(The House of Representatives was called to order at 11:00 o'clock a.m., Assistant Deputy Speaker Emil "Buddy" Altobello in the Chair.)

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Staff and guests, please rise and direct your attention to dais where Representative McGee will lead us in prayer.

GUEST CHAPLAIN BRANDON L. McGEE, JR.:

Let us pray. Almighty Creator, guide our deliberations as we come together to attend the matters set before us. Assist our Legislators in making the difficult choices that will forever keep the spirit of the State of Connecticut alive and well for generations to come. Lastly, help us find blessings in this worthwhile -- while cause that calls us to lead and serve. Amen.
REPRESENTATIVES:

Amen.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative and congratulations to you and your wife on your new arrival.

REP. McGEE (5TH):

[Laughter] Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Would Representative Concepcion of the 4th District, please come to the dais and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance?

REP. CONCEPCION (4TH):

(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.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you. Thanks Randy. [Applause] Is there any business on the Clerk's desk?

CLERK:
Yes, Mr. Speaker. The only business is the daily calendar.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Are there any announcements and introductions?

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Mr. Speaker, I rise to make an introduction.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

One moment please, sir. Mr. Clerk, perhaps an announcement might be in order? Yeah.

CLERK:

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

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

And Representative Michel of the 146th, you have the floor. For what purpose do you rise, sir?

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I rise to make an introduction.
REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, I'd like to introduce one of our greatest environmental heroes on planet Earth, Captain Paul Watson, who is founder of Sea Shepard Conservation Society and previously also was founder of Green Peace. So, this is Paul Watson. Also, I'm introducing Omar Todd, who is working closely — very closely with Captain Paul Watson, as well as Mr. Vic Guerin, who is the Chapter leader for the New England Chapter. So, thank you for the introduction. If we could have a round of applause for our environmental hero and the Chairmen, that would be great. Thank you.

[Applause]

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you very much Representative and the gentlemen up there. Thank you for gracing our Chamber today. We're happy --
Thank you --

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

-- to have you --

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

-- Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

-- as a guest. The House will stand at ease.

[Gavel] House will come back to order.

Representative Currey of the 11th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CURREY (11TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move that we suspend for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 37, 38, 39, 40 and House Resolution 33.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

That objection is so ordered. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar 637?

CLERK:

On Page 1, House Calendar 637, Senate Joint Resolution No. 37, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE JAMES W. ABRAMS OF
MERIDEN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE JUDICIAL REVIEW COUNCIL. Favorable Report of Joint Standing Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Vargas of the 6th District, you have the floor, sir.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The question before the Chamber is acceptance of Joint Committee's Report and adoption of the Resolution. Please proceed, sir.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Resolution is to confirm his Honor James W. Abrams to be a Commissioner of the Judicial Review Council. This is a part-time, nonpaid position for a four-year term. I'd just like to say a few things about -- about Judge Abrams. He's a graduate of Trinity
College and UConn Law School. He's currently both Chief Administrative Judge for the Civil Division statewide and Administrative Judge for the New Haven Judicial District. He also serves as a Trial Judge and mediates cases as part of the Judicial Alternative Dispute Resolution Program. And prior to his -- his becoming a Judge he was Corporation Counsel for the City of Meriden and Chief Counsel for the House Democrats.

He's been a leader in many spheres, including his serving on the Board of the New London Associate of Schools and Colleges. He also was an actor with [inaudible - 00:09:17] stage which is quite interesting for a -- for a Judge. He volunteers with the Boys and Girls Club [inaudible - 00:09:24] Haven, and is married to Senator Mary Abrams. So, I urge adoption of the Resolution, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Vargas. Further on this Resolution? Representative Perillo of the 113th, you have the floor.
REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker. Thanks very much. I just rise very briefly to echo the gentleman's comments. Judge Abrams is highly qualified, highly respected. And I would urge all members of the Chamber to support the Resolution.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you very much, Representative Perillo. Further on this Resolution? Further on the Resolution? If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Opposed. [Gavel] Resolution is adopted. Will the Clerk please call Calendar 638?

CLERK:

On page 2, House Calendar 638, Senate Joint Resolution No. 38, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE LAURA F. BALDINI OF WEST HARTFORD TO BE AN ALTERNATE MEMBER OF THE JUDICIAL

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Vargas, once again you have the floor, sir.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The question before the Chamber is adoption of the Resolution. Will you remark? Representative Vargas.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Senate Joint Resolution confirming Laura Baldini, who is a member of -- who is a Judge in Superior Court to be an Alternate Member of the Judicial Review Council. She lives in West Hartford with her family. She was approved unanimously by our Committee. She is a graduate from Yale Law School. Her career includes
private practice in civil matters and litigation in New York and Hartford before opening her own law firm, which focused on the boutique practice on litigation real estate work. She was appointed to the Superior Court in 2010, serves as Presiding Judge of [inaudible - 00:11:19] Criminal and Assistant Administrative Judge for Hartford Judicial District. She has been admitted to the Connecticut and New York Bars, also the US District Court in D.C. and the US Courts of Appeal Second Circuit. She's imminently qualified. I urge my colleagues to adopt the Resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Vargas. Representative Perillo of the 111th, you have the floor.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Excuse me.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):
And again I -- I rise in support of the gentleman's statements. Judge Baldini is highly qualified, not only her experience on the bench, but also her experience in private practice, as well prior to that, gives her a unique perspective. And I would urge adoption.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Perillo. I think I misidentified your District. It is the 113th. Further on this Resolution? Further? If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Opposed. [Gavel] Resolution is adopted. Will the Clerk please call Calendar 639?

CLERK:

On page 2, House Calendar 639, Senate Joint Resolution No. 39, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE ANNA M. FICETO OF
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

May 23, 2019

WOLCOTT TO BE AN ALTERNATE MEMBER OF THE JUDICIAL REVIEW COUNCIL. Favorable Report of Joint Standing Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Vargas, you have the floor again.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The question before the Chamber is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution. Please proceed, sir.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Resolution confirming Judge Anna M. Ficeto as to be a member of the Judicial Review Council. She lives in Wolcott with her family, was voted unanimously -- unanimously in the affirmative on May 16th. She's a graduate of Mount Holyoke, UConn -- and UConn Law
School. Her career began in the private -- private practice. She spent much of her career also with the State of Connecticut in a number of legal and senior roles, in DCP, Public Works, DAS, and Governor Rell's office, and as a Peer Commissioner. She has been a Judge since 2012 and has served in Hartford and -- and in GA14. Currently, she serves as Assistant Administrative Judge for the Waterbury Judicial District and is the Presiding Judge for Family in Waterbury. I urge adoption of the Resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Vergas. And Representative Perillo, you have the floor.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The -- the Chair of the Committee is absolutely correct. Judge Fecito's experience in the private sector, on the bench, and also in state government, will be of great value to the Commission. And I urge adoption of the Resolution.
ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

    Thank you, Representative Perillo. Further on the Resolution? Further on the Resolution? If not I'll, try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

    Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

    Opposed. Ayes have it. Resolution is adopted.

[Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar 640.

CLERK:


ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

    Representative Vargas.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):
Thank you -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Resolution of Joint Senate Resolution confirming Melissa Kane to be a member of the Commuter Rail Council. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you. The question before the Chamber is adoption of this Resolution. Will you remark further?

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Melissa Kane was voted unanimously in the affirmative in our May 16th public hearing. She is currently serving as a Selectwoman from Westport.

Representative Jonathan Steinberg spoke very highly of her in -- in her hearing. And Senator Will Haskell submitted a letter of support with his highest recommendation.

She's a graduate of Mount Holyoke and besides being First Selectwoman, she also owns a small business which she's operated for over ten years.
She worked in public relations for the Hearst Industry and the Record Industry. She's also held leadership roles in the democratic town committee, many non-profits, and is currently President of Connecticut Against Gun Violence and is on the Boards of NARAL and also on the Democratic Woman of Westport.

So, she's quite involved and understands the commuter rail issues facing the State of Connecticut. I urge adoption of the Resolution.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Vergas. Further on this Resolution? Further? Representative Perillo of the 113th, you have the floor.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I -- I appreciate it. If I could just ask a question or two to the chair of the Executive Nominations Committee?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed, sir.
REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know, that the individual was supported unanimously in Committee. But in reading through her resume and her background, I do have to ask one question. Has the nominee ever been a commuter? Through you, sir.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Vargas.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

I believe the answer is in the affirmative. If I recall correctly, she is a commuter.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you. To -- to -- to where does she commute? Through you, sir. Because I -- I simply don't see it in the -- in the resume.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Vargas.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):
I believe that it was elicited during the public hearing that she was a commuter and that she was pretty familiar with the issues facing commuting in the State of Connecticut. But you're right, I did not read it in her resume.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative --

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

-- or in her, you know, initial statement.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I didn't either. You know, this is the Commuter Rail Council. We -- we would hope that every member would have experience as a commuter. And perhaps, the fact that -- that this nominee doesn't have that experience, she is obviously from a town that has a lot of commuters and -- and obviously it's -- it's very relevant to the town of Westport and all of
lower Fairfield County. So -- so I would join the
gentleman in urging adoption.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you very much, Representative Perillo.

Representative Steinberg of the 136th and the
wonderful town of Westport, you have the floor, sir.

REP. STEINBERG (136TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good morning. I rise
in support of Melissa Kane's nomination. I've known
her for a long time. She has displayed leadership
in a variety of ways in our community. And as
Representative Perillo pointed out, Westport has
long been a commuter community. It's not well
known, but we actually have more people commuting
into Westport than we do have going into New York
City which is sort of the traditional expectation.
So, as Third Selectman of the town of Westport,
Melissa has been imminently involved with many of
commuter issues, which go beyond just the trains,
they have to do with multimodal and the use of mass
transit as well.
She brings tremendous experience to this. And even if she hasn't necessarily currently been a daily commuter to New York, she has a fundamental understanding of how critical the commuter rail line is to the vitality of the Fairfield County economy and the state of Connecticut. I strongly support her nomination. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Steinberg. Further on this Resolution? Further on this Resolution? If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Opposed. The ayes have it. [Gavel] Resolution is adopted. Are there any introductions? Are there any introductions? Representative Kokoruda, how are you this morning?

REP. KOKORUDA (101ST):
Good morning, Mr. Speaker. It's good to see you up there, as always. Mr. Speaker. I would like to just welcome two fourth-grade classes from Jeffrey -- Jeffrey Elementary School in Madison, Connecticut who are here today, and for most of them, it's their first trip to the Capital. So, I ask my colleagues to -- to welcome them this morning. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Applause]

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Kokoruda. And thank you to all the students for making the trek up to Hartford. We hope you enjoy your day. Thanks for visiting. Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker, we have two birthdays in our caucus. I see one member has not arrived yet, but one is here. And maybe the nicest person in the entire Chamber, certainly nicer than you, Mr. Speaker. [Laughter] Ladies and gentlemen, happy birthday to Representative Tammy Exum from West Hartford. [Applause]
ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Ritter. And any further announcements? Are there any further announcements? Representative Lanoue of the 45th. For what -- for what purpose do you rise, sir?

REP. LANOUE (45TH):

Point of personal privilege.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed.

REP. LANOUE (45TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very proud to have with me today -- you can come over, Andy -- Andy and Angela. Andy Koniecko, he is a long-term -- longtime friend of mine. We've gone to school since kindergarten, right through high school, both graduates of Northridge Academy Class of 2001. And out of full disclosure, he's also a cousin of mine. He won't admit that, but he is. And we are proud relatives. And he's a teacher at the Bennie Dover Middle School in New London. And he has with him, Angela Rasmussen, who also is a -- a -- a faculty
member at Bennie Dover. I appreciate 'em both for their life dedication to our young people. And I hope the Chamber will welcome 'em here today.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you very much. [applause] Thank you and welcome to our Chamber. And I hope you enjoy your day. And of course, Representative Lanoue, since you and your cousin have gone to school together since kindergarten, if anybody needs any dirt, we should go see him [inaudible - 00:22:16]. Thank you very much. Are there any further announcements or introductions? Representative Porter of the 94th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. PORTER (94TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We rise for a point of introduction. We would just like to welcome Ms. Shirley Ellis West. She is the Interim Director at New Haven Family Alliance. And I would just ask that the Chamber please give her a warm welcome.

[Applause] Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you, colleagues. [Applause]
Thank you, Representative Porter. Further announcements? Any further announcements? Further announcements? Introductions? Representative Meskers, you have an announcement? Thank you very much. Any further? If not, we'll return to call of the calendar. Will the Clerk please call Calendar 635?

CLERK:


Assistant Deputy Speaker Altobello (82nd):

Representative D'Agostino of the 91st, you have the floor, sir.

Rep. D'Agostino (91st):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance of the House Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The question before the Chamber is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage. Please proceed.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is the last of several contracts that we have continuing from yesterday. It's also the most significant, so I wanted to spend a brief minute on introductory remarks to put it in context. This is, of course, the Interest Arbitration Award with respect to our state troopers, not the lieutenants and captains but the troopers, sergeants, and master sergeants, about 900 members strong.

And I think, as most members know, but -- but just to put on the record and for the public, our state police are unique. They're -- they're not like other state police across the country. In many
states, of course, the state police are simply a -- a highway patrol. Our state police do much -- much more than that. They are imbued with criminal investigatory powers. They serve --

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

There you go.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

How's that?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Much better.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I was saying, with respect to our state police, they're -- they're -- they do much more than just obviously highway patrol. They provide direct law enforcement services. They serve as an investigatory unit of municipal police forces when necessary. And, of course, as many members in the Chamber are aware, they serve as a residential police force for many towns across the State of Connecticut.
So, that 900 members strong do a lot of and -- and serve the state in many capacities. And, of course, part of their job description is that, on, any given day, they may be called to give their life in service of the people of the State of Connecticut. I mean I'd ask us all to think about that for a second when that's part of your job description.

And regrettably, last year two troopers did lose their lives in the line of duty, Private First Class Kevin Miller -- excuse me, that's Trooper First Class Kevin Miller and Trooper First Class Walter Greene, Jr. in 2018 gave the ultimate sacrifice and service of the people of the State of Connecticut. And I raise their service not -- not as a reason to -- to approve an arbitration award, obviously. That -- that is not a -- a reason to vote for this award. I raise that again, simply to put in context what we are about to consider here today and the breath of services that these troopers
do provide to the citizens of the State of Connecticut.

And I'd ask all members to keep that in mind as we talk about this award because it is substantial. It -- it is larger numbers than we've considered previously. All in over four years, this award has an incremental value of about an additional $50 million dollars to the state and salary and benefits and -- and other parts of the package, which -- which I'm sure we'll go over today. But again, keep that amount in context of the services that are provided and in context of the fact that, in the last three years, the troopers have seen a reduction in force from almost 11 hundred troopers to now 900. And that, alone, has saved the state about $36 million dollars in salary and benefits and net millions of dollars, even when you account for overtime that had to be included, because they're so understaffed.

So, I'd ask all members to keep that in mind. This is a four-year award. It covers fiscal
years '19, '20, and '21 -- excuse -- excuse me, '19, '20, '21, and '22. And when you look at it again, in the context of the scope and breath of the services that we receive from all 900 members, I think it's worthy of adoption.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Further on the Resolution? Further on the Resolution? Representative Lavielle of the 143rd, do you wish to comment?

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Good morning, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Good morning, madam.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Yes, I -- I do have a few questions for the proponent. I -- I would start by saying that I certainly agree with his assessment that the state police are extremely valuable citizens of Connecticut and they do an amazing job for all of us. They are the police force for some of our communities, for others of us, they protect us
generally and they help to enforce our laws. I have a great deal of respect for them, as I hope we all do. And they certainly put their lives on the line many hours of every day.

So, with that, I think that having -- coming on the tail of five other contracts that we discussed yesterday and five others we discussed before that, and proceeding a few more we're going to do before the session ends, I would like to ask some questions to the proponent.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed, madam.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you very much. I wonder if -- if the good Representative would just give a -- a sketch of the difference of the status of the state police union vis-à-vis the SEBAC contract going into these negotiations, their difference from the other unions that have gone through this process. And I would say, dating from 2011 and again in 2017, where did
they stand? What did they do? And where do they go now in terms of SEBAC? Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's -- it's a great question. And this came up when we did the SEBAC contract a couple years ago. So, the state police unions are covered by SEBAC in terms of pension and healthcare, so they are bound by those terms. Of course, there's some unique parts of our pension healthcare system with respect to hazardous duty and how they're compensated in pensions and their -- and their retirement dates. I think after 2011, they can retire after 25 years of service or after they hit the year -- reach the age of 50. But they are part of the SEBAC architecture with respect to pension and healthcare.

Unlike most of the other state employee bargaining units, however, the state police have always chosen to independently negotiate their wage
and hour contracts. And they're free to do that. Any -- any bargaining unit is free to do that. The state police, though, have uniformly decided not to be part of the offer package. When we negotiate pension and healthcare, we also do wage and hour for the other bargaining units. And there -- there's a couple of others that don't do that, as well.

If you recall, yesterday we had one contract -- or a couple -- one contract that extended out an extra year like this one does and goes to June 30rd, 2022, rather than June 30th, 2021, like most of the -- what I would call SEBAC bargaining unit wage hour contracts. They've always chosen to do that. I think the last contract went through the similar process, went through an interest arbitration, received an award.

That is how we've always done the wage hour, again, a bit independently of the pension and healthcare. But they are tied to the pension and healthcare negotiations that occurred in '17, and will occur -- and -- and technically won't be opened
up again until 2027. Although, I think we all expect and understand that those pension and healthcare pieces will be opened up, likely, in 2021 when all the other wage hour get reopened.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And do I understand then, that in the three years preceding '20 and '21, the next two that are facing us, when quite a number of raises and annual increments have been negotiated, during those three years preceding, all of the units we've discussed so far and -- and I think intend to discuss a bit later, there were zero annual increments in '17, '18, and '19, either general wage increases or annual increments. Is that correct?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
That is correct and just to anticipate I think where the Representative is going and -- and probably complete the question she asked me previously, so yes, those SEBAC -- what we call SEBAC architecture wage and hour contracts did have hard zeros, no wage increase, no annual increment in '16, '17, and '18, and of course of the $2 thousand dollar additional payment in '19. So, there were hard zeros.

And to anticipate the next question, no, the state police did not do that, and were not bound by those hard zeros, because their contract was independently negotiated and went through interest arbitration. So, they did not -- they were not part of those givebacks on wage and hour. I will note and, well, I'm sure we'll talk about this, the arbitrator considered that fact when making his award with respect to the terms of this contract including giving the state a number of provisions, including eliminating longevity entirely for the state police, which I believe is not the case in any
other contract. They don't have longevity at all, period, gone, goodbye after this arbitration. And one of the reasons the arbitrator sited, was precisely this issue that the Representative is bringing up, because the state police were not part of the hard zeros that the other bargaining units gave in the last three -- three years.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. And so, I'd like to ask the Representative what the increases, both general wage and annual increment? Let's start with general wage increases, the state police got in '16, '17, and '18, each year.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
Through you, I believe the last award that was two and a quarter or two and a half percent, I can't remember off the top of head. I'll defer to the Representative if he's got the actual numbers. But they did get GWI and step increases in those three years for a total of somewhere in the five to six percent range, I believe.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Well, if I answer my own question, which wasn't what I intended to do, I have for 2016 two plus -- let's see, there was a two percent salary increase. There was a one percent salary increase in the following year -- no, sorry that goes up to three. I've got a two and then a three and then a one. Is that accurate? That was a question, Mr. Speaker. Is that accurate?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.
REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that it was a -- it was a mean increase of around two percent so she's -- she's doing math on me again, Mr. Speaker. She promised she wouldn't do that yesterday, but --

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

I did not.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

But yes, over the three years, I -- that was my understanding is that we were average a GWI of around -- around two and I believe a -- an annual increment around -- around three. Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

And what about annual increments in those years, Mr. Speaker?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
Again, my understanding was the average was around the three, three and a half range. But if she's got the specific numbers I'll defer to -- again her math. Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Back to you, Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

That'll do for me. So, that was -- so our understanding basically is we're -- we're looking at around five and a half to six guaranteed increases for the state police in '16, '17, and '18, while the other units we discussed were getting what is referred to in this room as three years of hard zeros. Okay.

Now, in going forward this is just to get the details right, in fiscal '19, lump sum payment is a substitute for the increment. This is similar to the others, was $2 thousand dollars. Is that correct?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.
REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. For the other state employee units, yes, we've got the $2 thousand dollar lump sum payment. The -- the state police contract going forward for '19 is a straight GWI step formula, which we can talk about. It's a -- I think it's a soft zero on -- it's a zero on GWI and plus step in '19. But there's no, what's been euphoniously called the bonus payment in '19 for the state police.

And just -- just to sort of put a bow on the discussion with respect to '16, '17, '18, and '19, again as I mentioned in my introductory remarks, yes, they received the GWI in step. But remember, there was also a reduction in force of somewhere in the neighborhood of 300 troopers. So, there was actually a net -- even though there was a salary increase, there was a net savings in salary and benefits to the state of $36 million dollars in that time frame under the state police contract. But with respect to --
REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

I will get to that.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

-- '19 -- with respect to '19, my understanding is it's a -- it's a zero on GWI plus step under this arbitration award.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

And I believe it was -- that was awarded retroactively for '19, the step award, because we're only doing the -- we're only doing the arbitration award now. Is that correct?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That -- that's correct. So, when you look at the way the payments are breakin' -- broken out, again, we talked about the steps, how they're done twice a year.
There's -- there's about $464 thousand dollars paid retroactive for this year. And then, that's made up in -- in the next half of the following fiscal year with another payment for about $929 thousand dollars in fiscal year '20. So, that -- that is correct. Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. And then as we look at fiscal year '20, the general wage increase is?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Two percent.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

And the annual increment, on average or median?

Through you.
ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Again, that's going to vary and there's a little -- I don't to aggress too much, there's a little wrinkle in this contract in, they've moved from a step system, to what's called a years of service system. It's functionally the same thing, but instead of being a step three, they're noted at year of service, you know, ten or -- or nine or whatever that is.

So, the increment is going to vary depending where the various members are in their years of service. And obviously, there's a range there. But the expectation is that, again, that -- that annual increment or -- or now, year of service, is gonna float around that two and a half to 3.25 range. Again, factoring where everybody is, remember we've got -- we should have some new classes coming in. So, there's a -- there's a lower impact to that, and then, a bit more in the out years. But you can --
you can assume around a three percent range for the annual increment.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. And so, in fiscal '21, it would be the same thing? A general wage increase -- well, actually the general wage increase is 2.25 that year. Is that correct?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That -- that is correct. And again, I want to -- I want to -- again, in context here, these are -- this is an arbitrated award. So, the state sought to pay less. The state did seek the hard zeros for those earlier years. The union wanted more and the -- this is what the arbitrator arrived at for the various years
the zero, the 2, '21 2.5, '22 2.5 for the general wage increases.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. And the annual increment for '21 is, again -- would be similar to '20, about three percent, give or take; correct?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

That is correct. Mr. Speaker, through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. And then the general wage increase for '21? Sorry for '22? Forgive me. The general wage increase for '22, is how much?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
Through you, Mr. Speaker, '21 and '22 are identical, the two and a quarter plus the year of service step, if you -- if you earn that through -- I should -- I should note just as a foot note there, you don't automatically advance like any of the other bargaining units. You have to receive the satisfactory ratings. You have to be evaluated correctly. You can be held back if you -- if you are unsatisfactory. But assuming that that happens for both years '21 and '22, it's two and a quarter GWI plus a -- a year of service increase of around three.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

   Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

   Thank you. And then, I notice also that there is a -- a -- a guaranteed annual increment provided for in fiscal '23. Is that correct? And if so, how much is it?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

   Representative D'Agostino.
REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. This -- this contract expires June 30th, 2022. So, there is no guarantee for fiscal year '23.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Oh, actually that's my mistake. That's the way that the -- that's where -- the -- the fiscal note has columns that are structured differently than they are in the other fiscal note. So, pardon me. That's my mistake. Okay. So, also, there is a stipend for -- well, it's not a stipend, actually -- there is a new term in this contract which involves paying the individuals for their half-hour meal break. Is that correct? And how is that calculated?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. So, yes. That is correct. This is new. This has been the subject of a long-running dispute between the bargaining unit and the state for a long time. The troopers' argument, and it's a very rational one, is they are really always on duty. They have to eat their lunch wherever it is that they are assigned, be that in the patrol car or at a facility, if they're assigned to a facility. They have to have the radio on, all their gear on, be able to respond at a moment's notice.

And so, their argument was, hey, we're -- we're always on. We should be paid for that limited mealtime. And, in fact, they actually have previously filed a federal lawsuit under federal fair labor laws arguing that they were entitled to that mealtime not only going forward but retroactively for arguably 30 years. A win on that type of lawsuit would be [laughter] significant. Going forward, that cost, it's been awarded going forward only, is estimated around $4 to $4.3 million
dollars, depending on the year and staffing levels.
So, it's -- it -- it carries a cost going forward, but it is not retroactive. And as part of the -- this award, the union has told the administration and told everybody that they will be withdrawing their lawsuit.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, we're -- we're -- I -- I see in my -- just in my OFA numbers, that it -- it does begin around $4 million dollars and as the years pass, it goes up to about $4.5-$4.6 million dollars a year, and I believe, is equivalent to something like 16 days of work when you add up all the days of lunch, in terms of salary.

So, what about overtime? I know that the -- some of the provisions of overtime are just there and may not have been part of the award. But how is overtime calculated? What is the rate for it? And
how is treated in terms of overtime calculations for the state police?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So, there -- there's a number of elements to -- to overtime. First, I think everybody should be aware this has been an issue obviously with respect to pensions for a long time. And remember now that all new hires since post 2017, there is no more spiking of overtime. We -- and this is not just for the state police but it's for everybody. When you retire it -- it's a smoothed out of your salary and overtime over your 20, 25-year career, so you can't work the last three years and -- and spike.

And even before the new hirers, in 2017, the last contract with the state police changed that calculation as well. So, I think there's a smoothing out, if I recall, of I think five years
for the -- for the overtime, for the state police as well. So, that's an issue that -- that we've tried to address on the pension side.

On the day-to-day operation side, look there -- there have been some significant overtime costs in the last few years on the state police side. That is -- that goes hand in glove with the fact that there has been this significant reduction in head count in the last three years. And net the savings in salary and benefits exceeds the overtime. That said, you want to try to get a handle on overtime. And what -- there -- there are provisions -- it's not part of the -- as part of the award because the parties agreed. The parties agreed to a -- a process and there are -- there are extensive processes with respect to the state police on approving overtime, and types of overtime which is different than other bargaining units.

There's some overtime that they can work, like if they're at the troop barracks and they're assigned that counts towards their pension. There's
other overtime, special duty -- or excuse me, some highway overtime for private vendors or other types of work that does not count for the pension. And so, the -- the troopers put in for overtime. It goes through a system, there's a hierarchy. There -- there's some -- there's -- it's obviously randomized so it's not just the higher paid folks are gonna get overtime. They've also tried to eliminate, in the last few years, and -- and this is part of the TA, the -- the Tentative Agreement here, trading of overtime. So, you don't have people trading out to somebody who maybe wants to try to get more overtime because they're planning on retiring.

So, both the state and the union leadership are very well aware of those issues and cognizant of them and have actually embedded in this agreement different structures to try to address the overtime issue. And, again, as I mentioned, both as it affects pension and as it affects day-to-day operational costs.
ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. In addition, I know there are various stipends, I think there are about 74 employees who receive hazardous duty stipend. There is, in the contract, a stipend for -- for example, equipment and protective shoes, certainly reasonable. I did not see it in this contract. Although, I remember discussing it for years -- four years when we last discussed one of these in appropriations, that there was a stipend for officers who took working dogs home with them at night and had to care for the dogs, also totally worthy certainly for the dogs. And I understand that at the time that those stipends were all counted as part of salary for purposes of calculating retirement. Is that still true?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.
REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you. Yes. If you receive a stipend because of the particular unit you're in for hazardous duty, and again there's a -- there's a difference in the contract in hazardous duty. This -- this award added the major crimes unit as hazardous duty. The state police actually wanted all of their members to receive the stipend, because they argue, they're really all subject to hazardous duty [laughter] and there's -- there's some merit to that argument. But the arbitrator disagreed and awarded it only for major crimes. So, major crimes and then, as the Representative mentioned, any of the prior units that have been designated for receiving a stipend because of their particular duties, that counts as your salary, it does count towards your pension. It's, I think, $100 dollars a month.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.
REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, those -- those are expenses for straight-out expenses that count toward retirement. And then, do the -- does the payment that they are now going to receive for their meal periods, also count towards salary for retirement purposes? Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, it does.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. Does everybody get the same -- do they get the same rate on the meal period coverage. Or is that -- done as a percentage of salary?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is everyone gets the same.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. All right. I think that -- yes, one more question, the trainees, who are going to be very important in the coming years in -- in the efforts to fully staff the troopers, the trainee rate is going up to $50 thousand dollars. What's it coming up from?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think it's around $44 thousand dollars, if I'm not mistaken, for the trainee rate. And again, remember, you are -- you are a trainee for 18 months. And in that period, you can be dismissed without cause at any point in time. That was another part of this award, as well.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

And how many trainees are we expecting in 2020 and '21?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you. I believe we're expecting two classes of 40. Now, whether everybody makes it through that is another question. And just as a little asterisks to this, my understanding is about 400 troopers are going to be eligible for retirement in '21. Think about that for a second. If they all leave, that -- that -- that will be a severe problem for the state of Connecticut [laughter] if that many go. Now, I have no idea if that many will go. But it's a significant number that are -- are eligible. So, they're trying to manage the class sizes going
forward with potential retirements in mind and keep employment set at level. But that's my understanding, over the next two years with the respect to the classes.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I -- yeah, I -- I am aware of the -- that imbalance. And I think the 40 is the number of troopers they think they might keep if they train 80, you know, some of them always don't make it or decide they don't want to do it.

I wondered -- I wanted to ask a question as well, about something that we talked about a great deal with the Department of Corrections in the Appropriations Sub-Committee. The Department of Corrections, as -- as you know, has also people who are exposed to hazardous situations every day of their lives. And they are increasingly concerned in the Department of Corrections that they are going to
lose people to the state police because of the overtime and retirement terms, which they do not get currently in the Department of Corrections. Is Representative familiar with that?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):
Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That issue, I -- I -- when I -- when I've heard about the issue, I also should have coupled it with the fact the state police are also losing members to -- like for example, a starting trooper is making around $50 thousand dollars, can make almost double that in a year or two working for Yale, for their private police force. So, the state troopers are also losing people to other forces, as well. It's sort of a cascading effect. But yes, I had heard that on -- with respect to -- to DOC. Obviously, two separate bargaining units there.
Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Well, I think that the state police are in sort of a special situation, in that they have a lot of openings. So, if -- if people are looking to better their circumstances, it's a -- it's a good place to go. I want to thank the Representative for his answers. I'm -- I'm going to just make some remarks, which are very -- they're very considered remarks and I think important considering the circumstances that we are facing at the moment at this time and this moment in this session.

One of the things, and I think everyone has seen at some point or other, the fiscal note on this contract, which for the coming couple of years, 2021, and the spillover in '19 for some retroactive payments and also the fact that the contract goes to 2022, for that period, the total incremental cost of this contract to the state is $50 million dollars,
5-0, $50 million dollars.

The five contracts that we did yesterday, their incremental cost to us over that period, some of it was 2022, some wasn't, was $12 million dollars. And as I said, there were more contracts before that and more contracts to come, $50 million dollars at a time when we have not yet produced a state budget. We don't know what will be in the state budget. We don't know how much it will spend. We don't know how much revenue there is to pay for it or where it is coming from. We have been told that this money is all set, it's covered, it's in the Reserve For Salaries Account, the RSA. Sure it is. But that money is still money. I don't care where it is or what you call it. It's still money. It's $50 million dollars.

So, a few things to consider here. One, the contract is written for or the -- the Arbitration Award, my mistake, the Arbitration Award is being granted in the context of people who have not made the same three-year concession, that the other
people made for whom we've been voting on their contracts. So, yes, the terms in a couple of cases may be slightly lower here. But again, time value of money. They were getting six, seven, eight percent cumulative raise over those three years preceding the period of this contract.

The second thing, the annualized cost to us, in other words, if the level of troopers, if the number of employees stays even, if it does not increase, which we hope it will, if it stays at 931 after 2022, and if nothing else happens, and there are no other negotiations, our annual cost following this Arbitration Award will be $23 million dollars a year in addition to what we already spend. And that is, don't forget, I use this word a lot, that is, forever. It doesn't go away. The raises don't go away. The stipends, which I have no argument with but being -- being considered as part of retirement, they do not go away.

The -- it's also -- I -- I -- I don't have anything to say one way or the other about is there
an argument for giving -- for paying the half hour of mealtime. That's -- that's a policy decision. But I think it's important to realize that that between $4 million dollars and $4.5 million dollars a year amounts to six percent salary increases for every individual. Six percent in addition, to the two and 2.5 that they're getting every year. And again, unless someone tells us otherwise, it is forever.

Under the circumstances that we are facing with no budget today unless everybody in this room knows something I don't know, and I think that's not the case, no budget today, deficits that are projected to be over $2 -- $2 billion dollars for the -- for the biennium, pension obligations over $80 billion dollars, we're going to take $50 million dollars, and say, okay, the needs of the entire population of Connecticut are being put in second place as we look for one population, which is far, far smaller.

Do they serve an essential, very important, and very hazardous function to serve the people of
Connecticut? Absolutely, they do. I wouldn't deny that for a second, and I am very grateful for it. This has nothing to do with who we're talking about with what they do, with what the other people who also serve this state, some of them in a hazardous context, some not, it has nothing to do with what they do.

It has nothing to do with the people that Representative D'Agostino and I talked about in previous conversations who bring revenue into the state. The argument for them was, they bring in so much money, they deserve all this. It has nothing to do with who deserves what. It's about the way we're running our finances. And if we continue to do this, which unfortunately we have over the past almost decade that I've been here, they aren't going to be any services to run. And frankly, there's just going to be a whole lot of people to serve who can't get any service.

So, I ask you again to consider, this has nothing to do with the state police for whom I have
the greatest respect and highest level of gratitude. It has nothing to do with the other people who have also received Arbitration Awards or generous contracts. It has to do with the state's ability to afford it. And by the state, I mean everyone who lives here who funds the state with their taxes and their fees. There is only just so much money, it doesn't grow on trees. And we can't keep reaching because it's finite.

One more thing, I do believe that this is an inditement of the system of binding arbitration that we adhere to in this state. Not binding arbitration in itself, but last best offer arbitration. I think in this case the arbitrator did a pretty good job. But again, in last best offer arbitration, you have each side that can submit one -- when they can't agree, one proposition. And the arbitrator must decide between those two. The arbitrator can't say well, you know, actually they got a good argument here, I think they need something, but not this much. The arbitrator can't do that. They have to
decide between one and the other.

    Does it take a -- does it maybe shorten the timeframe for arbitration? Maybe. But does it leave room for flexibility? Absolutely not. So, in consideration of all those things, and the very heavy burden that this award will place not only on the state for the next three years but on the state forever. Regardless of the immanent respect I feel for the state police, I cannot bring myself to support this contract. And I would urge others to reject it as well. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

    Thank you very much, Representative.

Representative O'Dea of the 125th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ODEA (125TH):

    Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just a few comments, if I may. I'm not going to have any questions for the good proponent. You know, back in my other life, I represented the state police in a
number of lawsuits, defending them in excessive force, false arrest cases. And I always told my clients, who were state troopers, that I respected immensely, in my next life I'd like to come back as state trooper or fighter pilot. But I'm probably too tall for the fighter pilot.

But in any event, you know, I've said before in Chamber that, you know, deserves got nothin' to do with it. I quoted Will Money -- Mooney at -- in the -- the movie, that Client Eastwood played Unforgiven, you know, deserves got nothin' to do with these votes.

The state troopers, nobody deserves a raise more than the state troopers. They put their life on the line every day, and there's nobody here that doesn't respect them for all they do for us. They save lives daily. And I can't tell you how much I respect every trooper that's out there. And I'd love to vote for this Bill. But we don't have the money.

We're going to have to find money for those
with special needs. We need to find money for those who need housing. We need to find money for so many people that are in such dire straits. And our economy is spinning down the toilet, unfortunately. And the only way we can -- we're going to be able to get out of this mess is if we tighten our belts, cut spending, and increase our job growth. And unfortunately, this session, in my mind, has become the anti-business session with all the Bills we're passing that's going to hurt small business.

So, in looking at this contract, I know we all want to vote for this. No one more than I, for the state troopers who deserve all the money we're proposing to give them. We just can't afford it.

So, to the extent that my friends -- I have a number of friends who are current troopers and former troopers, and they're gonna watch this and they're gonna say, Tom why did you vote against it? And I'm gonna tell 'em I voted against it, because we can't afford it. Not because I didn't want to give it to you or vote -- vote for it. You deserve
it. You've earned it. We just can't afford it.

So, while I appreciate the good proponent's comments and why they earned it or need this money, we just can't afford it. So, I would urge my colleagues not to vote for this Resolution. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further? Representative McGee of the 5th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. McGEE (5TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I rise -- I have a few question -- well actually one question for the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. McGEE (5TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. If the kind gentleman who's doing an outstanding job explaining this contract, I think often times I sit and kind of glaze over it because it's so -- so many details.
But if he could be so kind just to explain to me the new FOI, Freedom of Information exemption, and just clarify that piece of this Bill for me, please.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate the question. It's good to -- to just sort of get this issue out there, because I know it was a subject of some discussion. This is an agreed upon term between the state and the union. It was not arbitrated. They both -- it went into arbitration but they both agreed. So, as part of the agreement, in -- in my mind it's just clarifying language.

Currently, right now, if there is a complaint against an officer, a citizen's complaint or any other kind of complaint from internally, it must be investigated by the Internal Affairs Unit. And if that complaint, and many times those complaints are unsubstantiated, people, they look into it and it
turns out maybe there was some sort of, you know, vendetta or whatever it is, but there's -- there's no action taken and the complaint is deemed unsubstantiated.

Currently, under this contract, that result is not put into the personnel file. Nevertheless, there's still a record of this investigation out there. So, all this language does it says that in no way is an unsubstantiated complaint, and the fact that you've been vindicated, subject to FOA. And -- and the contract then by virtue of us adopting it and through the supersedence clause is that amends our FOA statutes with respect to this particular bargaining unit. That happens all the time.

And this has happened previously in another contract on much more extensive terms, that I won't get into here. But with respect to this, it's really a continuation of already existing concept, which is if somebody makes a complaint against you -- you embezzled funds, you abused someone, etcetera and -- and again, they have to investigate
all of that. And if it's unsubstantiated, it's not in the personnel file and it's not subject to FOA. And all this does is clarify that -- that result, that complaint is not subject to FOA.

It -- it really, if you think about it, it's -- it's sort of a continuation of a bedrock principle that you're innocent until proven guilty, no matter who you are, whether you're a state trooper or not. And that really is the -- the -- that's -- that's what this language does with respect to FOA.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative McGee.

REP. McGEE (5TH):

Thank you so much for that clarification. And I'll just end on just a comment. I really appreciate the kind gentleman alongside the state police union and others to work with the black and Puerto Rican caucus on this issue -- or not issue, but just really clarifying for us the importance of this piece of -- of the Resolution. So, thank you
so much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

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

REP. NOLAN (39TH):

Thank you. And through you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to thank the component of the Bill for bringing this Bill forward. And I also thank the good fellow, Mr. McGee, because that's the comment that I had a concern in regards.

But I want to talk a little bit about how great the state police do with the things that they go through on the roads that we are supposed to take care of. I want to take my hat off to them. Because I am in support of this Bill. And I stand here to publicly say that I appreciate all the work that the troopers are out there doing. And I heard a lot of discussion about the word forever and about words that we support and that we would support them if.
Well, this money that we're talking about is in a reserved fund. So, I just want clarity on that. It's not new money. It's money that has been put away. And I understand the longevity aspect of this. But this money is there. And it's available. So, I just would like people to have that clarity, understanding that longevity. But I do believe that our troopers deserve every bit of this. So, once again, thank you for those who put this Bill together.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

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

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And Mr. Speaker, I do rise in opposition of this contract like all the other ones. And again, this is not an issue about our state workers. But it's an issue about the overall impact of the entire budget.

You know, I know now one of the issues that
we've been grappling with is the teacher pension and the state pension as to how we are going to fulfill those unfunded liabilities. I think there's a $3.5 billion dollar balloon payment that is coming up for our teachers' retirement. And the proposals that we've seen is essentially restructuring it to kick off those payments into the future and costing the state of Connecticut even more money in the long run and costing our taxpayers more money in the long run.

And overall, in the big picture of things, we continue to hear we need to correct the bad decisions from 40 years ago. Well, ten years ago when I stood here, people used to say, we need to correct the bad decisions from 30 years ago. And so, to me this is just another contract that we're justifying in our head that somehow it's paid for.

And maybe there's a line item in a budget that's going to be coming out next week that funds it for two years. But we have no plan in place to fund the next 40. And I think we -- we owe it to
our children and -- and our grandchildren to make sure that we have long-term sustainability in the state of Connecticut. And unfortunately, this contract doesn't do it.

So, I am sorry to have to stand up and vote against it. Certainly, we all support our state police officers. But Connecticut is really just headed for more bad times. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

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

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Good to see you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. YACCARINO (87TH):

This is probably one of the hardest votes I'm ever going to have to take. I have such great respect for our men and women, our state police, and our law enforcement and first responders that
protect us. And I -- I think they do deserve, you know, raises and more money and more -- we need more troopers. The fact is, we don't even have a budget yet. So, without a budget, even though there's -- there's -- we have money in reserve, do we really have that money in reserve, when we have the teachers' pensions we're now funding and we have so many people who are homeless and so many people that are not working. So, I listened to the debate and I looked at the numbers and I -- it just -- it pains me.

So, I just have to say, I have the greatest deal of respect for our state troopers, our law enforcement, what they do for us, how they protect us 24/7. I've done ride-a-longs with local police and I've never seen anything like it. It's -- it's a tough job. I don't think I could do it. So, if we had a budget, I could support this. We don't even have a budget yet. So, I think it's a little irresponsible. That's all I had to say.

And I want thank the good proponent and the --
the work that both sides do. But the fact is, we do not have a budget yet. And it's hard to vote on something when you don't have the actual funds, for sure. So, thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Case, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions to you, to the proponent, on the RSA account.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So, we talk about an RSA account. We do have dollars in the RSA account for this contract for this year. After these contracts are done, unless we replenish that with money from a budget, do we have other money in that RSA account?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):
Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, is the short answer. So, the -- the way the RSA obviously works is, it does carry over. So, there's about $71-$72 million dollars in -- right now, not including the amounts for this contract year for this contract, which I think is a couple million dollars or -- or less. That carries over to the next fiscal year. And the budgets that have been proposed add in further dollars in fiscal year '20, another $18 million dollars in fiscal year '20, another $23 million dollars in fiscal year '21.

And so, that reserve salary account is constantly being replenished. We do that in every buy-in. It's obviously a responsible thing to do, because we know we may have issues like this coming up. And so, there is -- there is enough money in that account to cover all the contracts that we've done and when you carry forward that money and include the replenishment, there's -- there's more
than enough for this contract, again on an incremental basis for each of the coming fiscal years, as well as the other contracts that we voted on. And -- and -- and there's still tens of millions left for other contracts as we go forward. And that's responsible budgeting. We do that every year.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

So, through you, Mr. Speaker, the RSA account is basically established to help us with the first year of new contracts. We have about four more contracts that'll will be coming to Appropriations. Once that RSA account has funded that contract, that line item within -- within that contract goes into the budget. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.
REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So, the funds, yes. The funds from the RSA account are -- the RSA is in the budget. And then the funds are transferred to the particular line item, particular department where that is necessary to -- to pay it. I should note just as a little aside, the judiciary contracts we talked about yesterday were already prefunded. They were not part of RSA. So again, the RSA, when that money is transferred to deal with the particular budgetary needs for a particular bargain unit agreement or in this case an award, that's how the money then moves forward.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, for clarification once again, when we have a budget two years from now, these contract increases will be in the line item of the particular contracts or the particular
agencies that they're in, those monies won't come out of an RSA, they will come out of the agency's budget. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to clarify that because I believe I heard that the RSA will cover this -- these contracts going forward. In the -- it is correct through the good Representative that it is good budgeting that we have dollars set aside for new contracts. But we have to remember, we're budgeting for years out and we're fixing departments' budgets with these increases.

So, let's say, for example, the $50 million dollar increase, I believe so far this year we're up
over the $100 million dollar range in increases. Those are fixed costs within those agencies. Those costs don't come out of the RSA. And I -- I do agree, once again, that you know, the RSA is to help when these contracts come up. But we have to remember, these are fixed costs in the agencies' budgets. These ongoing costs do not come out of the RSA.

So, through you, Mr. Speaker, just a few comments, I don't have any other questions for the good Representative. We all support and we all work very graciously with the state police. They do a wonderful job. As many people said, we have a lot of things to fund in the state of Connecticut. We don't have an RSA account for the DSS contracts where there's a strike pending June 3rd; I believe negotiations start -- or there's another meeting tonight on that. That's going to cost us $10 million dollars -- up to $10 million dollars a day if that strike starts. But we don't have an RSA or reserve account for that.
We have to watch our dollars in what we're doing. Every penny counts. I do believe that we don't know what is going to come out of negotiations of contracts and that is why the RSA account is put there. We need to remember that the RSA account will take care of that contract for the first year and after that is a fixed cost within that agency. So, we just grew the budget by $100 million dollars over these contracts in the past few weeks.

With that, Mr. Speaker, until we start supporting and giving something across the board to everybody, especially with this strike pending with the state of Connecticut and DSS with the nursing homes and the two thousand people on a waiting list for IDD, they don't have an RSA account we can pull the money out of. So, with that, I cannot support this. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further? Representative Klarides, you have the floor, Madam.
REP. KLARIDES (114TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I don't know if I can say that this is the most difficult vote I'll ever have to take, but it's certainly up there. You heard me stand up a few weeks ago and we were talking about Department of Revenue Services attorneys. And on that same day, most of us were upstairs at an intellectually and developmentally disabled breakfast. And there were Republicans and Democrats, House and Senate members, and we all stood there and pledged our undying support for those parents and those kids. Those kids that are minors and those kids that are adults, which most of those parents are in that circumstance, caring for children who can't care for themselves who are now adults themselves. And you heard me talk about how we could give 20 percent increases to attorneys in revenue services, when those parents struggle every day. When those parents worry every day about how their children are going to be taken care of when they pass on.
And I bring that up today because we are voting on contract after contract, and they're all different subject matters. Today it's the state police. There were DRS attorneys. There's judicial branch employees, etcetera. And I don't think that one of us thinks that they all don't have a valid job and don't do a good job and take their job seriously. And we thank them for the job they do. But I think we all probably look at this particular contract in a different way.

We all know that whether it's our municipal police or state police, those are the people that protect us. We all know that they have jobs that, quite frankly, I would never be able to do, although I feel like my life is at risk here on a daily basis, but that's more psychological. But very seriously, I could never do that job. I have law enforcement in my family and I have the highest regard for the job he does and every other person that does that job.

But I feel like we shouldn't be in this
position right now. And by that, I mean this. My colleague mentioned earlier that ten years ago when he first got here we talked about we can't continue the mistakes we made in the past 30 years. And now, it is we can't continue the mistakes we've made for the past 40 years. And I promise you, ten years from now, it's going to be the mistakes we've made in the past 50 years. Because although, I believe we are doing what we believe is right, we continue to make the same mistakes. And by mistakes, I mean past legislation, negotiate contracts, talk about concepts and ideas and programs that we simply cannot afford.

I want nothing more than to vote for this contract today. I have to be honest with you, that I've struggled with it for several days. I support our -- my local troop. I've been there. I've done drive-a-longs. I do nothing but have the highest regard for what they do. But this contract is just not sustainable. It isn't. Just like the ones yesterday weren't. Just like the ones last week
weren't. And if we start picking and choosing winners and losers, no matter how important I think this is, then where are we? Where are we? We're still making wrong decisions.

You've heard us talk a lot about prioritizing. We're facing a multibillion dollar deficit in this state, multibillion dollars. What should be happening today is we should be able to support this contract because we all believe that law enforcement does things differently. That they fulfill a different role. That they protect us. I want to vote for this. I didn't want to vote for 20 percent wage increase for DRS attorneys. And I apologize to any DRS attorneys, because I keep targeting you, but that's the one that sticks out in my mind. When those contracts are negotiated, like you do in your home, you have a pot of money and you have to figure out where that pot of money goes. What is your most important thing you can do with that money?

I believe that a priority of that pot of money is law enforcement. I believe that. But this state
has taken that choice away from us. You have taken the ability to prioritize by just giving everybody exorbitant raises, raises that do not happen in the private sector, and now, put us in a position we can't prioritize. We cannot prioritize the people that protect us. It makes me sad. I spend many days in this building angry. Today, I'm angry and sad.

If we figured out what we believed was important, instead of giving everybody as much as they ask for, we'd all be able to vote for this contract today and feel good about it -- and feel good about it.

But the things that are going on in this building this year are beyond my comprehension. We're saying people need to have a greater minimum wage because they can't live. Okay. So, we do that. And then, in the next breathe, we're taking money out of their payroll checks with FMLA, something they may never use. I don't know how people live in this state. I don't know how people
can afford to stay here. You see people leave every day.

If we do not start prioritizing the things we believe are important, like law enforcement, this state is never going to change. That number is going to go from 40 to 50 to 60 years. And then there's going to be no turning back.

Those kids that don't have anybody to take care of them when their parents pass because they can't take care of themselves. Law enforcement, who protects us every day, quite frankly they are losing respect every day and I don't think being treated very nicely. Those are the people we have to protect in this state. But you have taken that choice away from us by the contracts you negotiate. And I think it's a horrible thing. And unfortunately, I cannot support it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam. Would you care to remark further? Representative Ritter, you have the floor
REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I would urge the Chamber to support this contract. I want to thank the men and women of the Connecticut State Police Union for their work and their service. And one way to demonstrate that, is to support a fair contract for them and their families. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further? Would 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? 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 Resolution 33.

    Total number voting                      135
    Necessary for Passage                     68
    Those voting Yea                          90
    Those voting Nay                         45
    Those absent and not voting               16

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

    Resolution is adopted. [Gavel] Are there any announcements or introductions? Any announcements or introductions? Representative Currey. We are purposely [inaudible - 01:38:25].

REP. CURREY (11TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Democrats will be caucusing immediately after the next matter. And
with that, I move that we -- for suspicion of the rules for the immediate consideration of Senate Joint Resolution 36.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Hearing no objection, so ordered. Will the -- will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 636?

CLERK:

Page 1, Calendar 636, Senate Resolution No. 36, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATING OF MARISSA PASLICK GILLETT OF WEST HARTFORD TO BE A UTILITY COMMISSIONER OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY. Favorable Report of the Joint Committee Standing Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Vargas, you have the floor, sir.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

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 Vargas.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a Resolution -- a Senate Resolution jointly done with us in the House that confirms Ms. Marissa Paslick Gillett to be a Commissioner in the Public Utilities Regulatory Authority. This is a full-time, salaried position, and this is her initial appointment. Ms. Paslick is relatively new to the state of Connecticut, but she has extensive experience in the energy field. She was approved by the Committee. There was one -- one-no vote cast by Senator Fasano, but he made it clear that his opposition was more superior as an agency than to Ms. Gillett.

She went to school at Clemson University where she obtained a Bachelor's in Science in Bioengineering with Honors. And she obtained a Juris Doctor degree with Honors at the University of
Baltimore Law School.

She spent her career working in the field of regulation related to energy and environmental issues. She spent many years at the Maryland Public Service Commission as an energy policy analyst, a Commission Advisor and a Senior Advisor to the Chairman. Her most recent position with -- was at Energy Storage Association in Washington D.C. as Vice-President of External Relations.

So, although she is new to Connecticut, she is familiar with Connecticut's energy landscape, worked with the -- with Connecticut Energy Policy leaders, and with regional program reviews. So, I urge my colleagues to adopt the Resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further on the Resolution before us? Representative Perillo, you have the floor, sir.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker and thank you very
much for the opportunity. I rise to join the
gentleman in supporting this nomination. The
nominee has extensive experience in the energy world
as a regulator and I think she'll be an excellent
fit.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

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

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I rise
also in support of this nominee. Marissa has met
with our Committee, the Energy and Technology
Committee. She's extremely knowledgeable in the
area. She brings with her a tremendous amount of
experience from the state of Maryland. And I urge
my colleagues to support. Thank you very much, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark
further on the Resolution? Representative Arconti,
you have the floor, sir. Representative has some
issues there. Representative Arconti.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. -- Mr. Speaker, I also rise in strong support of this nomination. As Representative Ferraro mentioned, we had the chance to meet with the -- Marissa a few weeks ago and she has a wealth of knowledge that is going to serve the state of Connecticut and all our energy needs very well for the next few years. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further on the Resolution before us? Would you care to remark further on the Resolution 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, nay. The ayes have it. [Gavel] The Resolution is adopted. Representative
Candelora, for what purpose do you rise?

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purpose of announcement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. CANDELORA (86TH):

Upon recess, Republicans will be caucusing downstairs. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker, before we go into recess and caucus, we mentioned it was Representative Exum's birthday. It is also Deputy Speaker from Waterbury, Larry Butler's birthday. Happy birthday, Larry. [Applause] Larry is normally one who likes to stay late, but tonight I'm not so sure that will be the case. We'll find out. So, I move that we go into recess, subject to the call of the Chair. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

There are no objections, the House end in recess. [Gravel]

(On motion of Representative Ritter of the 1st District, the House recessed at 12:43 o'clock p.m., to meet again at the Call of the Chair.)

(The House of Representatives was called to order at 1:50 o'clock p.m., Deputy Speaker Juan Candelaria in the Chair.)

CLERK:

Immediately members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives will reconvene immediately. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Chamber will come back to order. [Gavel] Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Ackert, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of introductions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm here with my lovely family. I -- I -- this is my daughter, Taylor, and I think of my daughter, Taylor, as a thread in the fabric of Connecticut. My daughter was born in Middletown, grew up in Coventry with us or she's from -- got a little piece of Middletown, a little piece of Coventry, went to Eastern Connecticut State University where she graduated Cum Laude and with Education and Mathematics honors. Then she went to UConn and got her Master's at UConn. And she's a 11th year teacher in the city of New Haven Board of Education.

So -- and she's here with, you know, what I would call my two angels in life, Fiona May, who's her fifth year being here, came about the same time that Nathan James is being here so. And he's got
something to say about what's going on around here, I see. [Laughter] It got somethin' to do with, like I'm hungry, let's eat. But thank you and for -- if you could welcome -- welcome. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you and welcome to your house.

Representative Betts, you have the floor, sir.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Here we go. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And it's my pleasure, on behalf of Representative Pavalock-D'Amato, and I don't see him but Representative Ziogas, to introduce to the Chamber a very special group of young ladies who are here from Bristol, Bristol Youth Services. If you'd like to just all stand up for a second. I'm not going to introduce you by name, but they are here, in part of a program called Girls with Power. And I have met with them a couple of times. And they are very special. They do have a lot of power. They're here with Aly and Maria. And they've been taking a tour of the Capital. And I would ask the Chamber to
please give them a nice warm welcome.  [Applause]
Thanks very much, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir, and welcome ladies. Welcome, Girls with Power. [laughter] Any other announcements or introductions? Representative MacLachlan you have the floor, sir.
REP. MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm very honored today. I have a guest from my District, the great town of Killingworth, Mr. Francesco Lulay.
Mr. Francesco Lulay here is a -- as an immigrant from Albanian, came to this country, has started multiple small businesses, started a beautiful family, moved to Killingworth, started one of the best restaurants in -- in the state of Connecticut, is running for the first -- First Selectman of the town of Killingworth. His story is truly the American dream. And I am so proud to have him here, my friend, Francesco. Please give him a -- a warm State House welcome. [Applause]
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Welcome, sir, and thank you for choosing our state. Are there other announcements or introductions? If not, we'll return to the call of the calendar. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 150?

CLERK:

On page 63, House Calendar 150, Substitute House Bill No. 7244, AN ACT CONCERNING THE PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR SERVICE MEMBERS AND VETERANS HAVING DISABILITY RATINGS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Planning and Development.

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 is for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Representative Borer, you have the floor, madam.

REP. BORER (115TH):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an Amendment, LCO 8070, and I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment, and that I be leave granted -- be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 8070, which would be designated House Amendment "A"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A" LCO No. 8070 offered by Representative Borer.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there any objections? Hearing none. Represent Borer, you have the floor.

REP. BORER (115TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Amendment simply does is remove the reference to Death Certificate to be consistent with other statutes. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before the Chamber is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark on the Amendment? Will you remark on the Amendment? Hearing none. Those -- those -- all those in favor of the Amendment, signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. [Gavel] Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Representative Borer.

REP. BORER (115TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, as you know, we have almost 200 thousand veterans throughout the state of Connecticut. Many of them
are disabled. They're disabled because they fought to allow us to do the very thing we do in this Chamber every single day, to speak freely and to help create legislation for the will of the people. Our -- our disabled citizens -- our disabled veterans have difficulty with their taxes and making payments on their home property taxes. So, what this Bill does, is it provides some relief to our disabled veterans and it provides an additional $500 dollar exception to veterans who are disabled of ten percent or greater.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Representative Vail, you have the floor, sir.

REP. VAIL (52ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a brief comment. I just want to thank the good Chairwoman of the Veteran's Affairs Committee for all the hard work she's done on this. And I will be supporting the Bill. Thank you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further on the Bill as amended? Would 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 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? Please check the board to ensure that your vote was 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 7244 as amended by House "A".

Total number Voting 140
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES May 23, 2019

Necessary for Passage 71
Those voting Yea 140
Those voting Nay 0
Those absent and not voting 11

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Bill as amended passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar 277?

CLERK:

On page 21, House Calendar 277, Substitute House Bill No. 7187, AN ACT CONCERNING REVOCATION OF A PUBLIC OFFICIAL'S PENSION OR A STATE OR MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEE'S PENSION. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Blumenthal you have the floor, sir.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

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 is for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Representative Blumenthal.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a very simple Bill with a very scary title. Under current law, the Attorney General's Office is required to notify the State's Attorney when a public official or a state or municipal employee is convicted of a crime related to those duties for the purpose of evaluating the revocation of that person's pension. Here's a problem with that situation, the State's Attorney is the person who knows that that person has been convicted. And the Attorney General is the one who's supposed to certify that they're eligible. What this Bill does is simply switch the notification. The State's Attorney will be the person or the office to notify the Attorney General that such an individual has been convicted of pleaded nolo contendere. And then, the Attorney General will certify whether they're eligible to
have their pension revoked or reduced as our law allows. So, a very simple Bill, good Bill, ought to pass. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

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

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Good afternoon.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Mr. Speaker, I also rise in support of the Bill before us, certainly for all the good reasons the good Vice-Chairman had indicated, and literally it is that simple. It is just changing the notification. It obviously makes sense to have the Prosecutor notify the Attorney General, because the Attorney General would not have known otherwise. So, to put the burden on the Attorney General to tell the Prosecutor something certainly makes no
sense. So, I rise in support of the proposal. And I also rise in support of, I don't think the title is so scary. I think individuals need to be responsible in their positions, and if they're not, they should be facing revocation of a pension. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Would you care to remark further on the Bill? Would you care to remark further on the Bill before us? If not, staff and guests, please come to --

UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER:

Representative Petit.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Oh, Representative Petit, you have the floor, sir.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. An issue came up before another committee, Energy and Technology, and my question, I guess is a topic that we -- we discussed energy and technology, and I wonder if
through you, Mr. Speaker, if the provisions of this
Bill, can apply to the Municipal Electrical Energy
Cooperatives, as well? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Blumenthal.

REP. BLUMENTHAL (147TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To the extent that
those cooperatives may be municipal employees,
public officials, or state officials or employees,
excuse me, otherwise eligible for this provision,
this would apply to them as well.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark
further? 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 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 7187.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number Voting</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Bill passes. [Gavel] Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Petit.
REP. PETIT (22ND):

There we go. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to take a moment to introduce the -- please stand up, up here, the third graders, the Toffolon Tigers. The Toffolon School in Plainville was the -- the recipient of the District of Distinction through the Makerspace Program. [Applause]. And I'd like to give a warm house welcome. [Applause] And -- and Mr. Speaker, I -- I'll need some assistance from my colleagues, because the last class that was up there, I have to go to speak this class, they wanted me to tell 'em what the difference was between the Democrats and the Republicans. So, if I don't come back, send -- send a search party. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. [Laughter]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. [Laughter]

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 160.

CLERK:

On page 11, House Calendar 160, House Bill No.
5969, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A COLLAPSING FOUNDATIONS
LOAN PROGRAM TO PROVIDE LOW INTEREST LOANS TO
CERTAIN PROPERTY OWNERS. Favorable Report of Joint
Standing Committee on Banking.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette, you have the floor.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Good afternoon.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's
Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The question before the Chamber is on
acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and
passage of the Bill. Please proceed.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an Amendment in his
possession, LCO No. 9488. I ask for permission to
summarize.
Assistant Deputy Speaker Alto bello (82nd):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 9488, which shall be designated as House Amendment Schedule "A"?

Clerk:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 9488, offered by Representative Doucette, Representative Delnicki, et al.

Assistant Deputy Speaker Alto bello (82nd):

Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize. Without objection, please proceed.

Rep. Doucette (13th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Amendment is a strike-all Amendment to the Bill. The Bill originally proposed a low interest loan program for individuals who are affected by a crumbling foundation. This Amendment is the product of a great deal of collaboration and a tremendous amount of work between members on both sides of the aisle and the Banking Committee and others, the banking industry in the state, CHFA, Department of Banking and others, who came up with a program here
that is going to provide a tremendous amount of relief to homeowners affected by crumbling foundations.

Basically, what this does, is it creates a low interest loan program for homeowners who are affected by a crumbling foundation and have gone through the process of applying and receiving a participation agreement or a grant through the Captive Insurance Company established by this legislature some years ago. This program is a public-private partnership. It is funded through Capital from participating lenders and is backed by a limited state guarantee.

The program is very similar to the Federal Workers Furlough Program that we passed through this Chamber back in January. And again, is the product of similar collaboration between the banking industry and the state.

Basically, what this program does, just to summarize, is to provide a low interest loan up to $75 thousand dollars for a term of up to 20 years.
It is designed to provide assistance for eligible repairs for the homeowner that would not otherwise be covered by the grant provided by the Captive Insurance Company. This includes things like walls and framing. It is provided at a low interest rate. The rate in the Bill is the Federal Home Loan Bank rate, which currently ranges from 2.5 percent approximately, up to about 3.2 percent. And I move for passage of the Bill. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The question before the Chamber is on adoption of House "A". Will you remark further? Representative Delnicki of the 14th city --

REP. DELINICKI (14TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'm fully in support of the Amendment. And I'll have a couple of comments to make after the Amendment is passed.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you very much, Representative Delnicki.

Further on House "A"? Further on House "A"?
Further on House "A"? If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor. Representative Fishbein of the 90th, you have the floor.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon. I -- I just -- not knowing the difference between the underlying and the Amendment, I just had some questions on the Amendment, which I believe becomes the Bill. If I may?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please -- please proceed.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you. I'm looking for the interest section within the language. And if I could just be pointed to those particular lines.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It is in Section 3,
Subsection 2, starting on lines 109, in that section there.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And is that the reference to the New England fund rate? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, that is correct.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And why are the taxpayers having to back these loans, understanding that my review of the language shows that the maximum is a $20 million dollar loan payout, but the
backing is only ten percent of that which is $2 million dollars? Why are the taxpayers having to shoulder that burden under this language?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It is a limited guarantee as the good Representative summarized of no more than $2 million dollars. The state is further secured by CHFA getting a mortgage on the property.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Well, thank you, MR. Speaker. I -- I don't know that that answers the question, in that, ten percent of it is being guaranteed by the state. Why do we need the state? Why isn't this just a private situation that we would authorize these loans?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The intent is to provide some relief to homeowners affected by crumbling foundations through no fault of their own, which is a problem which is well documented in this Chamber and in this state. It affects real estate values, throughout the state.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I -- I still haven't heard -- I don't know why the taxpayers need to be on the hook. But moving forward from there, there's certain requirements, as far as what this money is to be used for, and for instance it can't be used to put an addition on -- on a property or to, you know,
per se improve that property but -- but to fix the situations. Who, in the state, is going to be charged with making sure, to protect the taxpayers because they're on the hook here, from making sure that the money is not being used for those things.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Since it is a private loan from a private bank, the bank through their normal standards of due diligence and underwriting, would determine whether or not the expenses are eligible repairs. And the language is quite detailed as you will see in the Bill.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, that's exactly the reason why we would not want the state
to get in here, because we're relying upon the private people, the homeowner and the bank to enter into this arrangement based upon their trust. But the state's not and the taxpayer is not being protected here.

So, if a bank was to give a loan, let's say erroneously or because they didn't do their due diligence for a, you know, increasing the size of somebody's single family residence, is there liability on the bank to protect, once again, the taxpayer?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The bank would have liability in that it holds the loan. The state would have liability, in that it provides the guarantee that would back a default.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):
Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. With taking that a step further, if the bank is not paid by the residential homeowner and, therefore, the state has to come in with their guarantee and pay the bank, I believe the language says that the state then steps into the foot -- the feet of the bank. Is that true?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is true. CHFA would hold the mortgage, would have the ability to foreclose that mortgage to recover the state's investment behind the guarantee.

Through you,

Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.
REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, now that the state is put into the shoes of the bank and -- and ascertains through its due diligence, many years perhaps after the loan has been given, and finds out that the bank did something wrong, didn't do their due diligence, will the bank be able to be sued by the state?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is not dealt within the Bill. I will say that the definition of eligible repair expenses in the Bill is quite detailed.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Fishbein.

REP. FISHBEIN (90TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I agree, it is
quite detailed. But the problem is, is that where it's trust. There's nobody here that's protecting the taxpayer. So, it's a private contract and we're stepping in to protect one of those individuals should there not be payment. And I don't think that that is the proper way to do -- deal with this. I -- it has not been proven to me why the state needs to be any guarantor in this situation. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

    Representative Doucette, do you care to comment further?

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

    No, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

    Further on the House "A"? Further on House "A"? Representative Case of the 63rd. You have the floor, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In -- I know the underlying Bill would become or the underlying
Amendment would become the Bill, but since it is different than the original Bill, my questions are, through you to the proponent, is a fiscal note within the budget?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The fiscal note is not in the budget. And indeed -- because it is a contingent liability, there is no appropriation.

There is a cost associated with a fiscal note. But again, it's a contingent liability. My understanding is that there would not be any liability in the -- the upcoming biennium.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I -- the concerns I have and -- and I know that we do have an issue with
the crumbling foundations, but we also have issues in the state with contaminated wells that the state was monitoring, and now they chose not to. I believe through you, Mr. Speaker, we do have a fund that comes out of everybody's personal insurance that was to help and to make this whole. Is that not -- is that true?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, that is true.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Case.

RE. CASE (63RD):

So, that fund will not help take care of this issue?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. No, it will not.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'll wait until the -- the Amendment becomes a Bill. But after we did the last, I -- I had good faith that that coming out of everybody's insurance payments would help solve the issues. I did have concerns that it wasn't going to be enough to do that. But I had a lot of constituents in a couple different neighborhoods that we couldn't help them out with their contaminated wells that were once monitored by the state of Connecticut and now are not. And we can't find the money to do that. So, unfortunately, I cannot support it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Case. Further on House A? Representative Pavalock-D'Amato, on House A.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. In -- where in the Amendment, does the Bill address priority claims? And in what position this -- this loan would be placed in comparison to a first mortgage or local taxes?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is not directly addressed in the Bill. The State has a right to place a lien. The -- whether that lien be in first or second position, it would, be similar to any other mortgage, home equity loan.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

So, does this loan take priority over local municipal taxes?
Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

  Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

  Through you, Mr. Speaker. No, I do -- do not believe that is the case.

  Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

  Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

  And there's mention of a $2 thousand dollar fine in here for any incorrect information on the application. If there is no equity in the property, and the state or lender has to foreclose, where, then would the state get -- be able to recover the money, if there's no equity in the property?

  Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

  Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

  Through you, Mr. Speaker. Again, as a
mortgagee on a property, their interest would only be collectable to the extent there is remaining equity in the property after senior creditors with priority are paid.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

And what is the length of the loan? Is it -- I thought I saw 20 years, but is it only 20 years or are -- are there -- is that -- is that negotiable? Can it be shorter?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The intent is that the term is up to 20 years. The banks that we have talked to -- or the -- the Bankers Association has represented that the banks would like the flexibility to offer and allow the borrower to
choose between a five, ten, 15-year or 20-year term.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

And so, if there was a need to foreclose, who would be the party that would be foreclosing, is the state or is it the lender?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It would be CHFA as the administrator of the program.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

That's all. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Thank you.
ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, madam. Further? Representative Delnicki further on House "A"

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

Mr. Speaker, a question to you. Have we voted on the Amendment?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

We have not.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

We have not? Okay. Again.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

We came very close, but we --

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

We came --

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

-- did not.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

-- very close. [laughter] Good deal. I just wanted to be sure of that. I wasn't sure. Once the Amendment has been voted on, which I would hope would be momentarily, that then, I would like to
have a few comments. Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Indeed, yes. We're -- unless there's further on House "A", we'll vote on House "A". And once that's done, you will certainly have another bite at this, sir. Further on House "A"? Further on House "A"? If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):


REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you for having an opportunity to speak to the Amendment. There's a lot of questions here about the people that are involved in this issue. And I heard questions raised pertaining to the surcharge and whether that would be something above and beyond
what the Captive Insurance is presently granting. And just to refresh everyone's memory, the Captive Insurance Program provides a grant of $175 thousand dollars to the affected homeowner. That surcharge that was referred to, goes into that fund. It is not something above and beyond.

The issue we're talking about here, quite simply, is the fact that people don't want to walk away from their homes. People, our friends, our neighbors, our relatives want to make the house whole. They are receiving a $175 thousand dollar grant and they find themselves in the position of needing additional money to finish it without having to go to the state of Connecticut for additional money, but doing it the old fashioned way, borrowing it.

What this program does simply, is it provides that tool. It provides that vehicle. It provides an opportunity for people to finish the repairs to their homes, so that they get back on the property tax rolls, so that they won't be foreclosed upon.
And -- and I might add, these are people that haven't walked away from their homes. Many of them have continued to pay their mortgages diligently every month, even though, they had a home that they could walk away from and they haven't. And that's something we all have to grasp and say to ourselves, okay, they're gonna get a loan.

Yes, there is the conceivable possibility, although, I highly doubt it, that somebody could default on it, because ask yourself this question, if I'm paying my taxes, if I'm paying my mortgage, if I go to the Captive Insurance, I do all those things, and now I apply for a loan, what are the odds that that person, who's been a good honest person, is going to default? Very low, if at all. I dare say that would probably be one of the most secure vehicles that a financial institution would ever have, when it comes to making a loan.

But to satisfy a variety of federal issues, I believe we got Dodd, Frank in there and a variety of other things, there needed to be some sort of
backstop. Those moneys aren't put into an account up front. Those moneys, if they were ever needed, would then have to come forward. But you would end up having a home that had been remediated that would actually be worth something, because these homes prior to remediation, are basically worth what the building lot is valued at.

And I'll use South Windsor as, an example, a home in South Windsor that typically went for $350 thousand dollars, on a fire sale from a bank went for $135 thousand dollars. You go to the Captive Insurance. You get $175 thousand dollars, which takes the value and raises it up.

Now, your Captive Insurance covers the foundation, that's why it's the Connecticut Corporation on Foundation Solutions. This would allow people to put heating systems back in, get their utilities hooked back up, do whatever necessary repairs, and again this is necessary repairs. These aren't scoff laws.

These are not folks that are just going to look
to go to this fund and borrow money for no real reason other than they want to do an addition to their home or other some superfluous issue. These are people that want to finish making that home livable, making it something that they can raise their children in, and they can continue -- continue to be productive citizens in their community. And they're paying interest on the loan. Yes, it is a good interest rate. Yes, it is based upon the -- and give me a moment, the Federal Home Loan Bank of Boston and their interest rates.

And yes, it will put properties backs on -- back on the tax rolls. Because remember, any community that has a home that has a crumbling foundation, the resident there, the property owner has been able to go to the town, and get revaluation thanks to the activities by the legislature back in, I believe, 2016. And that came out of my recollection was Planning and Development, I'm not positive on that. So, towns are not collecting the full value of that home until everything is done.
And then they have to go back and report to their assessors that it has been done.

So again, we have a situation, where we are not only helping residents rebuild their lives, people that have paid their taxes, that have paid their mortgages, that have played by the rules, we're not only helping them but we're helping our municipalities rebuild their property tax rolls by providing this program.

I dare say the exposure to the state of Connecticut and I can't say it's zero, is minimal, at best. And I can understand if there's folks in here that could vote against this. But I think you need to put yourself in the position of the folks here that we're talking about. Because this is not a grant. This is a loan. A loan that they will repay. They can take the loan out for as little as a year to up to 20 years.

And they want to play by the rules. They want to make that property productive and they want to continue to live in Connecticut. I dare say, these
are people that we need to be helping. So, I'd like to listen to the discussion a little bit further. I may have, and I reserve the right through the Chair, to speak again and perhaps ask a few questions. But I think this is a situation that we should all look at ourselves in the mirror and ask ourselves, does it make sense to finish these -- finish the deal to allow these people to put their lives back together and not through charity, but through a loan. And that's the key here. A loan to be repaid. To finish making their lives whole. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Delnicki. Further on the Bill as amended? Representative Luxenberg of the 12th. You have the floor, sir.

REP. LUXENBERG (12TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in strong support of this legislation. I want to thank the bipartisan crumbling concrete caucus for all their hard work. There were many -- many meetings and a
lot of collaboration with a lot of different state agencies as well as the private sector in terms of the banking industry.

What we have is an opportunity to provide just a little bit of help. Just a little bit of help for victims in this state who played by the rules, got a home inspection, purchased a home to achieve the American dream, and found the dream became a nightmare.

We have potentially 35 thousand victims across one-third of the communities in the state. This is not just an Eastern Connecticut problem. This is not just a Manchester problem. This is actually statistically shown to drag down the entire Connecticut real estate market, has been dragged down by this crisis.

Now, this legislature did an outstanding job of setting up the Captive Insurance entity. We funded it to the tune of $40 million dollars. And that's wonderful. But the cost of this crisis over the next ten years, 20 years could be as high as $6
Billion dollars. So, we have a fund with $40 million dollars. We have a crisis that's potentially a $6 Billion-dollar crisis. And for the people who are lucky enough to get that tiny -- tiny chunk from the Captive Insurance, in most cases it doesn't cover the complete amount it costs to fix their foundation. Often times there are $30 thousand dollars, $40 thousand dollars, $50 thousand dollars in additional expenses.

So, we have a choice, those folks cannot fix their homes, and not only will their home value stay plummeted, not only will they suffer, but their entire neighborhood will suffer, or we can do this Bill. We can work collaboratively with the banking industry to provide them just a small break on the loan. These are the safest loans in America. These are the safest loans in America.

The loan itself -- you can only get this loan if CCVCK Phenergan has already paid $175 thousand dollars or whatever the main -- up to $175 thousand dollars to fix the home. So, you're talking about
maximum loans of $75 thousand dollars, but they're tied to a $175 dollars -- in many cases $175 thousand-dollar repair to the home.

This is an outstanding collaborative bipartisan Bill. I want to especially acknowledge Kurt Vail. I want to acknowledge Tom Delnicki and Chris Davis and the entire -- as well as Jeff Currey and Jason Doucette, all the legislators in this Chamber who work on this Bill. I am extremely enthusiastic and proud to support it. And I thank you, Mr. Speaker for your time. Thank you for your consideration.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Luxenberg. Further on the Bill as amended? From the 80th District, Representative Mastrofrancesco. You have the floor, madam.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Mastrofrancesco. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just have a few questions and clarifications for the proponent of the Bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):
Please proceed.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. I'm just trying to understand. So, these residents that have issues with crumbling foundations were given -- each household was given a grant of $175 thousand dollars. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Each eligible borrower would have gone through that program. But certainly, it doesn't -- it's not as if every person who has a crumbling foundation would receive -- would be eligible to receive this loan. They have to go through the Captive Insurance Program, which is an exhaustive application, provide evidence that they are affected by the problem, and then, of course, have to wait for the funding.

The funding has to be available. The -- the Captive Insurance Company is -- is not a bottomless
hole. This legislature -- the state has appropriated certain funds. Those funds recently ran out, as recently as a few weeks ago, until an additional bond allocation was able to be made.

So, it -- it's a very limited number of people who be eligible to participate. They would have to have gone through that process first. Then, they would be able to go to one of the participating lenders and to apply for this loan. Then, they would have to qualify for that loan under the bank's underwriting standards. So, the person has to be able to qualify for that loan under a normal credit application and so forth. And then, at that point, they would be available to sign a note and mortgage and other documentation to take out one of these loans.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Francesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you, this
current program that we have right now, can you tell me how much money was put into that program?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It -- there have been allocations by the State of $20 million dollars. I believe, to date, two of allocations have been made. If I may.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Francesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. And through you, so, the program, if I understand it correctly, to -- for the crumbling foundations was $12 dollars a month, I believe, that people were paying through their homeowner's insurance to help fund this program. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):
Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The $12 dollars is part of the Captive Program. I'm not exactly sure if -- if that answers the question.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Francesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. And through you, yes, that is correct. I was just trying to figure out how much money was raised -- I don't know if that's the right wording, in this program. Has -- and you had mentioned that that fund has gone dry, my question is, was all the money that was in that fund, the entire 100 percent of it exclusively used for grants to residents with crumbling foundations? Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. I am not aware of the operations. I have not examined the -- the Captive Insurance. I believe that is generally correct. But I -- I'm not -- I'm not entirely aware of that.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Francesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. And through you, in lines -- and just -- just a clarification, in lines 135, I believe, through 149, that the loan -- the proceeds from the loan -- the money to be used -- be borrowed would be eligible for certain repairs. Can you explain to me in there, because it say that it's -- the money can be used for paying wall finishes, porches, decks, gutters, landscaping, swimming pools, and so forth repairs. Can you elaborate on that, exactly what that means?

Through you,

Mr. Speaker.
ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Those are eligible repair expenses for repairs or replacements or existing features of the home. The Captive Grant Program, as it's designed, does not cover these things specifically. It essentially covers just the foundation and the raising of the home. So, if your home is affected and you go through repairing the foundation, if you're lucky enough to go through the Captive Program, you would have to put back together certain structural elements of your home, any decks obviously landscaping around the home that would be affected, this loan could provide assistance in doing that.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Francesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. And through you, Mr. Speaker, I --
I'm not a contractor and I clearly [ha] wouldn't know the answer to this, but how would outbuildings, sheds, and swimming pools, how would that have an effect on a crumbling foundation? It's not -- it's not attached to the home.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Those would only be eligible if, in fact, they were existing and they were affected by the reconstruction of the foundation.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Francesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Mastrofrancesco.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):
[Ha] We'll get it right one of these days.

[Laughter] Thank you. Through you. And how would those -- how would that be affected through the process of fixing the foundation? I mean they're detached. You can have a home, and then you can have many -- many feet away a swimming pool or a shed. How would fixing a foundation affect a part of the home that is not -- a piece that is not attached to the home?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Generally speaking, I agree with the good Representative that they probably would not. However, if it was existing and it was just next to the house or in some way attached to the house and had to be removed, that would be a replacement of an existing feature of the house that would be eligible.

Through you.
Representative Mastrofrancesco.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker [laughter]. And through you, and just a quick question on the loan portion. Can you tell me when the loan is -- is to begin starting to be paid off?

Through you.

Representative Doucette.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Presumably these are like any other conventional or home equity loan, repayment would begin, you know, within 30 to 60 days of the loan being made.

Through you.

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you, on the part where the State would be responsible for $2
million dollars -- or the taxpayer I would say, can you explain -- elaborate on that a little bit. Let me explain to you, so it says here that the -- the guarantee program shall not exceed $2 million dollars. When the total amount of claim processed by the authority and paid by the Comptroller reaches $2 million dollars, the authority shall immediately cease to process claims. Could I understand that once that $2 million dollars is paid, there will never be -- the State will never be on the hook anymore of the taxpayer after that, once it's paid? Or does that money decrease, and then, it's possible that it would continue going forward into the years?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe the program would cease at that point when we hit that
$2 million dollars.

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Mastrofrancesco.

REP. MASTROFRANCESCO (80TH):

Thank you. I have no -- thank you to the Representative for answering my questions. I have no further questions. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, madam. Further on the Bill as amended? Representative Davis of the 57th, you have the floor.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And if I may, just a couple of quick questions to the proponent of the Bill.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, if the individual, who applies for this loan, they would
have to go through the -- the regular underwriting standards of that banking institution, that private banking institution, similar to, if they were to get a home equity loan or -- or another mortgage on the property. Is that correct?

Through you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, that is correct.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And that lending institution would place a lien on the property with a mortgage deed. Is that correct?

Through you,

Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.
REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Davis.

REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And if, for some reason, that homeowner were to default on that loan, under the good faith efforts that would have to take under this program laid out in this -- in this Bill, would the bank then foreclose on that loan and try to recoup those funds? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, the bank, actually, is required to undertake good faith collection efforts on the loan, which -- which could presumably include foreclosure. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Davis.
REP. DAVIS (57TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I'd like to thank both Representative Doucette and Representative Delnicki for working so closely together with many other members of the Crumbling Foundations Caucus to try to -- to put this Bill together, but specifically, those two gentleman that serve as leadership of the Banking Committee. And I say that because it -- I think this program is actually very well structured.

And it's, I'm sure no surprise to this [inaudible - 00:59:47] in my nine years here, I've been known to be very fiscally conservative and a watchdog for the -- the funds of taxpayers here in the state of Connecticut. And this -- this program was structured, in a way, that the state of Connecticut would only potentially guarantee up to ten percent of all the loans that are made, so $2 million dollars of the $20 million dollars that would be provided for this program from private capital, from private institutions. They'd have to
go through the underwriting standards as any other mortgage or home loan person would do.

And to a previous question on the Amendment, why the state of Connecticut is involved here, I think, the only reason why we are involved in this particular case, is because we're offering it as a low interest loan and in order to guarantee that low interest loan, only I think two and a -- 2.75 percent I think is around what the benchmark is now. The State stepped up in this case us stepped up and said to the banks well we'll guarantee up to ten percent of those loans in order for us to be able to offer to those individuals who no fault of their own have a crumbling foundation to be able to get that extra.

In one of the conversations that was had earlier too, the Captive Insurance Company that we created limits what money can be spent on. Literally fixing that foundation, lifting it up, removing that foundation, putting it back down. Hopefully in the near future solutions will be made
where that isn't even necessary so maybe these loans wouldn't even be necessary with ways to repair that foundation without disturbing much of the rest of the house.

But what this loan would then do would be able to be used to pay for those things that coverage does not pay for, and it was described pools. Why would a pool be affected? Well, if the pool is right of the back of the house when they have to remove the foundation, they have to dig around that foundation in order to get to it, remove the footings. So, in many cases they're removing that patio. They're removing that pool. They're removing the driveway, the deck, the patio, various other things in order to get to that foundation. None of that is covered under the Captive Insurance Company's payments to those individuals that qualify.

This loan would then provide that additional opportunity for them to do it at the expense of the homeowner. They're paying back this loan plus
interest. It just -- all this would do is provide them the opportunity to have a lower interest loan than perhaps that home equity, which until the foundation is actually repaired, there is very little equity in that house, if any, so they'd most likely probably wouldn't qualify for a home equity loan anyway. But even if they did, this gives them that opportunity to have that lower priced one.

With -- in my opinion very -- very little exposure for the state of Connecticut for the very things that I talked about before the ability of the bank to foreclose on the property and regain the funds before they even come to the state and try to recoup. So, for those very important reasons I will be supporting this Amendment. I am a cosponsor of it and this Bill. I think it's very important that we provide this opportunity for homeowners that are affected, and have proven that they're affected, by going through the Captive Insurance Company, the ability to restore the -- the equity in their home to its full potential, get them back on the tax
rolls and ultimately fulfill the promise that we've made to all these homeowners just a few short years ago. So, for those reasons I'll be supporting the Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Davis.

Representative Wilson of the 66th floor.

REP. WILSON (66TH):

Thank you, sir.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

You have the floor.

REP. WILSON (66TH):

I appreciate having you up there. So, as I sat here just now listening to Representative Davis, it reminded me of 2016 before I decided to run for office, I was sitting up in this gallery right about the same time listening to the budget debate and -- and who was I listening to but Representative Davis. And I said boy, that young man really is doing a great job. And again, he did it and he -- and he stole my thunder. What I was going to talk about
was -- was what he just talked about. And as many of you in here, I think, already have a feeling, you know, that I'm a pretty physically conservative and more times my name is up there in red than it is on green, especially on things that have physical notes on them.

I guess, the point I want to make on this, is I'm from the Western side of the state and I know that this is an Eastern side of the state problem. But I kind of have this analogy in my mind that goes back to during the years that I was treasurer of the town of Litchfield. And in the village of Northfield, which the good Representative Piscopo serves, they had a problem. And the problem was that the sanitary sewer systems were breaking down in that community so badly that the Federal Regulations and Rules required the town of Litchfield to install a sanitary sewer system in that piece of the town. And it was, I can't remember the number, it's probably 15 or 18 years ago. Representative Piscopo, am I correct on that?
So, there was a big debate in the community as to who was gonna pay for this. I mean, if I lived in Northfield, I didn't think it was fair that I had to do it all myself. But if I lived on the other side of town, not in Northfield, I was like, well, should we have to pay for fixing their sewers? Well, the ultimate referendum came down and -- and finally it was agreed, if I remember the numbers right, the Northfield folks paid 80 percent of the assessment and the rest of the town paid 20 percent. And the rationalization was because, if the property values went down in Northfield, then it would cause the mill rate to have to be increased to cover the burden for the rest of the town.

And so, I think we have a very similar situation here. If all of these hundreds or thousands of foundations that need replace on the Eastern side of our state causes their grand list to go down, ultimately it's going to have impact all across the state. So, that's probably the main driving thought in my mind ever since I started
listening to this debate why, we, as a state, need to support all of us in the state when it comes to an issue like this. So, I will be voting yes on this.

And -- and I honestly think that the liability for the taxpayers is gonna be very low to
Representative Davis' point in that, many of these homes, if they have a first mortgage and a second mortgage and a home equity line of credit, which I think there's probably a good number of those situations, there's not going to be a whole lot of equity that they're going to be able to borrow against.

So, I'm not sure that we need to listen to this $75 thousand dollar number a whole lot, because under bank underwriting standards, they're probably not going to qualify for a $75 thousand dollar mortgage on top of the first, second, and home equity line that they probably already are sitting on.

So, kind of calm down and just say, okay, this
is somethin' that we need to do for the state of Connecticut. And I'll shut up. Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Wilson, not necessarily because you shut up, but because you had good remarks there, sir. Appreciate it. Representative Case of the 63rd, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And just a -- some questions to the proponent of the Bill. It -- it was mentioned before, and we know this is an issue throughout the state of Connecticut, and everybody wants to make everybody whole to the best of their ability, and -- and I agree with that. So, when we voted a few years ago, I believe, it was a dollar a month out of the insurance, so that's $12 dollars a year per person. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Did all that money go to the intended purpose of crumbling foundations? Through you, Mr. Speaker.
Representative Doucette.

REP. DOUCETTE (13TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I'm not intimately familiar. I was not with the operations of the Captive. I was not here then, but my belief is yes it has. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

So, through you, Mr. Speaker. There's no -- well it's hard to ask a question when somebody wasn't here at the time, but I believe some of the dollars went to some lead paint stuff down in New Haven area. So, the fund was diversified and used in other places when we were told that it was being used for this. My concern is, and I totally agree with the Eastern part of the state. But we had an -- an agreement years ago with the Bonding Commission that we were going to do some help with -- with some contaminated wells, especially in the city of Torrington.
We have one neighborhood that has about 29 homes that the DEEP was monitoring their wells. The people can't sell their houses now because they can't get their wells approved. They were monitored for about 30 years and the good Representative who spoke before me, mentioned some sewer issues in the Northfield area. Well, that same area has problems with their wells. They were also being monitored and the state cut the funding off for that. The reason why they can't run water lines to these places is because there's ledge. And the reason why they're contaminated is for a known reason. That's why DEEP came in and monitored those wells and paid for those to be monitored.

Once we got into this, we found out there's about 96 communities throughout the state of Connecticut that have contaminated wells that the DEEP pulled the dollars. So, with that said, we -- we took a good vote to put a dollar per month towards crumbling foundations. And if you read the article, I believe there's about three or four
different things that money has gone to thus far.

My concern is, if we're gonna do something here as a state, we need to do it for all. I do understand there are issues with the crumbling foundation people and -- and in getting loans and -- and rehabbing and getting the work done. And a lot of the -- they're on both sides of the aisles, and I agree with that. These contaminated wells are on both sides of the aisle, and these people can't get loans or the people who want to purchase their house can't get loans because the wells don't pass inspection.

I mean I get calls probably monthly or every other week from some people, you know, there's cancer in the area. They're wondering if those wells, now, that they're not being monitored, if -- if something took place there.

So, we have concerns all over. My biggest thing is when we take a vote and we make sure that we put a dollar forward on everybody's insurance policy here, that the money goes towards it. And I
would hope that we would've been able to make sure that this situation was taken care of.

The loan and the guarantee from the State of the $2 million dollars, I know it's just a holdup for the guarantee. It's not a budgeted dollar. It's not in the budget, which we talk about a lot.

We need to make sure we prioritize, and this is a priority, but there are a lot of issues going on around the state of Connecticut and I don't expect everybody to be up on all of the issues, but we all fight for our own things. We all fight to try to help get things. We had almost unanimous vote on trying to get the dollars out of the dollar a month that everybody in the state of Connecticut has to pay through their insurance.

So, with that and all due respect, Mr. Speaker, I will listen to the rest of the comments and I just want to make sure everybody has a chance to make sure that their home is viable and their home is healthy to live in and their home is also able to be sold. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Case. From the 116th -- whoops, from the 53rd, Representative Wilson Pheanious, you have the floor, madam.

REP. WILSON PHEANIOUS (53RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in full support of this proposal and it's -- it's Amendment. And I want to people to think about the impact that crumbling foundations have had, not just on the Northeast sector. Now, my regions -- or my areas include Tolland, Ashford, and Willington. And over the last three years, Tolland has lost more than $10 million dollars off of its grand list, Willington close to $4 million dollars, Ashford closer to $2 million dollars, because of the devaluation of property of crumbling foundations.

I want people to understand what happens when somebody finds out that they have a home with crumbling foundation. A home is a person's whole soul. They have put all of their money and their savings, and through absolutely no fault of their
own, they -- their savings, their property is completely devastated.

Now, this -- this Chamber did some incredible work in ensuring that the insurance policy that the $12 dollars went to continue this fund. The -- the other work that's been done, both at the federal level and at the state level to address this problem. But I want people to understand that this is not just a problem in the Northeast, because if there is a hole in the Northeast [laughter] and, if you're losing close to $60 million dollars of the grand list from just three towns because of crumbling foundation, then there is a hole in the state of Connecticut, and it is everybody's business.

I do understand the point just made by Mr. Case. We've got a lot of problems in Connecticut. But the folks with crumbling foundations, this was not through any fault of their own. And what we're talking about is trying to make their property livable again. Yes, you can raise a
foundation and you can replace the foundation. But after that, if a deck has been destroyed, if a pool has been destroyed, if there is no longer any landscaping, if all of the kinds of things that surround that house have been destroyed because of this problem, how does that -- how is that remedied? How can that -- how can that property be made whole and saleable again, if somebody chooses to leave?

So, when I hear concerns about whether or not someone is gonna pay this loan back and whether somehow the state of Connecticut will be stuck with this, I -- I have to wonder if [laughter] -- if the person was going to default on their loan and walk away from that property, as the point has been made, it would've happened a long time ago. These are probably the safest loans that the state of Connecticut will ever make, and we're talking about a loan. Admittedly, a low interest loan, but a loan that will help somebody survive and bring their property back so they can raise their children, so that they do all of the things that they intended
when they purchased a home in these areas in the first place.

And I say this a problem for the whole of Connecticut. It's not just something for the Northeast. So, I will support this Bill and any others that come down to help the folks with crumbling foundations, because it is all of our problem, it is not just a little problem for some folks in the Northeast. It's more akin to a hurricane, to a natural disaster.

And yes, we've got a lot to do get to the bottom and to make this thing right. This is a just a small -- relatively small move on the part of bipartisan legislators to make it right for the people of Connecticut, all of the people, including those with crumbling foundations.

So, I would ask this Chamber to think about, what if this were your home? What if your entire life savings were wiped out from under you from no fault of your own? And you finally got the opportunity to make your home something that
wouldn't collapse around you, and now you simply wanted to put your lawn back, you simply wanted to put your deck back, you simply wanted to make your property so it was livable and saleable again. Would you not want this assistance? Would you not want someone to stand up for you.

So, I ask you to do that on behalf of my constituents and all of the people in Connecticut that have crumbling foundations. This is a good piece of legislation and it -- it should be passed. Thank you.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative. From the 8th District, in the back row, Representative Ackert, you have the floor.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yeah, they put me in the back row.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

[laughter]

REP. ACKERT (8TH):
Just to comment, Mr. Speaker. So, much of the topics have been covered, so I don't want to reiterate a lot of that. And I want to -- do thank the -- the work of the Banking Committee and Representative Doucette and Representative Delnicki on this. And I get it, you know, when I hear about, you know, the taxpayers' exposures and stuff like that. And I think Representative Wilson Pheanious just made a good point about the grand list. They are sinking and anytime that we have an economic development it's offset two or three-fold by the loss of grand list in our communities.

So, although we're trying to improve the tax -- the -- you know, the property tax burden in our -- in our communities, it's -- we're going backwards, to be honest. But I just want to give you an example.

We just had -- and I came here, I think it was last week, and I thanked this body for the good work that we did creating the CFSIC Fund, the -- you know, Crumbling Foundation Security Indemnity
Company and the -- and getting the dollars in there. And I know a Representative has asked about the insurance money that we added the $12 dollars per policy, that money doesn't even get deposited until next year, because it just went in in January of this year. So, that money doesn't even go in, and that's for the Healthy Homes Fund. Which, I think if you apply, for different issues on the Healthy Homes Fund, that that probably can satisfy some of the other issues that the good Representative had mentioned.

So, I think that's somethin' that they easily could look into on the Healthy Homes Fund. But I went to that home that I mentioned and came in the Chamber that day excited and thanking everybody, and I walked up their muddy driveaway, 'cause they had no driveaway left, and I walked into -- no landscaping in the front yard which they probably had had at a different time and a sidewalk, no back deck. And we were in the basement of the house looking at concrete, kind of -- I look at concrete a
lot in my job, and I'm looking at this concrete and
I'm like yeah, it's concrete. It just doesn't have
cracks anymore. And I looked around, and I go, and
they -- they had a little desk set up, and I looked
and there was some debris left from the finished
basement that they had, which they no longer have
the rec room for their kids. And so, I'm looking at
that and I'm goin', so, what is your plan for that?
And they pretty said, no plan right now, no -- no
dollars, no funds. You know, we'll -- we probably
don't -- can't get a loan because their home value
isn't what it was prior to the replacement of the
basement. It's better, of course, but it doesn't
have the same value because at the time that they
had a real driveway, sidewalk, landscaping, and a
completely finished basement.

So, overall I think that this is a good plan.
I think that this will get and help some of those
people that do have the ability to get the loan.
So, I'm in full support. And thank you, Mr.
Speaker, and thank you to good Chair for his
ANSWERS.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Ackert. Further on the Bill as amended? Further on the Bill as amended? If not, staff and guests, please retire to 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.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Please check the board to make sure your vote is properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked. Will the Clerk please take a tally? And will the Clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 5979 as amended by House "A".
Total number Voting 138
Necessary for Passage 70
Those voting Yea 131
Those voting Nay 7
Those absent and not voting 13

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The Bill as amended passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar 374.

CLERK:


ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Demicco of the 21st. You have the floor, sir.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.
ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance and passage. Please proceed.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Yeah. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an Amendment. It is LCO 9486. I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment, and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 946-- 9486, please, shall be designated Schedule "A"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A" LCO No. 9486, offered by Representative Aresimowicz and Representative Demicco.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The good Representative begs leave of the Chamber to summarize. Is there objection? Seeing none. Representative Demicco, please proceed.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this
Amendment which becomes the Bill, establishes a task force to study the financial stability and business models for recycling markets and operations here in the state of Connecticut. We are all aware of the current turmoil in the recycling market, the financial impact on -- on municipalities, which -- which is becoming more and more prevalent. And -- and the -- the declining market for recyclable products.

So, this task force is -- is -- is -- is charged with reviewing statutes and regulations regarding recycling and making recommendations. It's also charged with analyzing the markets for recyclable materials. The -- the -- and the task force is -- is required to report back to General Assembly with their recommendations no later than February 1st, 2020. I move adoption.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The question before our Chamber is on adoption of House "A". Will you remark further?

Representative Harding, you have the floor, sir.
REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon, sir.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Good afternoon.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

A couple questions to the proponent, if I may, through you?

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Please proceed.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you. So, my understanding is the Amendment clears all policy changes that were in this Bill and strictly makes this Bill a task force. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Demicco.

REP. DEMICCO (21ST):

The gentleman is correct.

Through you,
Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. And if I may, I'll just make an overall comment on -- on the Bill, because this is a strike-all Amendment, if I may. And my -- my comment is I do support the idea of creating a task force here, making the recycling industry a -- a -- a prosperous industry, a successful industry in this state. It's unfortunately becoming harder and harder to do.

Many of the waste companies in this state, the -- the municipalities are having a very difficult time trying to -- trying to recycle some of the recyclable items they're collecting, having a very difficult time selling at a certain rate, and the recycling costs which used to be a -- a profit for many municipalities, are now becoming an expense.

And I -- I hope this task force can work to
kind to remedy some of these problems, make this an environmentally friendly initiative, but at the same time, also make -- address some of the cost concerns involved with recycling and waste management here in the state, so I support this Amendment. I support this Bill, and I urge my colleagues to do the same. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Harding. Going to the back row, the dean of the house, Representative Mushinsky, you have the floor.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise to support the Amendment and -- and which becomes the Bill.

Just to give you a few examples here, when our mixed recyclables used to go to China, we had towns like Bridgeport being paid a $129,500 dollars for the recyclables. And now, because of National Sword Policy in China, Bridgeport has to pay $394,380 dollars to get rid of recyclables. The town of Milford used to gain $85 thousand dollars in
recyclable revenue, and now they have to pay $250 thousand dollars. The town of Stratford had to pay -- used to get reimbursed $94 thousand dollars for their recyclables, and now they're paying $240 thousand dollars. And this all happened within a year. So, because of China's decision and because of our custom in Connecticut of mixing our recyclables, we have suffered a loss. We need to address this quickly, help our towns, and help our taxpayers. I support the Amendment and I urge you to adopt it. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Mushinsky.

Representative Cheeseman of the 37th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I just have a few comments. I think this is an excellent idea. And I would encourage all the members who are going to be appointed to the task force to read today's Hartford Current, which actually has an
article about the amazing opportunities that
American companies, particularly those reprocessing
paper are seizing, they are expanding their plants.
There are a number of plants in Texas, North
Carolina that are upping the amount of plastics they
buy. So, I think -- as I say, refer to today's
Hartford Current, there are some great domestic
options out there because we do need to have a -- a
way -- find a way to dispose of our trash and,
ideally, have our municipalities benefit from it
again in terms of revenue. So, thank you very much,
Mr. Speaker. I stand in strong support.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Thank you, Representative Cheeseman. Further
on House "A"? Further on House "A"? If not, I'll
try your minds. All those in favor, please signify
by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Those opposed, nay. Ayes have it. [Gavel]
Further on the Bill as amended? Amendment adopted.

Further on the Bill as amended? If not, staff and guests, please retire to the well of the House.

Machine will be open. [Bell 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.

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Please check the board to make sure your vote is properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked. Will the Clerk please take a tally? And would the Clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

House Bill 7298 as amended by House "A".

Total number Voting 137
Necessary for Passage 69
Those voting Yea 137
Those voting Nay 0
Those absent and not voting 14

ASSISTANT DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO (82ND):

The Bill as amended is adopted [gavel] and passes as well.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 162?

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Haddad, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

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 for acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Representative Haddad, you have the floor.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I think that we can be proud of the history this Chamber has had at protecting students on college campuses from the -- from the -- the terrible circumstances of sexual misconduct that might occur on college campuses. We've adopted a number of policies over the years that have made our statutes model legislation for the conduct of universities when they are judicating cases of -- of alleged sexual misconduct.

What we do today -- one of the reasons why that is the case, is because the -- the statutes that we've constructed have -- work in careful tandem with federal regulations under Title IX that protect
those same -- those same students. Right now, the Department of Education is undergoing a substantial overhaul of the Title IX regulations at the federal level. And as a result, it -- there may arise a circumstance of conflicts between federal regulations and state statutes.

This Bill aims to make sure that those conflicts can be resolved quickly and that we can act to ensure that the protections that we built into our state statutes remain to the greatest extent possible, given any additional federal regulations.

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an Amendment, it's LCO No. 9362. I ask that the Amendment be called, and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Haddad, is that LCO No. 9363?

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Yes. Yes. I have my reading glasses on now. It is 9363. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):
Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9363, which will be designated House Amendment "A"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 9363 offered by Representative Haddad, Senator Haskell, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there any objection to summarization? Is there any objection? Hearing none. Representative Haddad, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HADDAD (54TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a bipartisan Amendment that seeks to establish the task force when the -- the federal rule is adopted by the Department of Education. Additionally, it also lays out the -- the -- the appropriate members of the task force so that the convened group will have the best possible experience to be able to address the question put at hand. I move adoption.
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before the Chamber is on adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark further on the Amendment? Representative Hall, you have the floor.

REP. HALL (59TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My good colleague, I think, summed it up perfectly. It's a friendly Amendment. I support Amendment. It -- we also changed the date originally proposed for this -- this study group, this task force to coincide when we actually get the federal guidelines passed down to us. So, it made some good changes. It made some great changes to the membership on this community. Good Bill. I support it and look for all my colleagues to support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, madam. Would you care to remark further on the Amendment? Would you care to remark further on the Amendment? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.
REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The Amendment is [gavel] adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? It's not -- if not, guests -- 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.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

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

[laughter]  I'm like the machine, move it.

[laughter]

If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 6890 as amended by House "A".

Total number Voting 138
Necessary for Passage 70
Those voting Yea 138
Those voting Nay 0
Those absent and not voting 13

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill as amended passes.  [Gavel]  Will the Clerk please call House Calendar No. 43?

CLERK:

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel of 146th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Representative Michel, you have the floor.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

So, Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an Amendment LCO No. 9533. I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment, and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the Clerk -- will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9533 which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A"?
House Amendment Schedule "A" LCO No. 9533
offered by Representative Demicco, Representative Michel.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection to summarization? Seeing none, Representative Michel, please proceed.

[laughter]

REP. MICHEL (146TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, this is a Bill that went through Committee, and that is to prohibit the sales and trade of shark fins. We have a --

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative, please pause, I believe the other side is letting us know that the Amendment isn't on the system yet, or they don't have possession of it. Let us check that out.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Harding, it is on the system. Representative Michel, sorry for the interruption. We just want to make sure we're all operating under a level playing field [laughter] here, sir. Please proceed.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, this Amendment would become the Bill and it basically prohibits sale, trade, and distribution of shark fins that were removed from a shark, and this went through Committee.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

[Inaudible - 01:52:04] move Adoption.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Thank you. Please move [laughing] for adoption.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Chamber will stand at ease. [Jaws music playing] [Applause] House come back to order. [Gavel] Representative Michel, you still have the
floor, sir. Did you move adoption of the Amendment?

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Yes. Move for adoption.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question before the Chamber is on adoption of the Amendment. Will you remark on the Amendment? Representative Harding of the 107th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have more questions for the underlying Bill. I just want to say that I -- I do support this Amendment. However, I will reserve my comments for the underlying Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Very fair. Thank you very much, sir.

Representative Dubitsky on the -- on the Bill or the Amendment, sir?

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

I'll wait for the Bill. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Mushinsky, the Amendment or the Bill, madam?

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH):

Amendment, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85TH):

This is a very well-crafted Amendment. It deals with the difficulty of figuring out which shark fin is which, many of the species are in trouble. We just simply ban any of them for sale, trade, or distribution. But the Amendment is very carefully written to exempt possession by commonly caught species in Connecticut, so a person could catch one, release it, and there's no interference with the fishermen in Connecticut.

So, it is very well crafted. And I commend Representative Michel, Representative Demicco for incorporating those changes. And I hope you will pass the Amendment and the Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, madam. Let me try your minds on Amendment before us. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. [Gavel] The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Representative Harding of the 107th.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a few questions, through you to the proponent.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel, please prepare. Representative Harding, please proceed.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, if the good proponent could -- could please tell me, do we have any input from the fish -- fishing industry in
regards to some of the implications that this Bill might have, particularly the new Amendment and -- and what that will do to any of the fishermen and fisherwomen that we have in our ports throughout the state?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I -- basically this Bill is to get rid of a loophole from the federal law, which has exceptions on spiny and smooth dogfish.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, just more particularly, I appreciate the -- the clarification regarding what the Bill tries to address. And I appreciate the advocacy on your
part. What -- what I'm looking to see is there --
is there any input from -- from the fishing industry
on how this Bill might impact them, particularly
with the change that we just made through the
Amendment?

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill doesn't
affect fishing. This Bill is regarding the
detachment of fins. And basically, they would have
to destroy that -- or not sell the fins.

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

    Thank -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through
you, Mr. Speaker, is that sale currently occurring
here in the state, the -- the selling of these fins?
And if the good proponent could -- could let me know
how -- how prevalent that is? What kind of industry that is here in the state?

Through you,

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. There were some investigations done in the past, and yes, there was one restaurant and a casino that was selling shark fins, that basically this -- this Bill is eliminating the loophole as I mentioned earlier -- by the way thank you for working on the -- on the Amendment, ranking member, but -- just give me one second.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please --

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Representative --

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
-- please proceed.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

-- Representative Harding, would you just repeat the question, just so I make sure I answer properly.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Harding would you please repeat the question, sir.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

More -- more than happy to, and I'm -- I'm a lawyer, so I ask compound questions and I apologize. So, just, through you, I'm just looking to see how prevalent the -- the -- the sale or trade is -- in regard to shark fins here in the state of Connecticut, if the good proponent has knowledge of that?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Basically, there's a
poaching industry all over the world that would actually -- it -- it's been found that in shark fin soup, for example, you would find several species of sharks, not one, not just one. And so, the endangered species that end up -- the endangered species that would end up in a shark fin soup, would be against conservation. So, basically, this is to make sure that we don't encourage poaching -- poachers to sell their products in our state.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you, I appreciate the qualification there. My understanding, if I'm correct, is that federal law already exempts -- or excuse me, prevents individuals throughout the entire country and ports throughout the country from selling shark fins independent of the body of the shark. And so, what I'm looking to see here is how this Bill is
different than federal law which already prevents such trade. So, if the good proponent could explain?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Basically, we -- the difference with federal law with this Bill, would be that this would not have the exemptions. We cannot enforce if somebody in a restaurant eats -- finds on the menu shark fin soup and he asks the restaurant, what shark is this from? There's no way to enforce to -- with a DEEP or DOJ to find out where the shark fin is from, which shark pieces.

Through you,

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Harding. [laughter]

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And -- and through
you, so right now, and I -- I think it's called
dogfish is -- is the correct terminology, and I
apologize if I'm incorrect, in that dogfish have a
tendency or individuals have a tendency to utilize
those fins and -- and -- and -- and advertise them
as shark fins in some manner. Under federal law, my
understanding is, that's currently legal. And under
this Bill, my understanding or the -- the Bill as
amended, that is going to -- going to be illegal.
Is -- is that understanding correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. yes.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Okay.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And so -- through you.
Then, without -- so now this Bill as amended, prevents any entity or any individual from selling dogfish fins in addition to selling shark fins, which I presumably is already illegal under federal law, that dogfish now, would be the extension beyond what federal law is. And so, what -- what I'm looking at here is that previously the original Bill banned possession. And so, that's no longer the case. It's only the sale. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

And thank you, Mr. Speaker. And -- and through you, so what I was asking earlier, is that do -- does that good proponent have any idea about the dogfish industry here and -- and, you know,
fishermen selling dogfish, which now would be illegal under this Bill. Does the good proponent have any idea what kind of predominance that industry has here in the state?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So, several years ago we started running out of cod. And so, generally dogfish would be a bycatch and would be thrown overboard. When the cod starting -- when we started running out of cod, then fishermen was exploring ways to use the dogfish. The own -- the usage that I found -- that I've heard about is dogfish is being cut up and sent overseas for fish and chips. If the fishermen do not remove the fin, there's no issues.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Harding.
REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And so, my understanding then, is that, the fin is just not -- is able to be -- not to be able to be utilized, that that if the -- if you're going to sale a dogfish or a shark, that it's got to be the entire body including the fin. It can -- it cannot be separated -- the fin cannot be separated.

So, going forward from -- from fishing and selling it at the port, so to say, what about a restaurant? I'll give an example, so if someone has shark fin soup that's made with, let's say dogfish fins, under federal law that currently would be legal is my understanding; under this particular Bill, it's not a fishermen, let's say it's a restaurant selling shark fin soup, that would now be illegal under this Bill. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

And -- and through you, Mr. Speaker. If the good proponent could please advise as to what the penalty would be if a restaurant was -- was caught selling shark fin soup, made of dogfish fins?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

[laughter] Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. [laughter] This would be a Class C Misdemeanor with up to three months and a $500 dollar fine.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Through -- through you, Mr. Speaker. So my -- so, my understanding is that would be a Class
C Misdemeanor. So, let's say it was a restaurant, what is the understanding of the good proponent in regards to who would be arrested? It -- it would be hard to prosecute a -- a Class C Misdemeanor upon a restaurant or a company. Who would be the individual that would be arrested, if that soup was being sold?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Presumably the owner.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Harding.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And thank you for the qualification. I want to thank the good proponent for some of the clarifications and work -- for working with us on this Amendment. I apologize for
the questions.

    We're just -- the -- the Amendment is fairly new and we're trying to learn some of the things in it. I -- I understand some concerns individuals may have. I understand what the good proponent is looking to do, which is essentially stop, you know, what is considered to be a rather barbaric type of industry. So, I appreciate his efforts and the proponent’s efforts. But I do look forward to listening to the rest of the debate on the floor in regards to some of the questions and some of the issues that might be brought up. But thank you very much for the time and for the -- answering the questions. Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you, Representative Harding. It's a pleasure working with you on this Amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Representative Dubitsky of the 47th, sir, you have the floor.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Would this Bill prevent a end-user from removing the fin from a shark in the -- while preparing the -- the shark for cooking?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It wouldn't present none. But if they were to detach the fins, then they would be breaking the law, if this Bill became law.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I -- I would ask that the good proponent identify the line that would make it a -- a Class C Misdemeanor for somebody to cook a shark after removing a fin.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Can you -- can the -- can Representative Dubinsky please repeat the question? Thank -- and sorry about that.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Dubitsky, can you please repeat the question, sir?

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Sure. My -- my question is about cooking and if -- if -- if I catch a shark and bring it home and
put it down and -- and get ready to cook it, is it a violation, under this Bill, for me to remove the fin from the shark during preparation for cooking it?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It is a violation when you remove the fins from any shark according to this Bill. Well, if you detach the fins, then it basically we'd have to destroy it.

Through you,

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this entire Bill, based on this Amendment that just passed, says any person who sells, offers for sale, trade, or distributes any shark fin that was removed from a shark, shall be guilty of a Class C
Misdemeanor. That's the whole Bill. I don't see anything in this Bill that would indicate that removing the fin for the purpose of cooking it in my own house would be any type of violation.

So, through you, Mr. Speaker. I would ask that the good proponent comment on that. And if I am incorrect, I wish he would correct me.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I apologize, actually, I did make a mistake. Possession is no longer an issue in this Bill. We've amended that part.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And further to that, if I then take the shark apart, as one would be
prone to do to cook it, have the fin on one side, pieces on the other, and I cook them up separately and I cook shark fin soup in my own house from the shark that I caught, would that be a violation of this Bill?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, going to a restaurant, if a restaurant sells shark steaks, which very often they do. I've been in a number of seafood places where maco, in particular, is sold. If a -- if a restaurant acquires a shark and cuts it up for sale to the public, is removing the fin from a shark that is being cut up for sale to patrons, is
that, in itself, a violation of this Bill?

    Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

    Through you, Mr. Speaker. The violation would be the sale or trade or distribution of any shark fin. That's what the Amendment covers -- the Bill covers.

    Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Representative Dubinsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. So, just to be clear removing the fin itself during preparation of the rest of the shark, would not be a violation of the Bill.

    Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. Correct.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Now, once that fin is removed from the shark, so long as that fin is not sold in any way, that restaurant would still not be in violation of this Bill. Is that correct?

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Michel.

REP. MICHEL (146TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. That is correct.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Dubitsky.

REP. DUBITSKY (47TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That was all the questions I had. I'll listen to rest of the debate.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank -- thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended?
Representative Ferraro of the 117th.

REP. FERRARO (117TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I listened to the questions that were asked. All my questions have been answered. I have no further questions. Thank you, sir.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? If not, staff and guests 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):

[Gavel] Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Please check the board to make sure your vote has been cast.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative, I will wait for you. My own people I may not wait for, but I'd wait for you. Have all the members voted? Please check the board to ensure your vote has been properly cast. As with the speaker, I won't close without the Minority Leader. Just to be clear, I will always wait for her. [Laughter] In case you were wondering.

Have all the members voted? Please check the board to ensure your vote has been properly cast. If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. Unlock -- unlock the machine. The Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 5251 as amended by House "A".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number Voting</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>110</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
The Bill as amended passes.  [Gavel]

[Laughter]  [Baby Shark music playing]  [Applause]

Juan.  You're up.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Fair enough.  Where are we?  Yeah.  Are there any -- any announcements or introductions?

Representative Gilchrest, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. GILCHREST (18TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed --

REP. GILCHREST (18TH):

May I --

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

-- Madam.

REP. GILCHREST (18TH):

Thank you.  Today, I am joined by Natalie DeLaCruz, who has been an intern with me since January.  Natalie is a freshman at Hall High School but is so interested in politics and policy, that
she has been coming to the Connecticut General Assembly after school and interning with us. And so, I would like to present her with this citation on behalf of the Connecticut General Assembly for your work as an intern during the 2019 legislative session. Your assistance and hard work is greatly appreciated. Thank you, Natalie. [Applause]

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

We'll return to the Call of the Calendar. Will the Clerk please -- okay. Representative Borer, for what purpose do you rise?

REP. BORER (115TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Together, Rosa Rebimbas and myself, the Co-Chairs of Women's Bipartisan Caucus would like to remind everybody that there is a diaper drive going on for those families in need and diapers can be brought and put next to the Prudence Crandall statue downstairs. Thank you.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Baby diapers.
REP. BORER (115TH):

Baby diapers. And we're going to be collecting through June 1st. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam. We'll return to Call of the Calendar. Will the Clerk please Calendar No. 84?

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Abercrombie, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

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 CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before the Chamber is on
acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Representative Abercrombie, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an Amendment, LCO 9424. I ask that the Clerk call -- please call the Amendment and I be -- I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9424, which would be designated House Amendment "A"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 9424 offered by Representative Abercrombie, Senator Moore, Representative Case, Senator Logan.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representatives leave to seek -- leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there any objection? Hearing none, Representative Abercrombie, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a strike-all Amendment that now becomes the Bill. Over the last year and a half, we have had some issues with our nonemergency transportation and what this does is give more oversight to DSS on this issue. I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

A question is on adoption on House Amendment "A". Will you remark? Representative Case of the 63rd, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Amendment does some good things in regards to working with DSS and the nonemergency medical. A question through you to the good Chairwoman of Human Services.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that it is the intent that the data that is already collected
through DSS is within the contract, and speaking with DSS and representatives of -- of the contract, they're -- they're -- they're unclear of the exact data that is collected. For legislative intent, we believe that all this is within the contract of what they need to do. Is that -- is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. That is correct. What we're trying to do is have DSS validate the data that we are currently getting through the contract with AL.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

I thank the good woman and -- and -- so, if we do find that there are some little intricacies of the reporting, I'm sure we can work that out and we
can work that out with DSS to make sure that we get everything that's needed within the contract and get the proper data to, not only the Commissioner's Office, but to the good representative of the Human Services Committee and the whole committee. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Abercrombie.

REP. ABERCROMBIE (83RD):

That is correct. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

And through you. Real -- just a comment. I mean, working with this and -- and working pretty hard to make sure that everything works smoothly, I -- I do know that there is such an app and such a -- a number out there called Where's My Ride. And -- and that was somethin' to try to solve and a solution and a data collection to help find out if a ride is late. So, I think we have the ways to do
this. The contractor has ways to do this. I thank the good woman for bringing out the Amendment. And you know, as always, we work together. And if there are things in the future, we can iron things out.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further on the Amendment before us? Would you care to remark further? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor, signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Will you -- 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 open. [Ringing]

CLERK:
The House of Representative 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. 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 7166 as amended by House "A".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number Voting</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>138</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Bill as amended passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 211?

CLERK:
On page 15, Calendar 211, Substitute House Bill 7316, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE TO STUDY AND CLARIFY THE EMPLOYMENT STATUS OF WORKERS PROVIDING IN-HOME SERVICES. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Labor and Public Employees.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Hall, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HALL (7TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Question before the Chamber on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Representative Hall, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HALL (7TH):

Yes. The Bill establishes a task force to study and clarify the unemployment status of homecare providers in the state. The Task Force shall submit its findings and recommendations to the

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

A question before this Chamber is on adoption? Will you remark? Representative Polletta, you have the floor, sir.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Excuse me, my microphone wasn't working at the moment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Go ahead.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Bill here, 7316. Just with one quick question through you to the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, sir.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

What issues were these in-home services individuals facing that brought about this study? Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Hall.

REP. HALL (7TH):

Yes. Issues surrounding their status as far as the types of -- the type of work they did and whether or not they were provided time off, sick time, compensation -- areas around compensation, things of that nature.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Polletta.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

And through you, Mr. Speaker. So this study would basically look into the treatment of these workers and report back to the General Assembly, I'm understanding, would be next year, and then if further action we would be taking, if I'm understanding this correctly, we would then delve into the details.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Hall.
REP. HALL (7TH):

That is correct. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Polletta.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. No further questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further on the Bill before us? Would you 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 the 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 7316:

Total number Voting 138
Necessary for Passage 70
Those voting Yea 101
Those voting Nay 37
Those absent and not voting 13

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Bill passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 295?

CLERK:

On page 22, House Calendar 295, Substitute House Bill No. 6392, AN ACT CONCERNING HIGHWAY WORK ZONE SAFETY ENFORCEMENT. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Transportation.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Lemar. You have the floor, sir.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance 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. Do you care to remark, sir?

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the House previously began to hear House Amendment "A". I would like to, at this point, withdraw House Amendment "A".

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

If there are no objections, so ordered.

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the House in possession -- the Clerk is in possession of Amendment LCO No. 9409. I ask that the Clerk please call the Amendment, and I be given leave of the
Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9409, what will be designated House Amendment "B"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "B", LCO No. 9409, offered by Representative Lemar, Representative Morin.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there any objection? Hearing none, Representative Lemar, you have the floor, sir.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Amendment is a strike-all Amendment that authorizes the Transportation Commissioner to use speed cameras to detect and enforce violations exceeding the posted speed limit in highway work zones of 12 miles per hour or greater.

Through you. I move adoption.
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before the Chamber is on adoption. Will you remark? Representative Devlin. You have the floor, Madam.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do have a few questions for the proponent of this Amendment, if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, Madam.

REP. DEVLIN (134):

Thank you very much. So, just for clarification purposes, because I think there were a lot of questions that were asked the last time that this subject came before the Chamber, but if the good Representative could just clarify what the reference means to maintenance work zones?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Maintenance work zones
differ from highway work zones, which is a broader category of work. So, a highway work zone could include construction-related activities. Maintenance work zones are where DOT is performing maintenance work, mowing lawns, repairing guide rails, replacing downed signs or trees. A highway work zone is the more traditional construction or utility work that you'll see along the road of a highway.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate that clarification. When will you -- let's see, so in lines 34 to 38, we talk about ensuring that there is visible signage to indicate that there is an automatic traffic enforcement safety device that will be in place, and that would not be less than 500 feet in advance of the maintenance work zone.

Will that also clarify that the traffic, that
is in the lane closest to the maintenance work happening, is the only lane where a camera will be positioned to only capture the image of the license plate regardless of the type of vehicle, and that the further lane, in fact, will not be recorded?

Through you, Mr. Chairman.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, that would be one heck of a sign. I do think that the verbiage on the sign will be limited to the regulations that DOT adopts, which would essentially say, work zone ahead, camera enforcement of speed limits will be utilized.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It wouldn't be inappropriate, given this is a heck of a Bill. But
is there any enforcement to traffic in the lane that is not right next to the actual maintenance work that is happening?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Based upon my research, the current technology that is being utilized in this regard, can only really monitor that lane that is closest to the camera positioning. So, people will be subject to enforcement under traditional terms if a police officer happens to be there. But it is unlikely, given the current limitations of the technology, that they can extend beyond that one lane. But I don't think it's fair to say that a person won't be held accountable for misgivings that happen in the second closest lane.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Devlin.
REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. When we last spoke about this particular -- the Bill, there were a lot of questions around data privacy. Could the good Representative speak to how this Amendment may address those concerns?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, there were quite a few. The good gentlewoman is correct. There were quite a few questions about how we would handle all of the data that would be collected through the use of this video technology, where it would go, who would have access to it, and whether or not it was appropriate for one agency or another to have that amount of data based upon conversations with colleagues about different thoughts and ideas that they saw.

We started to work with DOT, privacy experts to
determine what the most appropriate mechanism to handle this amount of data could be. So, we would now require DOT to adopt the regulations regarding privacy security collection use and the disclosure of images.

We then outline what it must include, so that we included these procedures in the Bill to ensure that the privacy and security of recorded images are maintained, that they are destroyed at a proper period of time.

We prohibit the disclosure of these images or data except for the DOT, state police, and the contractor in order to implement the Bill's very specific provisions. And then if there's a judicial order for that information, in a criminal proceeding, they can release it.

DOT can then release data for research purpose as long as it does not directly or indirectly identify a driver. So, you can compile how many people have been violating the law, how many tickets are -- have been issued. But you cannot personally
identify any of the information or any of the people in that regard.

The speed camera images, itself, and the data that -- that the state holds are not subject to FY laws. And it requires the DOT or it's contractor to destroy the images within 60 days of the alleged violation. I thought you brought up a really great point in our earlier debate, that 90 days was way too long a period of time. That's a lot of data that's sitting out there. And so, we wanted to tighten up that timeline as much as we possibly could. And so, they have 60 days after the alleged violation. If a ticket is not issued you got to delete it.

And upon final disposition of the case, to which the data pertains, you've got to delete at that point. And then we -- we want and, again, I thought you brought up another great point. We -- we're going to require DOT to conduct an annual audit for compliance to make sure they're actually complying with all these privacy policies they want
to report to us to ensure they're not invalidate of this.

We want to make sure, again, probably the -- the fourth time I'm going to commend you for some of the points you raised. We -- we want to make sure that we're complying with the full parameters of this law, and that there are no abuses and there are no deficiencies in it. And we want to have a chance to look at this within a year and see if there are any problems that we need to come back and clarify. We don't want to have this up and going and no ability to understand the true ramifications of it.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I think that information will be helpful since I don't think we really had any in terms of indicating that there was an issue today. But, if the good representative, if we could jump to Section 3, through you,
Mr. Speaker, the Commissioner of Transportation is to develop and implement a public awareness campaign. Could the good Representative please provide some clarification and further description of what that requires?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, you'll see in numerous activities the Department of Transportation engages in, the Big Orange Campaign, the Highway Safety Work Week that the Department of Transportation pulling down on its federal funds, will engage in a public awareness campaign. The Click It or Ticket or Drop Your Cellphone or Pay Attention to Highway Workers, you'll see that. We want them to utilize that process and -- and those funds to further educate our population that this new technology is coming.

We think it's imperative that you have notification at least 500 feet in advance. And we
think it's imperative that the Commissioner comes out and -- and -- and lets people know that this new technology will be utilized in Connecticut.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And so, the goal of this, as I understand, is that these safety devices, the cameras that will be put in place, would be operational on or after January 1st, 2020. So, through you, Mr. Speaker, if the good Representative could just clarify what the -- essentially the fiscal note will be around this? Because what we're speaking about now, is in less than a year, the DOT, in addition to what we have tasked them with, they will be procuring new technology. The DOT employees will be trained to be able to bring this equipment to a maintenance work site. They will be trained to put it in place and to operate it.

The systems will be in place to transmit images
to the State Police, I believe that's still part of the program, who will then have designated personnel to review these images because, I understand, they are only the images of 12 plus miles an hour not every vehicle that is going by. And, of course, that will only be in the lane closest to the work happening, not on that entire work road.

So, in addition to that, they will be mailing out, they'll have to identify who the in-state or out-of-state car belongs to. They will need to mail a copy of the image that will be pulled down. They will have to spend effort to retrieve and try to solicit payment if that does not come in.

They -- in addition the DOT will be expanding their promotional awareness campaign. So, could the good Representative, through you, Mr. Speaker, please clarify what added costs this program is put -- is going to incur?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker for that question. The good gentlelady outlines a number of questions and concerns that one could have with this Bill. And I think she does a -- a good job indicating places where things might not work as intended. And I think that one-year annual audit will help us evident some of the concerns that folks share about this Bill.

The OFA now [laughter] says -- indicates that there is a potential small cost, but that the revenue generated from the program would exceed those costs. We have evidence from other states, mainly Maryland and Pennsylvania, that the program does, in fact, become a revenue generator for the State. Thankfully though, with increased compliance over a period of time, those revenue dollars will drop. We won't actually collect as much money over time because people, once they start to receive a ticket, will necessarily start acting more in accordance with the law.

So, OFA has indicated that there's a potential
small revenue loss on the early stage, but an overall potential revenue gain based upon the number of tickets that will be issued.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate the good Representative's explanation. But I didn't hear a number. Through you, Mr. Speaker. could we get clarification?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The good gentlelady is correct. We did not hear a number because the OFA report was not able to indicate a specific dollar cost associated with the many issues that the good gentlelady raises.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):
Representative Devlin.

REP. DEVLIN (134TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I will end my questions at this point. I think my members may have some additional for the good Representative. But I appreciate the answers so far. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam. Would you care to remark further? Representative Ackert, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I do appreciate -- I didn't know this Bill was comin' back up. I did a little research on this, and maybe not as at -- I'm sure not as in depth as the good Chairman of Transportation has done. But my numbers conflict with the numbers that I've been hearing about the other states and how productive and how valuable the Work Zone Safety Ticket has been. Because the Maryland numbers that I see, show tickets down, traffic fatalities up in work zones. And so, the
traffic -- matter of fact, in 2013, Maryland had a program that they ended in 2013, and then reinstated it recently. They ended it in 2013 because of faulty traffic tickets. So, machines not working correctly. They dispelled that and then instituted it recently.

So, to the good Chairman, I'm not sure if you have it quickly and I know we're going to vote on this shortly, but what data and area could I have looked that would have given me numbers that are similar to yours?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Lemar.

REP. LEMAR (96TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we utilize data from the Maryland DOT. I requested data from Connecticut Department of Transportation with respect to the justification and efficacy of the program, itself. I received some limited data back to that specific question that you require.
They have indicated that since adoption in 2011 fiscal year, that they've seen an 80 percent reduction in work -- in work zone speed infractions.

And that yes, it is true, across the country. It's not just in Maryland. It's -- it's across the country. Traffic fatalities in work zones are up dramatically. It's -- it's largely attributed to inattentive driving. Speed is an incredible factor, as well. That's why you'll see some of the highway campaigns that Department of Transportation engages with on an annual basis. The Click It or Ticket -- Ticket -- yeah, Click It or Ticket campaign is common in people's mind about seatbelts.

But in the last few years, you've seen the Put It Down campaigns, asking people to put down their cellphones, to pay better attention to the road. That will be the number one safety concern you start to hear from. And we think that this type of program will also -- we think this program will also yield much safer working conditions for the -- the men and women who are on the side of the roads
working for us every day.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And the good gentleman does bring up the actual topic out there is safety work zones are very dangerous. It deals with, as we might, you know, distracted driving primarily and closer lanes where people are -- are more uncomfortable. So, it's a -- it's actually hazards with the -- the reports that I have seen. The actual -- when you're working on a road, the road is not as safe because it's under repair. They're tighter -- there's more accidents because they're tighter. And there's more accidents because they are distracted driving. The speed, as was mentioned, was shown that it was down but that fatalities were actually increasing. So, it's more of a traffic habit issue than it is a traffic speed issue.
What I've got -- my concerns are -- are people that have fleet vehicles, that are FedEx, our large corporations that have speed that if I, my driver, right now in my work van is out driving and gets a ticket, it goes to his license and he has to pay it. If an employee is driving an employer's vehicle and that vehicle gets a ticket, the company gets the ticket, and cannot, by labor laws, transfer that charge to the individual driver. It's against our labor laws. It's like breaking -- it's like getting in an accident. It's like breaking a tool. It's like causing a mishap at a -- at a job. They can't -- you cannot charge them for that. So, that's a misnomer that we can actually relay those costs.

If you're renting a vehicle, rental and their contract says, hey, listen, you go through -- you get a speeding ticket or something like that, they can do that, but not through labor laws.

So, with those concerns and my research, I'll probably be a no on this, through you Mr. Speaker.
I thank the good gentleman for his work and his effort on this. I think we may be not trying to -- we're not going to accomplish the goals -- the laudable goals that this legislation want to do. But thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further?

Representative Morin, you have the floor, sir.

REP. MORIN (28TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. MORIN (28TH):

Mr. Speaker, just a brief comment. I want to thank the Chairman of the Transportation Committee and all the people that put -- gave their input onto this piece of legislation. I know some people have issues. I -- I get it. Really the intent when -- when we -- we brought this idea out, was really to do something to help save lives, help keep workers
safe in maintenance work zones. I think this is a good step.

As -- as many pieces of legislation in this building, maybe things will arrive in the future that will force us to revisit, revise. But again, really just have great appreciation for the Chairman and those that gave a lot of input to get us to where we are. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further on the Amendment before us? Do you care to 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, nay. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. [Gavel] Would you care to remark further on the Bill as amended? Would 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 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? 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:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number Voting</td>
<td>136</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Walker, for what purpose do you rise?

REP. WALKER (93RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to be recorded in the affirmative, please. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will the Journal note Representative Walker in the affirmative? The Bill as amended passes.

[Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 321?

CLERK:

On page 24, House Calendar 321, Substitute House Bill No. 7286, AN ACT CONCERNING HOME INSPECTORS AND APPRAISERS. Favorable Report of Joint Standing Committee on General Law.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Gibson, you have the floor, sir.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Hi, 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 Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Representative Gibson, you have the floor, sir.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an Amendment, LCO No. 8216. I would ask that the Clerk to please call the Amendment, and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 8216, which will be designated House Amendment "A".

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 8216 offered by Representative D'Agostino, Representative Altobello.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the -- the
Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there any objection? Hearing none, Representative Gibson, you have the floor, sir.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you. So, Mr. Speaker, this Amendment actually does a couple things. What it does, it's -- it strikes Section 2 and it replaces it with simplified language. And if I may, Mr. Speaker, I will explain?

What it does is allows home inspectors to have -- who have been certified by the agency, approved by the Commissioner of Consumer Protection, to inspect certain building foundations within the scope of it's -- of his or her licensure for the presence of pyrrhotite. It also ensures that these inspectors have gone through a program where they are certified and they are trained, that they are able to conduct such -- such testing for -- for pyrrhotites, as well as, determine to the Commissioner's satisfaction, that each appraisal
management company that does these appraisals are compensated in compliance with the Federal Truth and Lending Act and it's amended from time to time.

Mr. Speaker, I move for adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before the Chamber is on adoption. Will you remark? Representative Cheeseman, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you, Mr. Speaker, I have a couple of questions for the proponent of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, Madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Does this Amendment have a fiscal note? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Gibson.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No, it does not.
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you and through you Mr. Speaker. Will this make the whole process of finding a good home inspector and ensuring that appraisers are paid fairly, more transparent and fair?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Gibson.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, it does.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Cheeseman.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have no further questions.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Do you care to remark further on the Amendment before us? Representative Hall, you have the floor,
Madam.

REP. HALL (59TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Amendment. What we have found, over the course of several years is, our home inspectors truly were the first line of inspection on these troubled foundations. With the Captive Insurance that we implemented in last session, we found that we were running short of the actual engineers that would take a look at these foundations.

A lot of people don't realize under the Captive Insurance, when you purchase a home, part of ensuring that you can apply for this Captive Insurance in the future, is to have an engineer inspection. So, not only are our buyers having home inspections, radon inspects, septic inspections, water inspections, now they're being really required to have engineers look at these foundations. So, by this new Amendment that was added to this Bill is now allowing the people that have been inspecting these foundations for years to actually do it and be
certified to do it.

So, I rise in support, in strong support. This is gonna make it much easier for the buyers, for the home inspectors. And it -- it certainly layer -- takes away a layer of bureaucracy in applying for the Captive Insurance. So, I'm a strong supporter of this Amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam. Would you care to remark further of the Amendment? Representative Delnicki, you have the floor, sir.

REP. DELNICKI (14TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in support of this. For far too long, there was no way to know whether an inspector truly had the credentials to spot the problem. And far too many people were victims and became victims of home inspections in the past. This will ensure that there are no new victims due to the fact that an inspector provided a deficient report and didn't know what they were looking for. Definitely a step
in the right direction. And I wholeheartedly support it. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to 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, 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
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

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 7286 as amended by House "A".

Total number Voting 138
Necessary for Passage 70
Those voting Yea 138
Those voting Nay 0
Those absent and not voting 13

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Bill as amended passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 193?

CLERK:

On page 14, House Calendar 193, Substitute House Bill No. 7173, AN ACT CONCERNING CONTRACTS BETWEEN HEALTH INSURERS, OPTOMETRISTS, AND
OPHTHALMOLOGISTS. Favorable Report of Joint
Standing Committee on Insurance and Real Estate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dathan, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. DATHAN (142ND):

Thank you. Thank you very much, 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's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Will you remark, Madam?

REP. DATHAN (142ND):

Excuse me. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an Amendment, LCO 9213. I would ask that the Clerk please call the Amendment so that I can be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9213, which
will be designated House Amendment "A"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 9213, offered by Representative Scanlon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing none, Representative Dathan, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. DATHAN (142ND):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This law makes a change to the 2015 law that provides an insurer cannot mandate discounts, optometric services or procedures unless the insurer provides insurance coverage for these services. This Amendment closes the loop -- this law -- sorry, excuse me, the Bill and the Amendment close a loophole that added products to the prohibited actions here. The change in the Amendment adds the 1947 Taft-Hartley Law in Sections 67 to 69. I move adoption.
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before this Chamber is on adoption. Will you remark? Representative Pavalock-D'Amato, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just one question. Does the -- through you, Mr. Speaker. Does the Amendment bring the Bill in compliance with federal law? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Dathan.

REP. DATHAN (142ND):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, it does.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

That's all, Mr. Speaker. And I'll save my remaining remarks for the underlying Bill after the Amendment is adopted. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam. Would you care to 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 against. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. [Gavel] Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Representative Comey, you have the floor, sir -- Madam. Madam. You have the floor, Madam.

REP. COMEY (102ND):

    Thank you very much, Speaker. I just rise in support of this Bill. This Bill will close a loophole in the noncovered services and insure that -- that -- that the discounts and insurers' mandate are not distorting the marketplace. So, I would like to say that I support this Bill. And thank you very much for bringing it forward.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

    Thank you, Madam. Would you care to remark
further? Representative Pavalock-D'Amato, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. PAVALOCK-DAMATO (77TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, as previously stated, this just adds opthalmology to a current existing law and then, also adds products to our current statute; again, what was a Bill that was passed just a couple years back. And I urge my colleagues to support it. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam. Would 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 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? 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 7173, as Amended by House "A".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number Voting</th>
<th>138</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>137</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Bill as amended passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 280?

CLERK:


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):

The question is on acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill? Will you remark, sir?

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Yes, Mr. Speaker. The underlying Bill does exactly what the title says. It removes three sections from -- from the general statutes that are obsolete relating to the Department of Corrections. The Clerk is in possession of an Amendment, LCO 9546. I ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9546, will
be -- which will be designated House Amendment "A"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 9546, offered by Representative Stafstrom, Representative Rebimbas.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Are there any objections? Hearing none, Representative Stafstrom, you have the floor, sir.

REP. STAFSTROM:

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Amendment includes some other language that had a public hearing that came out of the Judiciary Committee, which seeks to continue this legislature's work in a bipartisan fashion to address the opioid epidemic in our state, by providing information on substance abuse treatment options to those who are incarcerated in the Department of Corrections 45 days prior to their release. I move adoption.
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

   The question before the Chamber is on adoption. Will you remark? Representative Rebimbas, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the Amendment. Just a few clarifying questions through you to the good Chairman.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

   Please proceed, Madam.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, to the good Chairman, the Amendment indicates 45 days before someone is released. What happens if the Commissioner does it sooner than 45 days or after 45 days?

   Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

   Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

   Through you, Mr. Speaker. The requirement is
not later than 45 days. So, certainly they can do it beforehand. And there's also, certainly, permissive in it's -- in nature based on timing of release. The expectation here is more of a guideline to make sure the Commissioner does it.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And through you, Mr. Speaker. This is also, the individual who's being released, they have to personally, themselves, request something and identify themselves as someone who may have either had an opioid addiction or currently is under treatment for it. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Stafstrom.

REP. STAFSTROM (129TH):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, that's correct.
The individual incarcerated person has to identify him or herself as having had suffering from Opioid Use Disorder or relapsing into an Opioid Use Disorder.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the good Chairman for his responses. This is a very good Amendment. This is information that would be very helpful for the individual upon release and, hopefully, assist them with their addiction as they move forward. I thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you [laughter], Madam. Would you care to 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, 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 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 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 7217 as amended by House "A".
Total number Voting 136
Necessary for Passage 69
Those voting Yea 136
Those voting Nay 0
Those absent and not voting 15

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Bill as amended passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 46?

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Linehan, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you very much, 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 Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Will you remark? You have the floor, Madam.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. What this Bill does is simply extend the reporting deadline for Special X17-6, which we passed in 2017. Which is a Task Force to study the voluntary admission to the Department of Children and Families from January 1st, 2019 to June 1st, 2020. I move adoption --

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Question --

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

-- for acceptance of passage of the Bill. My apologies.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

[Laughter] Thank you, Madam. Would you care -- would you care to remark further on the Bill before us? Representative Green, you have the
floor, Madam.

REP. GREEN (55TH):

   Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in full support of this Bill, and it's really just an extension of a deadline to June 2020 as the good lady said. And it's a good Bill, should pass. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

   Thank you, Madam. Would you 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 Representative 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. 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 5779.

Total number Voting 135
Necessary for Passage 68
Those voting Yea 135
Those voting Nay 0
Those absent and not voting 16

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Bill passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 122?

CLERK:


DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Gresko, you have the floor, sir.

REP. GRESKO (121ST):

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 CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Will you remark? You have the floor --

REP. GRESKO (121ST):

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

-- sir.

REP. GRESKO (121ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Bill prohibits --

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

[Gavel] You may proceed, sir.

REP. GRESKO (121ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill prohibits the intentional release of lighter than air, a/k/a helium balloons, by individuals into our atmosphere. I move adoption. Let's pass the Bill.
Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further on the Bill before us? Would you care to remark further on the Bill before us? If -- Representative Harding, you have the floor, sir.

REP. HARDING (107TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to thank Representative Haines for all her work on this Bill. I know she worked very hard to make this happen. It's been a critical issue in her District and many Districts that have lakes and streams and rivers, which is our entire state, essentially. So, thank you to the -- the Vice-Chair and the Chair and, particularly Representative Haines for her work. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you 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 -- 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 5314.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number Voting</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>123</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Bill passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 484?

CLERK:
On page 38, House Calendar 484, House Bill No. 6714, AN ACT CONCERNING THE COST OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES. Favorable Report of Joint Standing Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Ritter, you have the floor --

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. --

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

-- sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I -- I make a motion to move this -- refer this Bill to the Appropriations Committee. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question is on referring the Bill to Appropriations. Is there no objection? So ordered. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 175?

CLERK:

On page 12, House Calendar 175, House Bill No.
5213, AN ACT EXPANDING REQUIRED HEALTH INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR HEARING AIDS. Favorable Report of Joint Standing Committee on Insurance and Real Estate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Scanlon, you have the floor, sir.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance on 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? Would you care to remark, sir?

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk is in possession of Amendment LCO 8789. I ask that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 8789, which
will be designated House Amendment "A"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 8789, offered by Representative Pavalock-D'Amato and Representative Scanlon.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there any objections to summarization? Hearing none, Representative Scanlon, you have the floor, sir.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I -- this Amendment makes slight technical changes to the underlying Bill. And I would move adoption and then will speak on the Bill when we get past the Amendment. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question is on adoption? Would you care to remark further? Representative Pavalock-D'Amato, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. PAVALOCK-DAMATO (77TH):
Thank you. I just wanted to ask, the Amendment, does it comply with requests and recommendations by the Department of Insurance?
Through you.
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):
Representative Scanlon.
REP. SCANLON (98TH):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. yes.
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):
Representative Pavalock-D'Amato.
REP. PAVALOCK-DAMATO (77TH):
Thank you. And I'll save the remaining -- my remaining comments for the underlying Bill.
DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):
Thank you, Madam. Would you care to remark further on the Amendment before us? Would you care to 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, nay. The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. [Gavel] Would you care to remark further on the Bill as amended?

Representative Scanlon, you have the floor, sir.

REP. SCANLON (98TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And good evening everybody. This Bill comes to us from my good friend, the ranking member of the Committee, Representative Pavalock-D'Amato. It passed with bipartisan support in our Committee. And all it does, is it removes the age restriction right now around coverage for hearing aids by insurance companies. Right now, the federal law and law of Connecticut is that it's only covered for those under the age of 13, despite the fact that there are obviously many, many people in our society who need and utilize hearing aids well past their 13th birthday. This Bill would change that.

And again, I want to commend my friend, the ranking member, on introducing this Bill and for all
the hard work she's put in to make this Bill happen.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further? Representative Pavalock-D'Amato, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. PAVALOCK-D'AMATO (77TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just also want to thank my -- yeah, Chair -- Chairman, thank you -- Chairman for also his cooperation and hard work. And I urge my colleagues to support this Bill.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam. Would 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? 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 5213 as amended by House "A".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number Voting</th>
<th>135</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The Bill as amended passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk, please call Calendar No. 323?

CLERK:

On page 67, House Calendar 323, Substitute House Bill No. 7219, AN ACT CONCERNING SCHOOL
SECURITY. Favorable Report of Joint Standing Committee on Education.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Verrengia, you have the floor, sir.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH):

Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

The question is on acceptance of the Joint's Committee Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Representative, you have the floor, sir.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this Bill requires DEMHS to update state school security and safety plan standards and simplify certain school security reporting requirements and school security infrastructure, grant applications, in an effort to streamline the process. It also develops criteria to identify qualified school security consultants.
Mr. Speaker, I want to give a special shout out to the individuals who worked in this Working Group and were proactive from the outset and spent a lot of time over the summer months in coming up with this Bill, particularly ranking member, Representative Sredzinski, Representative Hall, Representative Carpino, and Representative Borer, who I believe did an outstanding job on this much needed Bill.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further on the Bill before us? Representative Sredzinski, you have the floor.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I thank the Chairman for his comments; I -- I do appreciate them. As many in the room know, we set out to form this School Safety Working Group to answer the question, are we doing everything we can to keep our kids safe at school. This group convened. I also want to
mention former Representative, Brian Oler, who is part of the group that put this team together.

Many ideas came out of this Committee, out of this Working Group. Many ideas came out of it, including the physical security of the buildings, school safety personnel, and even social emotional learning amongst other instructional items.

The good Chairman did a good job explaining what is in the Bill. But I would like to say that there is no fiscal impact in the Bill, and that this is supposed to be done within available appropriations and came out of the Public Safety Committee unanimously. Great Bill, ought to pass, sir. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further on the Bill before us? Representative Borer, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. BORER (115TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I, too, rise in support of this Bill, which has been said earlier as
a combination of recommendations that came out of our School Security Working Group. The School Security Working Group was formed in response -- in response to the Parkland Florida shooting, which was yet, another terrible reminder that we need to do everything we can and leave no stone unturned when it comes to school security.

When Connecticut had our own horrific tragedy in 2012 following the Sandy Hook tragedy, the Sandy Hook Commission was developed. And it reviewed school design, mental health, and school security. Six years later, we thought it would be best to get together and reevaluate that legislation and see if there was anything that needed to be updated. This was a great bipartisan working group. We know that this Bill is not a completely end all, solve all of our issues when it comes to school security but it's a good start.

This Bill recognizes -- I want to recognize Representative Sledzinski, our good Chair of Public Safety, Representative Verrengia, Representative
Hall, Representative Carpino. We know that our children spend one thousand hours in school and they should not be spending one minute of those hours in fear of their lives. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

    Thank you, Madam. Care to remark further?

Representative Hall, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. HALL (59TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to echo the same sentiments as my fellow representatives. I would like to thank the Chair of Public Safety and the ranking member for recognizing the hard work that this Committee put in over the past year through the summer, I want to add. And it truly was a bipartisan working group.

    I think everybody in this building can agree that school security is not a partisan issue in any way, shape, or form. This group worked to that end. This is a -- a small piece of the many Bills that came out of this Working Group. We have a fantastic group of Bills coming out of Education. We're very
hopeful. Those are going to moving forward as well. I think there was a total of 18 Bills that this Working Group put together.

It was -- it was truly a -- a labor of love on everybody that participated in this group. We had a -- a very wide and vast difference of opinion on several things, and we talked 'em out and we came together with the Bills that we moved forward.

So again, I'd like to thank all the members that gave of their time throughout the summer and the fall and put together these group of great Bills. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you to the Committee. And thank you for the indulgence.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam. Representative Linehan, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. A few questions to the proponent of the Bill, if I may?

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Please proceed, Madam.
REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Thank you, sir. Through you, Mr. Speaker. how does social emotional learning fit within this Bill.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Verrengia.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH):

There's nothing that specifies those particular areas other than DEMHS will be working in -- in consultation with the State Department of Education to develop those standards. So, if those standards were to fall short, we can work through those agencies to include those.

Through you,

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Great. Thank you very much. And I am absolutely believing that we need to look at school security. This is of huge importance to every
person, every student in the state of Connecticut and every parent in the state of Connecticut. Just one last question. Does this -- through you, Mr. Speaker, does this pave the way, possibly, for having armed security guards or arming teachers?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Verrengia.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH):

No.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Representative Linehan.

REP. LINEHAN (103RD):

Excellent. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

That concludes my questions. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam. Would you care to remark further? Representative Carpino, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. CARPINO (32ND):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to point out that this Working Group was also full of community members from across the entire state. So, not only was there a -- a diverse group of legislatures there, but we had experts from the -- across the entire state who gave us their honest opinions as to what is going on in their schools. This group is not done. It is a group that I hope continues to meet as the safety needs of our students and our teachers and the community members who utilize those schools in evolving task that we need to continue making sure that we do our very best. But there was a tremendous group of folks in that room and the energy, I hope, continues. Thank you, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam. Would you care to remark further? Representative Hall, for the second time.

REP. HALL (59TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the second time. I just wanted to respond to the good Representative
Linehan's question. The component for the emotional and social learning piece is in the Education piece. So, we're hoping that, and I -- I would be happy to share the Bill number with her as a side bar. But it is in the other component coming through Education. So, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam. Representative Cheeseman, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. CHEESEMAN (37TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I just want to share my gratitude for everyone who worked on this Bill. As we know, the safety of our children is paramount and I also want to acknowledge the great work of the Education Committee in looking at that social emotional piece.

If we address the underlying mental health issues in our young people, be they in terms of school security or be they in terms of just ensuring that they do not succumb to despair. Four times as many Connecticut residents kill themselves as die in
homicides. And unfortunately, the suicide rate among girls, is approaching that in boys. So, I want to thank everyone for their help. I look forward to moving this forward. And thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Thank you, Madam. Would you care to remark further on the Bill before us? Would you 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.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

CLERK:

House Bill 7291.

Total number Voting 136
Necessary for Passage 69
Those voting Yea 136
Those voting Nay 0
Those absent and not voting 15

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 421?

CLERK:


SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Gilchrest of the 18th, Madam,
you have the floor.

REP. GILCHREST (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Question before the Chamber is on acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Representative Gilchrest.

REP. GILCHREST (18TH):

The Clerk is in possession of an Amendment, LCO No. 9551. I ask the Clerk to call the Amendment and be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9551, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 9551, offered by Representative Gilchrest, Representative Comey, et al.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection to summarization? Seeing none, Representative Gilchrest, you have the floor.

REP. GILCHREST (18TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This is a strike-all Amendment, which takes a much needed first step towards improving public health, professionalizing the industries of esthetics, nail technicians, and eyelash technicians, and preventing human trafficking.

In Section 1, this strengthens guidance to local health departments, which is supported by the Connecticut Association of Departments of Health. It acknowledges the concerns that we've heard from residents across the state who have gotten harmed or received infections at nail salons. The guidelines state they shall include but not be limited to, and so that does give guidance but allows for the Departments of -- local Departments of Public Health
to weigh in with what they already might be doing. And it does increase the fee. It says that it can be up to $250 dollars to -- to conduct an annual inspection. Annual inspections are already required by state law.

In Section 2, this is a new piece for the state. This requires the Department of Public Health to work with the local Departments of Public Health and others to do a scope of practice. What we heard in trying to get full licensure is that we need more weigh-in from the various partners in the state. And so, this scope of practice is a great first step. It will be able to figure things out, such as the reasonable number of hours for training and the cost -- and weighing that with the cost of schooling, various pathways to licensure.

There are three separate licensures that we're talking about. And so also looking at could there be a combination of licenses. And we just want to be able to ensure that folks don't lose their jobs as we proceed in the state with licensing.
And so to -- to finalize this summary, we are the only state in the country that doesn't license estheticians and nail technicians. And so, this scope of practice and this increased oversight by local Departments of Public Health is a first step, an important first step. And so I move adoption.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question before the Chamber is on adoption of the Amendment. Will you remark on the Amendment? Will you remark on the Amendment? Representative Petit, Amendment or the Bill -- underlying Bill when adopted?

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Amendment.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much. Let me try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER CANDELARIA (95TH):

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The
Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Representative Petit of the 22nd District, sir, you have the floor.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would agree with the good proponent's comments that this is a good first step. The Bill as essentially written had a variety of issues related to the ability of the Department of Public Health to administer this appropriately and have appropriate funding. And I think the changes that are in here, specifically with the review -- review of the scope of practice, fixes must of this issue.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions for the proponent.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

She looks prepared. Representative Petit, please proceed.

REP. PETIT (22ND):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. What's the fiscal note on this amended Bill?
Through you,
Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative Gilchrest.

REP. GILCHREST (18TH):
There is no fiscal impact in this Amendment.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative Petit.

REP. PETIT (22ND):
There's a $250 dollar charge that can be administered each year to nail salons, etcetera. Is that -- is that a -- a yearly fee? And once the fee is charged, where does the money go?
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Representative Gilchrest.

REP. GILCHREST (18TH):
That fee is up to $250 dollars, and it will go back to the local Department of Public Health.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.
REP. PETIT (22ND):

Thank you. I -- I will just end with a comment. I think this review of the scope of practice will allow everyone to come to the table, the people involved in the education of folks in this industry. The Department of Public Health in a state and local level and is the appropriate first step. And I urge my colleagues to support this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Representative Comey of the 102nd, Madam, you have the floor.

REP. COMEY (102ND):

I thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. I would just like to thank Representative Gilchrest for her hard work and her tenacity approaching this issue. I have been serving on my local Health Department Board for our -- our community health improvement project, and
this has been a priority for them. They have been working with the salons already -- with the -- the nail tech -- the nail salons already to make sure that they have some -- some health awareness of what the health issues are and what their role in keeping it safe places for women to get their -- their -- their nails done and -- and other esthetics. So, but they would love some more resources. I think is a good first step for this.

I was also -- as having a -- one of the well-known cosmetology schools in the state, we have been working closely with -- with the schools, as well, to make sure that their needs are met, that we understand the -- the -- the -- the field, and the opportunities that they have to provide real careers for -- for folks in this industry and still be business friendly, at the same time.

So, thank you for all this work that we've done on it. And I'm looking forward to casting my vote. And I would love everyone else to support this as well. Thank you.
SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    Thank you very much, Madam. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Representative Genga, of the 10th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. GENGA (10TH):

    Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this Bill. And ever since this issue came up, personally, I've got involved with it because of a personal situation. I talked to ten or 12 people in the profession, all in favor of it. And as the proponent of the Bill said, we're the only state that doesn't have this. And we need to protect our taxpayers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

    I thought you were going to rise to say you get a manicure and pedicure, like I do, Representative but you fell short. [Laughter] Will you remark further on the Bill before us? If not, staff and guests, 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? Please don't run, I will wait. Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, please check the board to ensure your vote has been properly cast. The machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. The Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 6742 as amended by House "A".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number Voting</td>
<td>135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for Passage</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those absent and not voting</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill as amended passes. [Gavel] Will the Clerk please call House Calendar 427?
CLERK:


SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey of 133rd, Madam you have the floor.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Will you remark?

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this Bill creates a Connecticut-Wide Municipal Redevelopment Authority. And Mr. Speaker, the Clerk is in
possession of an Amendment, LCO No. 9552. And I would ask that the Clerk please call the Amendment, and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Will the Clerk please call LCO No. 9552, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A"?

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 552, offered by Representative Aresimowicz --

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection to summarization? Seeing none, Representative McCarthy Vahey, you have the floor.

REP. McCarthy VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Amendment is a strike-all Amendment. It creates a quasi-public agency for Tier 3 and Tier 4 municipalities, any municipality over 70 thousand
members, and any two or more municipalities over 75 -- 70 thousand members interested in opting in.

The Authority's goal is to assist these municipalities in stimulating economic development, encouraging residential housing developments, supporting the creation of thriving downtowns. Participating municipalities must have a memorandum of understanding with the Redevelopment Authority and appoint a local development board.

The Amendment outlines the powers and responsibilities of the Redevelopment Authority and the participating boards. And I move adoption.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Madam. Will you remark further on the Amendment before us? Representative Zawistowski of the 61st District. Madam, you have the floor.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I do appreciate very much the removal of eminent domain from this -- from the underlying Bill. I do have one question.
Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey looks prepared.

Representative Zawistowski, please proceed.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Under this Amendment, would the Authority have the ability to ask or to compel one of its member municipalities to exercise its own rights of eminent domain in an authority project?

Through you,

Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. McCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I -- I will reserve the rest of my comments for the Bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Thank you very much, Madam. Will you remark further on the Amendment before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. [Gavel] The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Mr. Speaker, a few questions for the proponent of the Bill.

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Will -- will employees of the -- of this new Authority, a quasi-public, be state employees in terms of salary and/or benefits and retirement?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
Representative McCarthy Vahey.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the employees of the quasi-public Agency would be employees of the state for healthcare and retirement. And for everything else, it would be up to the quasi-public Agency.

Through you.

Representative Zawistowski.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And the Board of Directors, will they be compensated? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. No.

Representative Zawistowski.
REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

And thank you for that. The Authority will have the ability to bond and to borrow. Through you, Mr. Speaker. if the -- if the Authority is unable to pay for these -- for any of the borrowing, is the State on the hook?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And would the Authority -- the Authority has the ability to collect fees in lieu of taxes to their towns. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):
Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes it is.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

I thank you for that. And would they require -- the -- that be covered in the MOU?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. McCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Could I ask the good Representative to just clarify what that meant?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Yeah.

REP. McCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Through you.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Zawistowski, one more try at that one please.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

Absolutely. The -- right here, the Authority
will have the -- have the ability to enter into agreements with -- that would have the private developers, owners, or leasees pay the Authority versus paying municipalities? Would the municipalities and the Authority have to go into a MOU to agree to that?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. MCCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

And thank you for that. And for legislative intent, does this Bill preclude municipalities from forming their own redevelopment authorities?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.
REP. McCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you. No it does not.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

And again, for legislative intent, does this Bill impede or make up obsolete any current municipal redevelopment authorities?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative McCarthy Vahey.

REP. McCARTHY VAHEY (133RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you. No.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Zawistowski.

REP. ZAWISTOWSKI (61ST):

And I thank the good Representative for -- for all these answers. Mr. Speaker, this creates a -- a -- a big new statewide quasi-public that has broad authorities. I'm concerned about the costs. The fiscal note does not note any costs paid by the
states or the municipalities, which I think is probably inaccurate. And while I do appreciate the -- the intent of trying to organize or redevelop an effort, I just can't support it at this time.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Madam. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? If not, staff and guests, 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 has been properly cast. I will wait for Toni. I will always wait for Toni, nearly the same stature as the minority leader. If all the members have
voted, the machine will be locked, and the Clerk
will take a tally. The Clerk will announce the
tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 7209 as amended by House "A".

Total number Voting 138
Necessary for Passage 70
Those voting Yea 81
Those voting Nay 57
Those absent and not voting 13

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Bill as amended passes. [Gavel]

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

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. We have a very busy
week next week. So, I would just encourage people
to think about that and plan ahead. We expect to
have some very late nights. We've had some earlier
nights this week. Because of that, we are gonna
come in on Monday, Memorial Day, startin' -- I'm
just kidding. [laughter] I'm kidding. I'm kidding. [laughter] The death stare from across the way, I had to correct myself quickly. We're gonna come back in Tuesday at noon. But again, everybody have a great Memorial Day. But we'll start at noon on Tuesday and we'll have some late nights. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much. So, for the last Bill of the day, will the Clerk please call House Calendar 121?

CLERK:


SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Pretty interesting. House Calendar 121 and I'll call on Joe Gresko of District 121. You have the floor, sir.

REP. GRESKO (121ST):
Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Representative Gresko, you have the floor.

REP. GRESKO (121ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This Bill authorizes the Energy and Environmental Protection Commissioner to adopt regulations regarding -- requiring hunters wear either florescent orange, like they can now, or pink clothing when hunting. I particularly would like to thank the introducer of the Bill, Representative Craig Fishbein with the hopes that -- hope by the end of session, we will get a model of the proposed attire. [Laughter] I urge you to passage.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question before the Chamber is on adoption
of the Bill. Will you remark? Will you remark? If not, staff and guests, to the well of the House. Members, 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.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, please check the board to ensure your vote has been properly cast. 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 5304.

Total number Voting 133
Necessary for Passage 67
Those voting Yea 120
Those voting Nay

13

Those absent and not voting

18

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Bill passes. [Gavel] Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Perillo of the 113th.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For Journal Notation, the following members missed votes, Representatives Camillo and Labriola for medical reasons, Representative Smith out of state, and Representative Betts with legislative business outside the Chamber.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much. The Journal will so note. Representative Reyes of the 75th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. REYES (75TH):

Mr. -- Mr. Speaker for purpose of Journal Notation, Associates that missed votes today, sick, Representative Orange, Rose, Garibay, and Young.
Business outside Chamber, Abercrombie, Hall, Rojas, Walker, and Reyes. Business in District, Boyd, Stallworth, Riley, and Phipps. Personal, Representative Tercyak and Genga. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Representative Reyes, you had me in there; right? I was in a couple budget negotiations. Thank you, sir. Any other announcements or introductions? Representative Porter of the 94th District is not in her seat. Representative Horn of the 120th is in her seat -- or the 64th, I'm --

REP. HORN (64TH):

64th.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

-- sorry, Madam.

REP. HORN (64TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, for the correction. As everyone rushes for the doors, I rise for the purpose of an announcement.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):
Please proceed.

REP. HORN (64TH):

The Appropriations Committee will be having a public hearing on Tuesday starting at 9:00 o'clock, followed by a Committee Meeting at 10:00 o'clock.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

That sounds fun.

REP. HORN (64TH):

Oh, absolutely.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

[Laughter] Thank you, Madam.

REP. HORN (64TH):

That you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Enjoy your weekend.

REP. HORN (64TH):

You, too.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Any other announcements or introductions? Representative Currey, the moment we've been waiting for.
REP. CURREY (11TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. 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):

The question before the Chamber is on adjournment, subject to the call of Chair. Without objection, so ordered. We are adjourned. [Gavel]

(On motion of Representative Currey of the 11th District, the House adjourned at 6:17 o'clock p.m., to meet again at the Call of the Chair.)
CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 336 pages is a complete and accurate transcription of a digital sound recording of the House Proceedings on Wednesday, June 6, 2019.

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