, the clerk has an amendment. It's LCO 4110, and I would ask the clerk to call the amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Clerk is in possession of LCO No. 4110, previously designated Senate Amendment Schedule "A" -- Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule "A", LCO NO. 4110, offered by Senator Kennedy, Senator Fasano.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The gentleman has asked leave of the Chamber to summarize. Without objection, Representative Demicco.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, this amendment would require the town of Durham to pay

the water diversion permit fee unless the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection waives that fee, and I would -- I would urge adoption. I would move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Question is on adoption. Will you remark further on Senate Amendment Schedule "A"? Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good amendment. I urge passage. I also support the underlying bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on Senate Amendment "A"? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Opposed, nay. The ayes have it (Gavel). The amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Mushinsky.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I've very happy that Durham is working with Middletown to finally solve this problem but for one more year without a diversion permit, they will be tapping an aquifer that takes care of a trout stream right on the fairgrounds. There are trout there now, and I am loathed to give them a diversion permit even for one more year. The fair could bring in water trucks for one more time, and take care of the fair customers that way, and so I will be voting no on this extension, but I am -- I do wish to recognize the good faith effort by Durham and Middletown to work out the situation and hope it will be fixed by next year, and if we -- if we look at this situation, it's just another reason why we need to pass a state water plan, and I hope we will do that before we adjourn on May 9, so I will be voting no. There is another alternative, and if you care about trout streams, I hope you will join me. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, ma'am. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the well of the House. Members take your seats. The machine will be open.
[Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

There's only a couple more to go ladies and gentlemen. If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the clerk will take a tally, and the clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 105 as amended by Senate "A" in concurrence with the Senate

Total number Voting	146
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	102
Those voting Nay	44

Absent not Voting 4

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Bill as amended is passed in concurrence with the Senate (Gavel). Mr. Clerk, would you kindly call Calendar 417?

CLERK:

On page 39, Calendar 417, Substitute House Bill No. 5429, AN ACT CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE SERVICES' RECOMMENDATIONS FOR INCREASED PENALTIES FOR CERTAIN CIGARETTE AND TOBACCO TAX VIOLATIONS. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Finance, Revenue, and Bonding.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Representative Rojas.

REP. ROJAS (9TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Question is on acceptance and passage. Explain the bill please, sir.

REP. ROJAS (9TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The title of the bill reflects the contents of the bill. It increases penalties for various tobacco violations. Mr. Speaker, the clerk is in possession of an Amendment, LCO 4920. I ask the clerk to please call the amendment and I be given leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The clerk indeed has LCO No. 4920, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A" -- Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO 4920, offered by Representative Rojas, Representative Davis, Representative Ferguson.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

If there's no except [Laughing] If there's no objection to Representative Rojas summarizing? Representative Rojas.

REP. ROJAS (9TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The amendment addresses two issues for small businesses in

Connecticut related to embalmers and cigar fulfillment centers. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Question is on adoption. Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "A"?

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I stand in support of this amendment. It is a probusiness amendment. It helps out two sets of local businesses here in the state, and I encourage my colleagues to support it as well. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on House Amendment Schedule "A"? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment's adopted (Gavel). Will you remark

further on the bill as amended? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House.

Members take your seats. The machine will be open.

[Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked, the clerk will take a tally, and the clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5439 as amended by House "A"

Total number Voting	145
Necessary for Passage	73
Those voting Yea	133
Those voting Nay	12
Absent not Voting	5

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

The bill as amended is passed (Gavel).

Representative D'Agostino for the record.

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

For the record, Mr. Speaker, I recused myself from the last vote. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. I did note you did leave the Chamber before the bill was discussed. Mr. Clerk, 191, please. Oh, I'm sorry. Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have one bill left. We are going to start tomorrow at 10:30. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you -- thank you, sir. 191, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 47, House Calendar 191, Substitute House Bill No. 5453, AN ACT CONCERNING THE RENEWAL OF LIABILITY INSURANCE POLICIES FOR UNDERGROUND STORAGE TANKS. Favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Insurance and Real Estate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

(Gavel) (Gavel) (Gavel) Thank you. If I could have a clear line of sight to Representative Demicco, I'd appreciate it. Thank you, sirs. Representative Demicco.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Okay, thank you -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Question is on acceptance and passage. Will you explain the bill please, sir?

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Okay. Yeah, Mr. Speaker, this -- this bill prohibits insurers from canceling or denying renewal of general liability insurance solely for the reason that the insurance applies to an underground storage tank.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good bill. It ought to pass.

DEPUTY SPEAKER PRO TEMPORE GODFREY (110TH):

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further? If not, staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Members take your seats. The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, please check the board to ensure your vote's been properly cast. Please check the board to ensure your vote's been properly cast. If all the members have voted including the representative of the 106th district, the machine will be locked, and the clerk will take a tally. The clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5453

Total number Voting	146
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	137
Those voting Nay	9
Absent not Voting	4

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The bill passes (Gavel). Announcements or introductions? Representative Santiago.

REP. SANTIAGO (84TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of a Chamber Journal notations. Business outside of the Chamber, Representative D'Agostino, Hilda Santiago, Representative Urban, Berger, and Currey. For business in the district, Morris, Morin, Perone, and Tong. Other business, Mushinsky for family business. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Representative Betts, it's your moment of glory here.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted

to say for Journal notations, missed votes.

Representative Frey was in district on legislative business. Representative LeGeyt was out of the Chamber on legislative business. Representative France is back in district on legislative business, and Representative Fusco missed votes for a funeral. Thank you so much.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Matt Lesser of the 100th district, sir, you have the floor.

REP. LESSER (100TH):

Good evening, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good evening, sir.

REP. LESSER (100TH):

For purposes of introduction.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. LESSER (100TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. At this time of the year, we're frequently joined by constituents from

our various districts. I want to recognize three individuals who have come up from Gilead Community Services, a nonprofit in Middletown, to advocate for those in need, and I want to recognize in particular Dan Osborne, Captain Gary Wallace from Middletown Police Department, and Suzanne Gaskell. I ask the Chamber to extend them our usual warm welcome. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

And, we will. Give them a warm welcome to our Chamber [Applause]. Thank you very much for visiting. Please take it as no sign of disrespect. We didn't get out of here until almost 2 o'clock last night, so I'm sure folks are heading home to get some sleep. Representative Hennessy of the 127th.

REP. HENNESSY (127TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Another announcement for Save a Suit tomorrow. I want to clarify that -- that this includes women Veterans. I don't know if that was made clear, but we're definitely collecting for women also, and don't forget us. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Mr. Speaker, I rise for -- to make a motion that we immediately transmit all bills pursuant to House Rule 11(F).

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Pursuant to House Rules. We will immediately transmit the bills. Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the majority leader noted earlier, we will be coming in at 10:30 a.m. tomorrow, so see you all then, and there being no further business on the clerk's desk I move that we adjourn subject to the Call of the Chair.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Question before the Chamber is on adjourning subject to the Call of the Chair. No objection?
So, ordered. (Gavel)

(On motion of Representative Albis of the 99th District, the House adjourned at 7:41 o'clock p.m.,

aa
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

337
May 2, 2018

sine die.)

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 337 pages is a complete and accurate transcription of a digital sound recording of the House Proceedings on Wednesday, May 2, 2018.

I further certify that the digital sound recording was transcribed by the word processing department employees of Alphatranscription, under my direction.

Alpha Transcription
3244 Ridge View Ct 104
Lake Ridge VA 22192