The Senate was called to order at 2:48 p.m., the President in the Chair.

CLERK: Senate will convene immediately. The Senate will convene immediately.

THE CHAIR: [Gavel] Will the Senate please come to order? Members and guests, please rise and [background talking] -- Would the members please rise, as well as guests? And our guest chaplain is the very distinguished Tim Kehoe.

GUEST CHAPLAIN TIM KEHOE: May the work that we do benefit all those we serve. Amen.

THE CHAIR: Amen. And Senator Anwar, would you please come forward as you are the only senator, and would I,
would I say one of our most wonderful senators, to do the Pledge of Allegiance.

SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):

Thank you. [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.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Thank you. And at this time, the Chair will entertain any points of personal privilege, if there are any. Seeing none. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, does the Clerk have Senate Agenda No. 1 on his desk?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

The Clerk is in position of Senate Agenda No. 1, dated Thursday, May 9th, 2019.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move all items on Senate Agenda No. 1, dated Thursday, May 9, 2019, be acted upon as indicated and that the agenda be incorporated by reference in Senate Journal and Senate transcripts.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I have some markings before we get to some of our bills.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar Page 15, Calendar 201, Senate Bill 64, I'd like to recommit that item.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 53, Calendar 316, Senate Bill 372, I'd like to remove that item from the foot of the Calendar.
THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 53, Calendar 317, Senate Bill 393, I'd like to remove that item from the foot of the Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 19, Calendar 253, Senate Bill 765, I'd like to refer that item to the Judiciary Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And for the very first of our go's, on Calendar Page 10, Calendar 155, Senate Bill 274, I'd like to mark that go. On Calendar Page 3, Calendar 81, Senate Bill 806, I'd like to mark that go. On Calendar Page 15, Calendar 202, Senate Bill 164, I'd like to mark that go. On Calendar Page 16, Calendar 218, Senate Bill 358, I'd like to mark that go. And on Calendar Page 30, Calendar 359, Senate Bill 859, I'd like to mark that go. Thank you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

So noted. Thank you, Senator Duff. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 10, Calendar Number 155, substitute for Senate Bill Number 274, AN ACT REQUIRING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE LEARN HERE, LIVE HERE PROGRAM. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Could you stand at ease, please?

THE CHAIR:

The chamber will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I thank you, Madam President. Madam President, would the Clerk call the first item?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. I believe that item has been called. And Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):
Thank you very much, Madam President. Great to see you today. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. This is AN ACT REQUIRING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE LEARN HERE, LIVE HERE PROGRAM. This is a bill that's strongly supported by the realtor community in Connecticut to help first-time homebuyers choose to set down their roots in Connecticut. But Madam President, the Clerk is in position of LCO Amendment Number 7191. I move the Amendment and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO Number 7191, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. This Amendment comes from the esteemed ranking member, my
good colleague from Fairfield. I would move for a voice vote and encourage my colleagues to accept the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. All in favor of -- Well, let's ask this. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support and acknowledge the support and effort of the chair of the committee. I want to thank him extensively and I urge support of this. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will anyone remark further on the Amendment? Senator Haskell, would you like to -- Okay. So with that, we will ask for a voice vote on the Amendment as discussed. All in favor of the Amendment, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? Amendment is adopted. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to refer this item to the Appropriations Committee, please.

THE CHAIR:

So noted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 3, Calendar Number 81, substitute for Senate Bill Number 806, AN ACT PROHIBITING A FINDING OF NEGLECT IN CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Senator Slap.

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance to the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill. As mentioned, there is -- The Clerk is in possession of an Amendment, LCO Number 7729. I move the Amendment can seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk, would you kindly read the Amendment?

CLERK:

LCO Number 7729, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Slap.

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Yes, thank you. Just very briefly, the underlying bill and the Amendment seeks to redefine neglect under criminal statutes and offers parents and guardians an affirmative defense if they are charged with neglect when it comes to caring for their children who are 12 and older in a public space. And again, ask for the chamber's support of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Slap. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? And would you like a voice vote on the Amendment, Senator Slap, or a roll call?

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Voice vote's fine. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. All in favor of the Amendment, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? Amendment is adopted. Senator Duff.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to move this item to the Judiciary, refer this item to the Judiciary Committee, please.

THE CHAIR:

So noted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 15, Calendar Number 202, substitute for Senate Bill Number 164, AN ACT INCLUDING CERTAIN MENTAL OR EMOTIONAL IMPAIRMENTS WITHIN THE DEFINITION OF "PERSONAL INJURY" UNDER THE WORKERS' COMPENSATION STATUTES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. The Clerk has an Amendment, LCO Number 8127. Will -- Okay. Madam President, I move the acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The question is on -- [crosstalk]

CLERK:
LCO Number 8127, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

There you have it. We will get it all out there for you, Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

[Laughing] Thank you very much. Madam President, I move the adoption of the Amendment and move to waive the reading. I would seek leave of the chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Madam President, this is a bill that will address first responders in their ability to collect worker's compensation after certain mental or emotional impairments as a result of their work.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, would you like a voice vote on the Amendment, Senator Kushner?

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

If there's no objection, I would like this done by voice vote.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you. All in favor of the Amendment as discussed, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? Amendment is adopted. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to refer this item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 16, Calendar Number 218, Senate Bill Number 358, AN ACT CONCERNING EMPLOYEE VOTING OPPORTUNITIES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kushner.

CLERK:

There are Amendments.
Ah. Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Madam President, I move the acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Yes, Madam President. There is an Amendment on this bill and that is -- The Clerk has the Amendment. It's LCO Number 7013. Will the Clerk please call the Amendment?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Mr. Clerk.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Oh, I have a different number. Sorry. Is that an old one? I'm sorry. That was an earlier draft. It's LCO Number 7327.

CLERK:

LCO Number 7327, Senate Schedule A.
SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This is AN ACT CONCERNING EMPLOYEE VOTING OPPORTUNITIES, and this bill will provide for workers to have up to four hours’ time off to vote without pay.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, would you like a voice vote on the Amendment, Senator?

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Yes, please, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. All in favor of the Amendment as discussed, please signify by saying, "Aye."
Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? Amendment is adopted. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to refer this item to the Appropriations Committee, please.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 30, Calendar Number 359, Senate Bill Number 859, AN ACT CONCERNING COMMUNITY HEALTH WORKERS. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Daugherty Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):
Yes, Madam President. The Clerk is in position of a strike-all Amendment, LCO 8246. I would ask that the Clerk please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO Number 8246, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

I move adoption of the Amendment and ask its reading be waived and seek leave of the chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This bill establishes a certification for community health workers. Community health workers are public health outreach professionals with in-depth understanding of a community's experience, language, culture, and socioeconomic needs who perform specific tasks, such as being a liaison between community members and health-care and social service providers and
outreach advocacy care coordination. This bill passed out of the Public Health Committee unanimously.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? Would you like, Senator Abrams, a voice vote on the Amendment?

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Yes, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. All in favor of the Amendment as discussed, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? Amendment is adopted. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee, please.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Would the Senate stand at ease, please?

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Our first item to go is Calendar Page 24, Calendar 289, Senate Bill 1080; followed by Calendar 34, Calendar 388, Senate Bill 843, marked go; followed by Calendar Page 42, Calendar 441, Senate Bill 964, go; followed by Calendar Page 28, Calendar 346, Senate Bill 521, go; followed by Calendar Page 48, Calendar 290, Senate Bill 140, go; followed by Calendar Page 44, Calendar 452, Senate Bill 504, go; followed by Calendar Page 22, Calendar 275, Senate Bill 229, go. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Duff. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 24, Calendar Number 289, substitute for Senate Bill Number 1080, AN ACT CONCERNING A TWO-GENERATIONAL INITIATIVE. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Good afternoon, Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Yes, the Clerk is -- Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of LCO 7749. I would ask that the Clerk please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO 7749, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

I move adoption of the Amendment and waive its reading and seek leave of the chamber to summarize.
THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Yes. Madam, could we stand at ease for a moment, Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

We can.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Chamber will be at ease.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Could we resume please?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you. The Amendment -- I apologize. The Amendment on this is to add a cabinet of people to the Advisory Board. Are there any questions? Sorry.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Moore. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I apologize for my confusion. I'd like to now speak on the bill.

THE CHAIR:
No, fur -- Before -- We would love to hear you speak on the bill, but first --

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Oh.

THE CHAIR:

-- we would like to know whether you would like to have an Amendment on a voice vote or via roll call.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Yes, thank you. Amendment on the voice.

THE CHAIR:

Very good. Then, all in favor of the Amendment as discussed, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.
THE CHAIR:

Opposed? Amendment is adopted. Please proceed on the bill, Senator.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you so much, Madam President. Madam President, this is the two-gen initiative that started in 2015 on my first year as a senator. And it is about building a family success cabinet and engaging families together to help them work their way out of poverty by working with different organizations and with the commissioners within the state of Connecticut. And this bill now makes several changes. They're changing it from an initiative to making it really part of the policy to build self-sufficiently, self-sufficiency. This inclusion of this family economic success cabinet will include parents who will have a place at the table. Twenty-five percent of the membership of this cabinet will include parents, because it should be family and parent-driven, understanding the needs of the parents from the parents' point of view. Madam President, I ask everyone to support this legislation. We've had support from both sides of the aisle since its beginning in 2015, and I think this is one of the initiatives and legislation that will really make a difference for families in Connecticut. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Moore. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of the Amendment that was passed and the underlying bill, and I urge my colleagues to support this bill. I think it is, would been good for families and will be helpful for the state of Connecticut moving forward. I understand that there's at least one of our colleagues who was not particularly in favor of the bill. But I employ all legislators, all senators, to vote in favor of the bill today. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much. Senator Logan, will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I just wanted to just rise very briefly to thank Senator Moore and certainly Senator Logan for their work on this. This has been a bill that, an issue, an initiative that Senator Moore has worked tirelessly on since she became a member of the State Senate. So I applaud the fact that we're moving on this. We continue to, to move on the Two-Gen Approach and Initiative. Something that is not only statewide, but Senator Moore has worked nationally as well on this issue and really shown how this initiative and her work on it is something that can be replicated in other states as well. So I just wanted to congratulate her on that and thank everybody so much for their hard work on this issue. And it will, it will make a difference and it will help families in the long run for this state. Thank you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further on the bill?

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Madam President, I'd like --

THE CHAIR:

Yes, Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

I'd like to correct the LCO number. The correct number is 7575.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. We'll just ask Senator Moore, can you please repeat that number, that LCO number, please?

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

LCO 7575.

CLERK:

LCO Number 7575, Senate Schedule B.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. We just need to stand at ease for a moment, please.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I think we had a little bit of an issue, so I make a motion that we reconsider Senate Amendment A, LCO 7749.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO 7749, Senate Amendment A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I make a motion to reject Senate Amendment A, LCO 7749.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. So moved, and all in favor of rejection of Amendment A, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:
Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? Motion carries. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I now yield to Senator Moore.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Moore. The second time is the charm. [laughing]

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

We believe. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Yes, Madam President. The Clerk is in possession of a strike-all Amendment, LCO 7575. I would ask that the Clerk please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.
CLERK:

The Amendment was previously called and marked.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Yes, I move adoption of the Amendment, waive its reading, and seek leave of the chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Please proceed.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Yes, Madam President, this Amendment clarifies who is a part of the cabinet for the Two-Generational Initiative. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Moore. Will you remark further? Senator Formica has just stood. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Good afternoon.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

I just have a question for the proponent of the Amendment, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Please proceed.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good afternoon, Senator.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Good afternoon.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

In -- on lines 11, this talks about the development of an infrastructure to promote data sharing within and between state agencies. Is this referring to
the digital front door that has been proposed by the Commissioner of the Department of Administrative Services? Is that the same or an overlap or a similar consideration? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. This is a combination and part of that initiative that the Commissioner has hired David Wilkinson to work on that we can be transparent in helping parents move through the systems.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The Commissioner of DAS? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Through you. Yes. Through you, Madam President. Yes.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):
Okay. Thank you very much for that --

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

-- for that answer. And I believe that -- Thank you for your patience, Madam President. I believe that's the extent of my questions this afternoon. Thank you so much for your answer, Senator.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Formica. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Yeah. I rise just to raise a small concern about the bill that's before us. I think that this is a laudable program. I think it is being developed with good intentions. I would be in complete support of this initiative, except in looking and reviewing the fiscal note. It makes it clear that this Amendment is going to allow the parent and family participants of this Two-Generational
Initiative to be compensated for the activities therein. And it's just something I don't agree with. I don't see a reason why folks that are involved in this process, who I think would be in this initiative voluntarily because of their concern over the effects and outcomes that the Two-Generational Initiative is designed to look into, and I don't see any reason why the state taxpayers should be responsible for payments to the parent and family participants of this program. So I'll be voting no today, and I'm very sorry that that has to happen. I would like to support the program, but I cannot under the circumstances. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the bill? On the Amendment. Apologies. Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, we will -- Would you like a voice vote on the Amendment? Yes. All in favor of the Amendment as discussed, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? Thank you. It, the Amendment is adopted. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you. Madam President, while I'm going to ask for this to go on the Consent Calendar, but I guess
it cannot go for a vote. I do want to say the purpose of paying, giving the parents a stipend has a reason. Everyone who sits on this advisory board is receiving some type of compensation. Whether they're working for a nonprofit as a part of an organization, whether they're a legislator, whoever they are, every single person is receiving some type of compensation. And we talk about wanting to support par -- families. And I believe that when a parent travels from Hartford, Connecticut, to Vermont to represent the state of Connecticut on this Two-Gen Initiative, that they should be compensated for their time, because they are just an equal partner in this initiative as I am when I go. When I go to New Hampshire or Maine or one of these states to represent the Two-Gen Initiative, I'm being compensated as a senator. These parents are equal partners in this initiative, and I believe that we should compensate them, because if we want to really have people engaged, and they're taking away from their busine -- from their jobs and their families, they pay for daycare, they pay for their transportation, that they should be equally compensated. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Moore. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. To Senator Moore, if I may, through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Yes, please proceed.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Senator Moore, I heard what you just said and I am now curious. Is the compensation one of stipend or is the compensation one of either salary or a payment of a certain amount? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. Thank you for that. It is a stipend, and it has not been -- We haven't decided what that is. It could be mileage. It could be $100 dollars. It depends on how many days this person is staying away. But it is a stipend. It's just something to say, we recognize and value your support.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Moore. Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

And -- Through you, Madam President. I know it says within available appropriations, but who is ultimately the one who decides the value of that stipend? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Through you, Madam President. It will be the advisory board that will look at what that stipend is.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

And, through you, Madam President, for our purpose of understanding the elements they would look at, is it your opinion that this would be based upon out-of-pocket expenses, gas, travel, things of that nature? Through you. Is that correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Through you, Madam President. Thank you. Yes. In the -- Let me just say, in the past, we have been able to get outside supporters to pay if they go and stay overnight at an event, but we don't pay them usually for daycare. We don't usually pay them for travel. So it'll be the advisory and each of the leaders of the House, the majority and the minority House will get to select who those people are to make those decisions on what it is and how it's formulated.
THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Then for legislative intent perhaps, this is not meant to be, if you would, a wage or a salary of some sort? Would that be accurate? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Through you, Madam President. That is accurate. It is not a wage or a salary.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I thank Senator Moore for the answers to my questions. I had the same concerns as Senator Sampson. In fact, we had an Amendment that we do have on the system that we are not gonna call. But we were concerned about what the elements were relative to that compensation. And I believe what I heard is this is really a nominal amount of money relative to travel time so that the board can do their work and the people on the board can get to their work. So thank you very
much, Madam President. Once again, thank you, Senator Moore.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Pardon me, pardon me. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, there was interest in having a roll call vote. So, Mr. Clerk, would you please call the vote and the machine will be opened.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 1080 as amended by Senate B. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 1080 as amended by Senate B. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be closed and the Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1080 as amended by Senate B.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Yea</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] Legislation is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 34, Calendar Number 388, Senate Bill Number 843, AN ACT CONCERNING THE UNLAWFUL DISSEMINATION OF INTIMATE IMAGES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, good afternoon, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you again, Madam President. This is a bill that comes to us through the Judiciary
Committee on a unanimous vote. What it does is it makes a distinction between the dissemination of a single, of an intimate image to an individual and an intimate image to more than one individual. If the intimate image is disseminated to more than one individual, it increases the penalty from a Class A misdemeanor to a Class D felony. I would urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Great to see you there this afternoon. I also stand in strong support of this particular bill. And it addresses a pernicious issue. Thankfully not rampant, but so serious that when it actually does occur, it has the potential to ruin individuals' lives. The dissemination of intimate images, especially regarding social media, has been gaining attraction over the years with the advent of more and more technology. And what happens is, let's say there's a young man or young woman, typically the case, have a relationship and then something goes wrong, and that individual, let's say the guy, has intimate images of his former girlfriend. Now, if he had sent those pictures to her, that's not a crime. But if he decides, almost like revenge porn, that he's going to disseminate these embarrassing personal intimate images to more than one individual, let's say sends it to a couple of his friends or it gets posted on Facebook, think of the devastation that happens to that young woman. We had ample testimony...
from an individual in the State's Attorney's Office that handles these cases. They're inherently difficult cases. First of all, just gathering up the information from the social media enterprises, Facebook, Twitter, Instagram, whatever, just getting that data to start making your case is difficult as it is. But the victims of these crimes find their lives devastated, because in this day and age, once this -- these intimate images are out there in the public, there's no way to reel them back. When asked by myself, do some of these individuals contemplate suicide, the answer was, yes. And in fact, if you watch some of the real-life criminal shows, there's more than one out there, not necessarily from Connecticut, where young women facing this reality have taken their own lives. Because they feel once their intimate images are out there in the public, their lives are over. They may be ostracized by their peers. They're fearful that their parents and other loved ones will find out about this. It's horrible. So by moving forward with this bill, a good basic ratcheting-up bill to address a very serious problem, we are adding another tool to the toolbox of the state's attorneys here in the state of Connecticut. First of all, by ratcheting up, we enhance the statute of limitations a little bit. But it also allows the state's attorneys to tie in another crime. So now, the perpetrator, rather than finding themselves facing one misdemeanor, by the way our laws work, they will be facing two felonies. Now, all of a sudden, there's extraordinarily serious consequences facing that individual. So they don't flout the law. They don't say just blatantly, no, to the state's attorney and say, "Go prove your case." Because now, should we pass this and it gets signed into law, they'll be facing some heavy prison time. And
now the incentive would be to plead out. And ultimately, while many of us have misgivings regarding the fact that 95 to 90 percent of our cases are pled out, when you have this kind of crime, the last thing a state's attorney wants to do is to have to put the victim on the stand to have to talk about the pain and the suffering and the embarrassment that has befallen him or her regarding these circumstances. If you can get enough pressure on the perpetrator and you can get the evidence and show it to that man or woman, young or old, and get a plea, it's the best for everyone involved. I can't imagine if this happened to myself, my children, someone I loved. But God forbid, this befalls someone that you care about or one of your constituents. It is not unusual to pick up the paper any given day, any given week, and read about a cybercrime. But when it's an intimate image that you felt that would never be revealed to the public that now is all over social media, think about how your life has just changed on a dime. So anything we can do to enhance the ability of the state's attorney to bring justice to these situations, protect the rights and dignity of the victims, and exact a fair plea out of the perpetrators so as to send a message that the state of Connecticut will not countenance this in any way, shape, or form is good public policy. I commend the State's Attorney's Office for bringing this issue before us. I commend Senator Winfield, Chairman Winfield, for moving this bill forward. I'd like to thank ranking member Rosa Rebimbas, my colleague in the House, and Chairman Stafstrom down in the House for working on this legislation. It's a good bill, ought to pass, and I'm very proud to support it. Through you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you again, Madam President. If there's no further conversation and no objection, I ask this be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 28, Calendar Number 346, Senate Bill Number 521, AN ACT CONCERNING MIDDLETOWN AREA TRANSIT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report, move passage of the bill, waive its reading, and seek leave to summarize. This is a very simple
bill. What it does is it asks the Senate to approve an expansion of the board of directors for the Middletown Transit Company. I don't live in Middletown, but I've heard of some of the stories and some of the problems they have and that Middletown itself only has two appointees to the Transit Board. And the board has been suffering. And what I'd like to do is yield to the Senator Lesser and then to Senator Abrams who may want to comment on this particular bill because they live there and they can tell you well what's happening.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cassano. Do you accept the yield, Senator Lesser?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, I do.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President. And I want to thank Senator Cassano for bringing out this important local issue, and specifically what we're looking to do is actually just allow the appointing authorities of Middletown Area Transit to remove directors as the case may be. This is the result of a past experience where we did need to change the board of Middletown Area Transit, but lacked the ability to do so under the statute created, the Transit District Statute. So I think this bill would simply
allow removal of the directors at the discretion of the appointing authority. This was a bipartisan issue locally and hopes it will be so in this chamber as well, and urge all of my colleagues to support this legislation. And thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If I could, I just have a couple questions to the proponent of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, please proceed, Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you. I -- When I first read the bill, it seemed to me that the reason why the request is made is because a particular non-attendance by a party of the board. Is that correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Through you, Madam President. I'm not sure if it's a party of the board. I know that there are only
two appointments for the town, and there is no removal process for anybody from the board.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you. Did -- was -- are you aware if there were conversations that the board had requested this member to just voluntarily resign if by whatever reason they cannot attend any of the meetings? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

That is not anything that was brought before the committee.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It's not in my area. I'm gonna support the bill, but I'm also with the questions, Senator Cassano. Thank you, sir. I think we're setting a very delicate, delicate precedent which I'm very uncomfortable with. If the board itself does not have an established procedure
to remove someone, but yet we come to the Legislature to say, for whatever the reason happens to be, this, we want this person off of this board. I mean, they were put on a board for a specific, for a specific reason. It could be because of their professionalism or because of minority representation or because of the charter or requisites call for that. And for us to pass legislation giving a board the authority to remove someone when they couldn't even testify at the public hearing as to had they asked the person just to step aside, really is I think, to me, is very dangerous. And I hope that this sends a message to other entities that may look into the legislation before us today and maybe read the testimony that's being discussed at the circle and say, well, Geesh, we never thought we should go to the person and ask them to resign. And what happens if this person refused to resign for whatever reason? I mean, I think that tells the whole story. And I don't believe -- Not the fault of anybody in this circle, but I don't think we have the whole story behind it. Again, I'm very wary of it, but I'm gonna support the bill, because I know oftentimes we do things for our particular districts to help them out, while it might not affect everybody else. But I'm afraid it may cause some kind of a precedence setting. So I'm just very cautious. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):
And I -- Senator Witkos, I do appreciate your comments. I feel the same way. However, there is no provision for removal of a board member, even if you've asked them to resign, and that's the difficulty they have is that they, they're dysfunctional, and it's clear from communication from area towns that are involved as well that something's gotta be done. And that's why the bill's before us, so -- But I do understand where you're coming from. I -- Seeing no other comments. If there's no objection, I'd ask it to be put on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you.

CLERK:

Page 42, Calendar Number 441, substitute for Senate Bill Number 964, AN ACT CONCERNING COURT OPERATIONS. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Good afternoon again, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.
THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark further?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. There is a strike-all Amendment, which is LCO 8206. I'd ask the Clerk call the Amendment and be granted leave of the chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO Number 8206, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you again, Madam President. This Amendment has several sections to it. It is the Court Operations Bill once it is adopted. What it does in the first section is it adds the victim service advocate to the list of mandated reporter expanding the reporting of suspected child and, abuse and neglect. And the second section, if there's a dissolution of marriage that is agreed upon by both parties, it reduces the fees that would be paid subject to the parties meeting certain requirements. In the third section, it divides the cost of paying
for appoint -- attorneys who are appointed in juvenile child protection proceedings. In several sections, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, and 11, it updates statutes pertaining to court reporting of recording monitors. In sections 9, 10, and 18, it deals with writs of error and streamlines the process by clarifying if they go to the appellate court. They currently will go to the Supreme Court and then be moved back to the appellate court. In section 12, it formalizes the presentence investigation process, allowing the court to tailor that to meet the specific needs of the case. In section 13, what it does is it specifies the victims and their relatives may be compensated in cases where it is not necessarily clear that would be juvenile matters. In sections 14 through 22, a transfer is a free -- FOI, Freedom of Information appeal hearings from the Hartford judicial district to the New Britain judicial district. This just creates uniformity in our process. Section 15, there's a technical change. Section 16 clarifies petitions to recover damages resulting from personal injury or wrongful death are to be filed in a superior court or a federal district court. Section 17 -- We're almost there. Section 17 clarifies that the party filing a special motion to dismiss shall file such motion 30 days after the return date. Sections 19, 20, and 21 remove references from the statutes to the Bristol Courthouse, and this reflects the closing of the courthouse. Section 23 is a technical change that reflects the way we send decisions electronically. Section 24 adds an additional appellate court judge to grant certification for review of zoning matters. This brings the process in line with the Supreme Court certification of such matters. Section 25 repeals a section of the statute that is no longer necessary, given what we've done in prior sections.
And section 26 repeals another section of the statute. I would urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. This is on the Amendment. It supplements the bill. I want to thank the Judicial Branch, Doreen Del Bianco, circulating in amongst the co-chairs, ranking members, vice chairs, so that everybody's on-board. And actually, assuming that everything goes smoothly this afternoon, this'll be one of the earliest ever days that Court Ops bill got out of the Senate. Usually, we're grappling [sic] of, oh, this bill, with three days to go, so happy to support the Amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise to just ask one question of the proponent of the Amendment, please.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, thank you, Senator Formica. Please proceed.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Good afternoon, Senator.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Good afternoon.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

On or around lines 355 or so, it talks about charges for paper copies. We're having some questions back where I come from about how, are there charges for electronic copies of that? Has that been -- And I'm scrolling through quickly, and I don't see that it's in the bill. Is that contemplated, and do we charge for -- Or is there a provision for that or should we begin to think about those kind of things as we move into the next generation of copying? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. If you could hold a second, I will get you that answer.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):
To my knowledge, we don't have a charge associated with the electronic copies.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Okay. Perfect. I'm not sure what the right policy would be for that, but I, you know, I think it's probably something we should be prepared for as we move these things through. So, thank you very much, Senator, for your answer, and thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, just to the point. I believe what I represented was correct, but I also have constant contact with the judicial system, and if it is not, I will engage with the Senator to figure out a solution to his issue.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, all in favor of the Amendment as discussed, please signify it by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.
THE CHAIR:

Opposed? All right. We're gonna try that one more time. Will -- If -- All in favor of the Amendment as discussed, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? I believe, I do believe the Amendment is adopted. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

When the vote is taken, I ask that it be taken by roll.

THE CHAIR:

On the bill, on the bill as amended? Thank you. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Just to say that I am in full support of the Court Operations Bill as amended. Urge my colleagues to support the bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Any further discussion on the bill as amended? Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If
not, Mr. Clerk, if you would please call the vote and the machines will be opened.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 964 as amended by Senate A. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 964 as amended by Senate A. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be closed and the Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 964 as amended by Senate A.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number of voting</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Yea</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] The legislation is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 44, Calendar Number 452, substitute for Senate Bill Number 504, AN ACT CONCERNING THE SUSPENSION OF DELINQUENCY PROCEEDINGS FOR TREATMENT OR OTHER
SERVICES IN MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT OR MISUSE CASES AND
CONCERNING DETENTION OF JUVENILES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Would the Senate stand
at ease for a moment, please?

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease. Mr. Clerk. Oh, we're [inaudible 01:33:51]. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to mark this
item PT and if the Clerk can go to the preceding
bill, Calendar Page 48, Calendar 290, Senate Bill
ten, one, Calendar -- I'm sorry. Senate Bill 140.

THE CHAIR:

So noted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 48, Calendar Number 290, substitute for Senate
Bill Number 140, AN ACT EXPANDING ELIGIBILITY FOR
TAX RELIEF FOR CERTAIN ELDERLY HOMEOWNERS.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. -- Senator Cassano.
SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill and waive its reading and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The question is on adoption. Please proceed.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam Chair. This is a very simple, basic bill that actually does a lot. It seeks to create relief for seniors that are owners or tenants of certain real property, over age 65 years age, of age, or widowed spouses. And they would be eligible for reduction in taxes on real properties. It's a relatively small number of people. CCM did express concern, but not strong opposition. As I read their opposition, they're concerned, obviously, about the stability of tax, local taxes. And they should be. I understand that. But this is a group of people that we are helping keep in their homes. Many of them simply cannot afford with the taxes and limited income to stay where they've, where they've lived for years. And so, this was voted unanimously in committee, and I would urge adoption of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cassano. Will you remark further? Will you remark further?
SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Madam Chair, seeing no remarks, I'd ask this be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objections. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 22, Calendar Number 275, Senate Bill --

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I thank you, Madam President. I'd like to PT that item and if the Senate will stand at ease, please.

THE CHAIR:

So noted, and the Senate chamber will be at ease.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Madam President. If the Clerk can now call Calendar Page 44, Calendar 452, Senate Bill 504.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 44, Calendar Number 452, substitute for Senate Bill Number 504, AN ACT CONCERNING THE SUSPENSION OF DELINQUENCY PROCEEDINGS FOR TREATMENT OR OTHER SERVICES IN MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT OR MISUSE CASES AND CONCERNING DETENTION OF JUVENILES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. We have had an issue with juveniles and motor vehicle thefts in the
state of Connecticut. There has been a lot of conversation about what the state would be doing to deal with the juveniles. Some of that conversation has been positive. Unfortunately, much of it has been negative. Earlier in the session, there was a conversation where many of the stakeholders were brought together to think about what we would do. This bill is a result of that and of the efforts of many of the people around the circle, including Senator Fasano. And so, what this bill allows us to do that we had not done is, when we have one of these youth, to suspend the sentence that they were going to have to put that young person into a program that they were no, they were not eligible for in the past. It also creates conditions for the suspension of that prosecution. And some, and one of the conditions is to cooperate in an assessment so that we can determine whether that child would benefit from the supervision and the services that are imagined under this bill. The other is to participate and complete satisfactorily the recommended services that would come from the suspension of that, of that prosecution. And also the child would be made to comply with any orders that are made from the court. This is a good bill that addresses a very serious problem that we have here in the state, and I would urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I stand in strong support of this bill. At the outset, I would
really like to thank Senator Fasano for bringing this bill to our attention. Madam President, at this time, I'd like to yield back to Senator Winfield for an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Madam President. I'm sorry. I forgot to actually call the Amendment that I was actually describing, which would become the bill. So the strike-all Amendment, it is --

THE CHAIR:

So before we go to discussion, we could have the Clerk call the Amendment. But, Senator, we do need to know which one. Oh. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I believe we're still awaiting the Amendment. So why don't we PT that and go to the other PT'd bill, which is Calendar Page 22, Calendar 275, Senate Bill 229.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered. We'll PT that item, and Mr. Clerk, we can move to the next bill.

CLERK:
Page 22, Calendar Number 275, Senate Bill Number 229, AN ACT PROHIBITING THE USE OF STYROFOAM TRAYS IN CONNECTICUT SCHOOLS. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of a strike-all Amendment, LCO Number 8392. I would ask that the Clerk please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO Number 8392, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This bill is a bill that would eventually prohibit the use of Styrofoam trays within schools. This would be regional schools, as well as vocational-technical schools and school districts across the state. It requires them first to come up with a plan for themselves to discontinue use of such said trays and certainly eliminate any contracts that they are bound to in the short-term, and then discontinue use by July 1st of 2021. I think we are all familiar with the product, the material of Styrofoam and how degrading this can be to our environment. We've also heard of several negative health impacts of polystyrene. So I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I also rise in support of the Amendment. I think we've done a pretty good job of trying to stretch this out far enough so that schools shouldn't be dramatically impacted. I think the switch from this material to something else, either a reusable material or perhaps a cardboard. We just passed a bill on hemp. God only knows. We might have hemp trays before too long. So I think it's a good bill. It's a good Amendment. And I would urge support. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Miner. Any further re -- Would any -- Will you remark further on the Amendment? On the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the Amendment, waive its reading, and seek leave of the chamber to summarize, which I have already done, but we did not go in order on that. I apologize.

THE CHAIR:

No, no worries. So, will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? So Senator Cohen, would you like a voice vote on the adoption of the Amendment? All right. So all in favor of the Amendment, of the adoption of the Amendment as discussed, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if there is no objection, I would ask that the bill be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

We -- I see that Senator Witkos is standing. Senator Witkos, would you like to remark on the bill as amended?

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Yes, I would, Madam President. Thank you very much. I concur wholeheartedly with the remarks of the chair and the ranking member on how the devastating effects of Styrofoam that could enter into our, our earth, our streams, and do all the damage that it's done. But we've limited in the bill to just our public schools. And I'm not so sure why we would just limit the use of those just to our public schools. Because we have other institutions that are public universities that come under the control of this legislature are funded by them. So if this is a good public policy to have them be eradicated, now is the time we should be doing it. So with that, Madam President, the Clerk has in its possession LCO Number 8391. I ask that it be called and I be given leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO Number 8391, Senate Schedule B.
THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This bill does exactly the same thing as described in the previous Amendment, which is now the bill. However, it adds to that constituent units of higher education. So basically, our community colleges and our colleges would also have to follow the same timeframe that's in the underlying bill by Ju -- coming up with a plan by July 1, 2020, and eliminating that two years out. This way, we would encompass everything from K through 12 and post-secondary education. I would ask that the chambers indulge in its support of the Amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Will you remark further on the Amendment before us? Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of the Amendment. I would like to echo everything that Senator Witkos has mentioned. As we all know, Styrofoam is absolutely detrimental to our environment. It is -- can only be burned or incinerated, and it is not good to be breathing in. I believe that if we are going to institute this policy, which I want to commend the chairs of the Environment Committee for bringing this forward -- I'm hoping that we could see this extend in the future to other items besides trays as we move
forward, that we should include our institutes of higher learning and our colleges and our universities here in the state of Connecticut that we fund. Perhaps they are already not using them. That would be terrific. But if they are, they should be on the same timeframe as our pubic schools to phase out the use of the Styrofoam trays and to look for alternatives, whether it be paper or maybe hemp by that time or plastic trays that can be washed and reused. I think it's an important step and I fully support the Amendment. And I hope that the people in this circle, my colleagues, will join us. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Will you remark further on the Amendment before us? Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I do appreciate my good colleague's effort to further ban Styrofoam across all institutions, including those of higher education. I would point out, however, my concern that we did not have a hearing which was inclusive of colleges and universities. So they didn't have a chance to weigh in on this. I would be amenable to looking at this in the future, in perhaps the next session. But also, am concerned about the fiscal impact to the state on something like this. It is no longer a municipal impact in the future, but could certainly have state implications, fiscal implications. But primarily for the purposes of allowing the colleges and universities to weigh in as the school districts were able to during our Environment Committee hearing. I would urge my
colleagues to vote no on this Amendment with the understanding that this is certainly something that the Environment Committee would be interested in looking at in the future.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Would you like a voice vote on this Amendment?

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

I would like a roll call vote, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, Mr. Clerk, if -- Oh, I'm s -- I apologize. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

No, that's my fault. Madam President, I'm gettin' old. Madam President, I would agree with the Co-chair that when we talked about Styrofoam, whether it's in this application or in others, I think we were trying to be careful not to reach too far. I do share the proposer, proposers of the Amendment's concern about having even those trays in the university system or in the college system. If we're trying to send a message here, I think it should be very clear. I wonder whether there would be another opportunity on another bill perhaps that we could support if we gained the support of UConn and the college system. That's how strongly I feel about trying to make it universal. But I must admit
that it is, it is a step farther than we did here. So I, I wonder whether we could have a brief conversation about that. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the Amendment before us? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. For the second time, you know, I said to myself, wow, when I heard some of the comments that were just made in that we're okay with the cost for municipalities, but we're not okay if there's an excess cost to the state. And that is the problem around this circle. We hear it from time infinitum from our municipal leaders. Stop the unfunded mandates upon us. This is a classic example. We think it's good public policy, but we don't want to put the state under the same conditions that we're requiring of our municipalities. Well, shame on us, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'm gonna echo the same thing. As a municipal leader, I took offense to what was said, because, you know, it's okay to pass this on to the municipalities, but forget the state. And to do that, I think is an injustice. We're cutting ECS funding in this budget to some towns,
yet we want to go ahead and, you know, put millions of dollars on municipalities across the state. I think it's wrong and I think if we're gonna do this, we should do this at once and take care of this problem. You know, we pay the money for the universities, a good portion of it, and we should -- If we're gonna do it to the towns, we should do it to the universities as well. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Champagne. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12):

Thank you, Madam President. And I appreciate the concerns of my good colleagues. I think I was a bit misunderstood, and what my intention is that we did not have a public hearing on this in the fiscal impacts to the colleges and universities, with respect certainly then to the state fiscal impact. We have a fiscal note here in front of us that outlines the municipal fiscal impact. We also had much discussion during the public hearing of the Environment Committee on this particular bill about the municipal impact. So that was very much considered and taken under consideration. I certainly do not mean, and did not mean, to imply that a municipal fiscal impact would be okay while a state fiscal impact would not. So I just want to clear the record that I was really referring to the fact that we did not have a hearing with respect to state colleges and universities, and I am not sure what the fiscal impact would be. And I believe that these state colleges and universities should have the ability to weigh in on something of this nature. Again, I just want to reiterate that when it comes
to the use of Styrofoam, I would like to see its use eliminated or drastically reduced. It is not currently recyclable material, and as I said, there are some health implications that we're aware of. And this is certainly something, the expansion of this bill is something that I would like to look at in the future and, you know, echo the comments of my good ranking member as well. So, I just want to clear that up. I am certainly very concerned with any fiscal impact, albeit, municipal impact as a former Board of Education member for the town of Guilford, that's obviously always of utmost concern to me, as well as a state legislator. So I appreciate your comments and the opportunity to clear that up.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before us? Senator Somers, for the second time.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I would just like to say, I echo the sentiments of former first selectman. I was the mayor of the largest city in the second district and I understand how frustrating it is to have something mandated to you as a town, but have the state carve themselves out so they are not equal in the requirements that we put down onto the municipalities. With that being said, I also would like to thank the good chairman for her remarks concerning going forward on Styrofoam. And I would like to ask, if I may, would it be acceptable if we find out what the fiscal impact is? Like I said before, it could be that universities
are not even using these particular trays at this point, not all of them. Maybe some are. But if we have a bill coming up from the house that addresses Styrofoam and we learn the fiscal impact, if we could consider possibly amending that. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Senator Witkos, for the third time.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This is unprecedented for me to stand up. But I, I wanted to comment. I went back and I looked online to see what the actual bill was that had the public hearing. And if I may, the bill that was heard that had a public hearing was that the general statutes be amended to prohibit the use of Styrofoam trays in schools in the state. Nowhere in this language does it talk about public secondary education. In fact, shame on the universities for not participating in the public hearing, because under the bill that had the public hearing, it was certainly applicable to them at the time. The bill that came out of committee reduced it to just the public schools. So that's part of the problem here when we have bills that don't have the specific language we're trying to get at, because people don't know what to come and testify on. But the bill that was, that had the public hearing made it applicable to every school located here in the state of Connecticut. So in fact, these higher education, upper, higher education facilities had the opportunity to weigh in, and if they didn't, well, shame on them. Thank you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

I thought I was getting home early. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I have learned in this short period that the university system is not opposed to the language that we're discussing. Unfortunately, I can't get an answer on the community college system. Which is why I think if there was a way to -- Perhaps we could reach out to the community college system and find out if they would be opposed to it. I frankly like the sweeping change and the universal change that's proposed in the Amendment that's been offered. But out of respect to the chair as to what she's saying, I think trying to make this last piece of the bridgework would be helpful. So I don't know if the, if we could PT this for a moment and make a phone call and see if we can find out whether the community college system in fact is prepared to do this already. And if they are, it sounds to me like the Amendment's a good Amendment. Please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Will the Senate stand at ease for a moment please?

THE CHAIR:
The chamber will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, we're going to PT this bill and we're gonna go back to the previously marked PT bill, Calendar Page 44, Calendar 452, Senate Bill 504.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 44, Calendar Number 452, substitute for Senate Bill Number 504, AN ACT CONCERNING THE SUSPENSION OF DELINQUENCY PROCEEDINGS FOR TREATMENT OR OTHER SERVICES IN MOTOR VEHICLE THEFT OR MISUSE CASES AND CONCERNING DETENTION OF JUVENILES. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. The Amendment is a strike-all, so I would ask that LCO 8394 be called and I be granted leave of the chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk.
Thank you, Madam President. My description of the bill prior to this was actually a description of the LCO that is in front of us. So everything that I said remains true. This is a response to very serious issues going on in the state with juveniles. It allows for those juveniles who previously were not able to access alternatives to sentencing to be, have their prosecution suspended should they adhere to the rules of the court, submit themselves to being analyzed, and it is a good bill that comes out of a lot of conversation in the General Assembly that began early in the session. Actually, it began before the session, but in this session, began very early. And there are a lot of people around the circle who had a lot to do with us doing this good piece of policy and not putting our young people directly into our jails, including the ranking member, Senator Kissel. Representative Walker had a lot to do with it. And Senator Fasano had an immense role to play in this. And I urge adoption.
Thank you very much, Madam President. At the outset, I'd like to commend Senator Fasano for bringing the bill proposal before us, but very much would like to commend and salute Co-chairman Winfield of the Judiciary Committee for really grabbing the bull by the horns regarding this, setting up certain meetings where all the stakeholders were gathered. Those were very interesting meetings. People had to put all their cards on the table, offer different ideas. "No" was really not an option during those meetings. It was, we have this issue. How can we get there? And we heard input from the State's Attorney's Office, from the public defenders, from people that were experts in the field. Ultimately, there was buy-in from individuals, both in the House and the Senate. As Senator indicated, Representative Walker very much involved in juvenile justice, policy, and oversight committee as the co-chair with the Secretary of OPM, but has been involved in this for years and years and years. And we've known for a while that there's been problems in particular with car theft and juveniles. And typically, the response has been, well, they should be kicked up to adult court. And the push-back would be, their brains haven't developed, we're not really sure why this is occurring. And it's not good public policy to just automatically kick a juvenile into the adult court system regarding a particular set of crimes when we're trying to drive the entire direction in a different way and break that cycle of recidivism and try to stop these young people from getting involved in the criminal justice system in the first place. So the salutary parts of this bill are many, but first off it would be up to the juvenile or their representative to make application. And this is in the nature of accelerated rehabilitation or any one
of the other diversionary programs we have. And so typically, these juveniles would have a public defender who would be in close contact with their client. And it's the public defender and/or the juvenile that needs to make application for this particular program. The court can't do it of their own volition. The state's attorney can't do it of their own volition. But the notion is that the juvenile would have to be willing to embrace all these services that would be made available. It's almost like wrap-around services for the young person. And they would be on probation for essentially six months. And if they needed further addressing, that could be extended by the court for an additional six months. The idea is simply to nip these incidents in the bud and try to turn these young people's lives around as soon as possible. So they may never really enter into the criminal justice system. And that comports with the entire direction that our state has been going. Quite often I've been asked and I've gone to various seminars, Washington D.C., Nevada, Denver, Colorado -- Not Nevada. Denver, Colorado, Philadelphia, and it's, you know, why is the conservative Republican want to rehabilitate criminals? And I wanna break the cycle of recidivism. I don't want juveniles to go into the criminal court system. I want law-abiding, productive, tax-paying citizens. I -- You know, seven correctional facilities, they don't all have to be packed. I'm down to six now. I'd love to keep whittling that down. It would be great if we had no prisoners. But we have to break that cycle of recidivism, and if we can stop the first crime from occurring or after the first crime, make sure no further ones occur, that's fantastic. At the public hearing, Senator Fasano was quite eloquent in bringing forward his ideas. And one of
the things that he stressed is he wanted data collection. And we weren't able to do it in the Judiciary Committee, but this Amendment which becomes the bill does do that. And I want to thank the representatives of the Judicial Branch for reaching out to us, embracing this notion, and saying, we can collect this data. Because there's a couple of things that I've learned through this process just this year. The incidence of juvenile stealing automobiles -- And this covers both Larceny 1 and 2. So it doesn't matter if it's a $60,000-dollar BMW or a $500-dollar clunker. Automobile theft is automobile theft. And if it's your car, you need it for transportation. And this addresses all this. But what we will also be doing on an annualized basis is gathering data so that we can figure out, why is this crime tends to be geographical in nature? It tends to be disproportionately higher in the Greater Waterbury area. You go to a different part of the state, it's not as high, and it's not necessarily because it's rural, suburban, or urban. But certain urban areas are just, have this more endemic to them than others. Why is that? I don't know. Is this simply joy riding? Is it some sort of like way to get into a gang? Is it just boredom? We need to get to the bottom of all of this. Because we can't figure out a solution until we have deep knowledge of what the actual problems are. And so we'll be gathering up that data. Unfortunately, this won't go into effect until October to get the Judicial Branch ramped up to be able to address this. And then the annualized data collection won't be ready until the following October. So we won't have it for the next legislative session, unfortunately. But we might have some preliminary data on the first several months before next February, and hopefully, we can
maybe glean some information from that. So we're trying to drill down deep and take a thoughtful, methodical approach to this issue of automobile theft by juveniles and other serious crimes that would fit into these categories. And again, I want to commend Senator Fasano for bringing this before us and really championing this, members of both caucuses, Chairman Winfield, Chairman Stafstrom, my good friend and ranking member, Representative Rosa Rebimbas, and to my knowledge, Representative Stafstrom and Rebimbas are sleeping right now after the 14-hour marathon that they just went through. Plus, 'cause that just started at 10:00. They were there even earlier than that. But again, Representative Walker in the House, Representative Porter, other interested parties, public defenders, state's attorneys, Judicial Branch, pretty much anybody and everybody that's involved with JJPOC that have an interest in trying to see us get our arms around this in a thoughtful way. And I would urge my colleagues to support this Amendment which becomes the bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I rise to comment on the underlining LCO, if I may, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):
Yes, thank you. And so I too want to recognize the incredible job that was done on an issue that has really become more than a flashpoint. And in fact, I would say that it is at epidemic levels. So in my hometown city of Waterbury, while we are very proud of the declining crime rate, we have an escalating rate of juvenile automobile theft, to the extent that it has risen to the degree of being a public safety issue. And so this session before the Public Safety Committee, there in fact was legislation that was proposed by the Waterbury delegation as well as a number of other cosponsors to talk about this. And so the bill, the underlining bill that is before us today is certainly complementary to the proposal that was brought before the Public Safety Committee, because it has risen to an issue of more than just the theft of the automobile, but to all of those who are in such communities. And if you mapped these instances out, you would see that it's very interesting. It is in urban centers, but it is also in rural centers. And in, particularly, going down the I-94 corridor, into the Fairfield area. I'll share with you just a case in point. So this past fall, one of our members of Board of Aldermen was at 7:00 o'clock, 7:15 in the morning driving his two children to school, and a busy road, but, you know, a lot of school buses, and also students walking to school. And lo and behold, a car out of nowhere comes down, narrowly misses Alderman Lopez's car, and T-bones the car directly in front of him. It was a youngster, a juvenile, 14 years old who was out for a joy ride before he was gonna go to school. And so, you know, I had been observing this for some time, and had started to kind of dig down on it, and working with my police chief who has been very helpful and also came and spoke before the Public
Safety Committee, who shared with me the unbelievable and concerning escalation of this problem to the extent that -- And then I spent a lot of time talking to folks in the judicial system. And they talked about the fact that this, these situations had almost become like a sport where, you know, one day someone steals a BMW, and the next day, their buddy goes off and gets a Mercedes. And it was kind of like this. But the other very alarming part of this was that these youngsters were getting into a culture, into a way of life that was very serious and then they became prey to older, older individuals and, and actually people who were in gangs. And so it became this very, very vicious circle. In Conn - In Waterbury alone, we had in 2018, 972 car thefts. The majority of them were juveniles. And of those 972, 52 were charged and 6 of whom on the, who were juveniles, were repeat offenders who had an average of ten thefts, ten automobile thefts and had been charged with a total of 75 crimes; 41 of those crimes were felonies. So it was -- As you can see, it's a very, very small population of the juvenile offenders. But they are very, very often repeaters and high, high numbers of incidents. And so the underlining legislation before us today will go a long way to trying to address this and deal with it. Because the fact of the matter is, if you have a juvenile who is doing this for, from ages 15, 16, or 17, when they become 18 years of age, it's not likely that all of a sudden the light is going to go on and they're going to say, "Oh, no, I'm not doing that anymore." Just the opposite. They have become engraunched in a culture with a group of individuals who is not very likely that they're gonna have a chance to turn it around. And so we if don’t address this right away, we do a grave disservice to this population of
repeat juvenile offenders who are clearly going in the wrong direction and who clearly have little opportunity to turn this around. So I stand in very strong support of this, and I believe that many other communities besides ourself -- Hartford, not too long ago, actually had a fatality with a young juvenile in a stolen automobile. And that wasn't the only community where that scenario played itself out. So I am very grateful to the Senate chair and the House chair of the Judiciary Committee and all those members who worked on this, as I am grateful to the Public Safety Committee, which was so helpful in listening and also moving this legislation. And so I stand in strong support, Madam President. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hartley. Any further comments? Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I want to applaud the proponents of this bill, first starting with Senator Fasano, Senator Winfield, Senator Kissel, along with all the House members that participated in this process. This addresses a very serious issue with juvenile car theft. But more importantly, the process addressed the issue of a diversionary process. The idea was to address the issue, but understand that we need to craft solutions to not put young adults into a pathway of incarceration and a life of crime. The idea that mistakes can be made by young people and this is an opportunity for us to understand through the data collection and understanding solutions so that we can work on
prevention. I applaud this because it addresses an issue that is not only rural, suburban, or urban. Because this crime affects all of us. And those that get incarcerated and those that are harmed by this crime all are affected. So as I look at this issue, it is a public safety issue. It is also a process of addressing juvenile justice and looking at diversions and understanding that incarceration may not be the way. But it also addresses the fact that crimes are being committed and how can we prevent them. The ultimate aspect that I take away from this positively is, as we sit through the last month of this debate where we will have moments of positive, moments of frustration, moments of wondering why we're here, it is very encouraging for us to hold on to this moment, to remember, this is what we're here for. We're here to solve problems on behalf of our community. And in working together, House and Senate, Democrats and Republican, we have crafted a solution. So I applaud the proponents and the people that have worked so hard on this, because you have demonstrated a pathway that we can find solutions. So I urge strong support and I thank all the proponents for their tremendous and diligent hard work. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hwang. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further? Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I stand in support of the Amendment and the underlying bill. In my, some
of the communities that I represent, particularly in Hamden and Ansonia and Naugatuck and Derby, I have heard from police chiefs over the last three years that I have been in the political realm here, looking for ways and solutions to work with legislators, to work with the local politicians, the town CEOs, to work with the community in solving this problem. I think it's our role to do our part and address this issue, and I'm glad, and I'm thankful for the leadership shown by Senator Fasano, Senator Winfield, and others in this circle to work together, to put together what I think is a good step in the right direction. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR: 

Will you remark further? Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

[inaudible 03:10:09] proponent of the bill, hopefully a simple question. Public Safety did have a bill that basically stated that if you have four or more felonies as a juvenile, then the next arrest you would be taken, treated with adult court. Does this impact that bill at all? Is this study gonna deal with that? Or is that bill still alive?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

I'm trying to think how to actually answer that question. The public sa -- I'll start this with,
the Public Safety Bill is no longer in play in this session.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cassano. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'm gonna keep my remarks short, because I think everyone said what had to be said about it. But I want to thank Senator Winfield, Senator Kissel, Senator Looney, Senator Strafs -- or Representative Strafstrom, and Representative Rebimbas, and Senator Hwang, who talked to an awful lot as the bill was being constructed, as well as Senator Logan. Madam President, the issue here I think is reasonably simple, and the -- What we're dealing with is something we don't know why we're having the problem. So having a data bank is gonna allow us to get the information. We can't solve something we don't know. What was amazing when we got everybody in the room is that no one really knew what was causing the problem. And was it boredom? Was it drugs? Was it gang? It was kind of like the issues that Senator Kissel went through. And the answer was, nobody had an idea. You can't solve something if you don't know what's causing the issue. So by putting a data bank together helps that issue. And then the second thing is, we have to get wrap-around services around those kids who need it. Now one
issue in the bill was, who gets to say this program is available? And that's the defender, either a private lawyer or a public defender of the juvenile. And then it was talked about whether or not you'd want the prosecutor or the judge to push this program. But if the child is not interested in the program and isn't self-motivated, you're wasting money. So we felt it should come from the juvenile, because that's the only way you're gonna get any traction to get help. So there was a lot of thought put on this. And it was amazing how many people came to the table. The common denominator among the Judiciary Branch, Juvenile Branch, prosecution, public defenders, Republicans, Democrats, Senate, and House was, what can we do to help these kids? How can we make this negative into a positive? What can we do, which isn't just lock 'em up? Where, where have we gone wrong and what can we do to get those services to those kids if that's the issue.

You're gonna have a group of kids who are gonna say, I'm doing it. I'm just -- Can't change. That's who I am. That's a different group. And that I would argue is a small percentage. I think a larger percentage are those who need help in one way or another. That's what this bill's going to do. Only time will tell, and only feedback will come after a period of time in which we'll see progress of this bill. So as you read and maybe some of these incidences will come up a little bit, and you'll say, well, we didn't do much. You gotta give this time. As Senator Kissel said, we won't have data till a year from this October that's really gonna mean something. And the legislature, which will be a new legislature at that point in time, will see some real data. And judiciary will look at it hard and so will everybody else involved in the process. And then we can make this and mold it a little bit
stronger and a little bit better. But I'm proud of the work that we did here. And I think Senator Hwang said it right. This is what happens when we get into a room. This is what happens when we have conversations. This is what happens when we put the labels away and say, we got a common problem. Let's figure it out. Let's get it done. And this is a good product. And I'm proud of the work this building, this capitol, and everyone that was included did on this bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, speaking in support of the Amendment, I want to commend Senator Fasano for introducing this concept which tries to find a solution to what is a growing problem. We hear all the time of the increasing number of car thefts by juveniles and the danger created sometimes when there are police chases as a result of that, or the juveniles themselves speeding and losing control of the car, causing damage or injuries to themselves and to others, as well as property damage. And it is sometimes a chronic problem with the same offense committed a number of times by the same juvenile. And there were some proposals about removing those cases from the juvenile system and treating them as adults and making punishment more harsh. But I think what Senator Fasano initially proposed, what he spoke about here is trying to find what I think is a far more enlightened way to deal with this, to identify
the problem, gather data about it, but at the same time, make sure that preference, if possible, is given to diversionary programs that would help solve the problems that is leading to this kind of behavior, which has a disruptive effect in society. I testified and offered testimony in the Judiciary Committee on the original bill that Senator Fasano introduced, which was Senate Bill 504, on this subject. And I think it is imperative that we find a way to both deal with what has become a serious problem, but at the same time, not lose sight of the fact that these offenders are in some cases very, very young teenagers and in many cases do need, need treatment and need attention to get to the heart of the problem of what is causing this dangerous and reckless behavior. So I wanted to thank Senator Winfield and the committee for the time and effort they put into this and Senator Fasano, as I said, for introducing this concept which tries to find a middle ground between solving a problem and on the other hand overreacting with excessive punishment. And I think that this Amendment and the structure provides that. So I would urge adoption. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, let me try your minds. So all in favor of the Amendment, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.
THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Madam President. I don't think there's any objection, so I'd ask that this be moved to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'm just gonna mark some items on to go.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar Page 6, Calendar 100, Bill 777, go. On Calendar Page 6, Calendar 105, Senate Bill 953, go. On Calendar Page 18, Calendar 238, Senate Bill 1048, go. Then on Calendar Page 22, Calendar 275 -- Thank you, Madam President. On Calendars 275, 229 that we marked previously PT, we’ll mark that as go. Calendar Page 34, Calendar 391, Senate Bill 1008, go. Calendar 41, Calendar 430, Senate Bill 58, go. Calendar Page
2, Calendar 52, Senate Bill 807, go. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 6, Calendar Number 100, Senate Bill Number 777, AN ACT REQUIRING A STUDY OF VETERANS' TAX ABATEMENTS. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark further?

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an Amendment, LCO 8222. I would ask that the Clerk please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.
CLERK:

LCO Number 8222, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

I move adoption of the Amendment and ask that its reading be waived and ask leave of the chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I would like to thank Senator Osten for bringing this concept forward to us. This Amendment is a strike-all Amendment, which in effect becomes the bill. And what it will do is it will ask the Commission of Veterans Affairs within available appropriations to conduct a study of tax abatements that are currently given to public safety personnel and compare that with abatements or exemptions that are given to veterans and make a recommendation as to whether veterans should be given an abatement or their exemptions increased.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Maroney. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Logan.
SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of the Amendment and urge my colleagues to do the same. This is an opportunity to take a look at ways to, a way to help our veterans who are in need of our support and having a harder and harder time in terms of affording to live here in Connecticut. And we'd like to give some tools to municipalities to be able to use, utilize in terms of helping our veterans. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Logan. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Thank you.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Bless you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Maroney. Will you remark further? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the Amendment being adopted, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further?
SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Madam President, if there's no objection, I would ask that the bill be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 6, Calendar Number 105, Senate Bill Number 953, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A CYBER TECHNOLOGY COMPETITION FOR CERTAIN STUDENTS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Madam President, this bill instructs the Military Department to create a cyber technology competition for students within their available appropriations. It is in line with the adjutant general's goals of recruitment, engaging the community, and building...
his cyber warfare capabilities. There is a cyber warfare unit within our National Guard that had been deployed in the capitol region and is also going to be deployed through a state program within Uruguay.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Maroney. Will you remark further? Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this bill and I urge my colleagues to do the same. This is an example of bringing information to our youth here in Connecticut. When it comes to technology, there may be many students, young folks out there who are STEM achievers in terms of math and science and may not fully realize that they can merge and their desire to study STEM-type careers and the military. So again, I think this competition is an excellent to bring the opportunities that the military can provide to our young people to the forefront. So again, I urge my colleagues to support this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Logan. Will you remark further? Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I want to thank Senator Logan for his comments and just remind people that the part of our mission is to make college affordable and that the National Guard does
offer tuition waivers. So this is a way for them to both highlight the modes of service that are cyber technologies within the Military, as well as to help students learn about opportunities to get degrees. Madam President, if there's no objection, I would ask that this bill be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 18, Calendar Number 238, Senate Bill Number 1048, AN ACT CONCERNING THE ONLINE DATABASE FOR STATE EXPENDITURES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Madam President, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:
The question is on passage. Will you remark further?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the bill before us concerns a searchable online database for certain state expenditures. Right now, that database is maintained both by the state comptroller and the legislature's own Office of Fiscal Analysis. The proposal before us would change that to require that that database be maintained solely by the State Comptroller's Office. It also makes a few technical and conforming changes associated with this proposal. And I would encourage my colleagues to support this bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I concur with the chairman of the GAE Committee that this is a good bill before us. It's streamlining government in some ways by transferring the responsibility for maintaining this database in the comptroller's office rather than the Office of Fiscal Analysis. It's a good bill. I support it, and I would encourage to as well. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if there is no objection, I move that we place this bill on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 22, Calendar Number 275, Senate Bill Number 229, AN ACT PROHIBITING THE USE OF STYROFOAM TRAYS IN CONNECTICUT SCHOOLS. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Senate stand at ease for a moment.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease while you chew. Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I had an Amendment before the chamber and I would like to withdraw that Amendment. It was LCO 8391, at this time.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. So ordered. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12):

Thank you, Madam President. The Clerk is in possession of a strike-all Amendment, LCO 8402. I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO Number 8402, Senate Schedule C.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the Amendment, waive its reading, and seek leave of the chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR COHEN (12):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I am happy to report that together with my colleagues, we
have come up with this friendly Amendment after speaking with the state college and university system and hearing from them that they are in agreement with this Amendment. So we will proceed by including not only each school district, regional school district, and regional vo-tech school, but also the higher education system within the state of Connecticut. So not later than July 1st of 2020, again, just to reiterate, they will come up with a plan for discontinuing use by the date of July 1st, 2021. And I'd be also remiss in just thanking my good colleague, Senator Maroney, whose young constituents, high school students I believe, had actually come up with this bill. So thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. As the Amendment becomes the bill, one of the underlying concerns was the cost to municipalities. And I know there's an effective date that's pretty far out there. But I'm just wondering, through you, Madam President, to the proponent of the bill, did anybody like CCM or CABE or any other entities representing the municipalities come and testify? And I ask this in a friendly way, because I just don't want to go back to my district and have my town say, this is a cost to us and why'd you support this, or we don't have enough lead time. And I'm just wondering, since there was the underlying discussion about the public hearing, I just want to make sure that there was ample opportunity for those folks that might
have issues to speak and if there was any pushback in opposition to this bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12):

Through you, Madam President, to my good colleague. There was an opportunity, and they did -- Several organizations that represent the schools did report out that they were concerned about the fiscal impact to schools. We also heard from schools that had already moved in, into either the paper pulp fiber trays or the compostable trays. I happen to have been on the Board of Education in Guilford, Connecticut, and they in fact are one of those districts that have moved in that direction. So I am happy to report that it can be done. And because of the fiscal impact to municipalities and the concern that I have in moving too quickly with something like that, we have moved this bill out and as amended again, it would not require the discontinue of usage until July 1st of 2021 to allow municipalities to really take a hard look at that and budget accordingly.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. So in an abundance of caution from my perspective, and this
is gonna bring my environmental scorecard right straight down, I'm gonna be voting no today only because since there was concern by different school districts and municipalities of which I don't know if any of those folks are from north-central Connecticut, I'm just gonna -- I can't even say I'm flagging it, because this is a final action. But I need to go back and talk to them and find out if this is gonna have negative financial ramifications. Because, of course, as we proceed through the end of this session, our towns are gonna be taking some hits, hopefully not as bad as it appears right now, but I certainly don't want to add a burden to them. But I do appreciate the hard work and efforts from folks that work on the Amendment, the good chairwoman in accommodating those concerns and putting out an effective date that should give folks an ability to plan. But, you know, there's just too many times over the years that I've been so honored to serve in this chamber, I go back after we're all done, and my towns go, what the heck were you guys doing? And I just don't want this to be one of those times. So I will be doing voting no on this particular bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Anwar.

SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, I just wanted to make some comments. And first, I rise in support of this Amendment. But I want to share some thoughts, and they're based on some of the conversations we have had earlier. First, it's a no-brainer that the Styrofoam is not healthy for the
environment and for the community and the people who are impacted or influenced by it. So taking care of that is important, and I think it's important to also recognize that this bill came into existence because of school children. And I think Senator Maroney's gonna speak to that hopefully to highlight that it was through the children in our community that realized that there's value in trying to address this. And that was through this leadership of our chair of the committee and also Senator Maroney that we actually got this bill at this point and through the efforts of people in the committee. But how our conversation evolved to try and divide the state and the municipalities in this conversation is concerning to me. Because we are trying to do something right and then we are also in the process trying to divide communities. It's important for us as a Senate to have respect for the process [inaudible 03:35:04] and also not try and attack individuals on their intentions, because their intentions were to help the children's voice be heard. And to suggest directly or indirectly that the intention of the bill was to try and create a wedge between the municipalities and also the state was unfair. And I think it's, it needs to be said, and it's probably important for individuals who suggested that to openly say to the chair that they were inaccurate and wrong about this. And that's the right thing to do. But whether that's gonna happen or not is something that we will see. But I think -- I want to recognize the chair for the good work that you've done, and I also recognize the fact that this was intended to do the right thing for the environment and it was in no way to try and create a wedge between the municipalities and the state. We're all trying to do the best thing over here and trying to identify ways of trying to create
strategies to make individuals or people look less than right is something that I think we need to stand up to. And I'm standing up and making sure that my comments are recorded about this aspect. So I will be supporting this Amendment. This is the right thing to do. And then hopefully we'll as a Senate do more than just the Connecticut schools with that. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Anwar. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Good evening, Madam President. Thank you. I have a couple comments on this legislation as well, and I would align my comments with that of Senator Kissel. I have heard from a few superintendents within the school districts that I represent about their concern about yet another unfunded mandate. And while I certainly appreciate the intent here and what Senator Anwar spoke to as well with respect to we are trying to do something that is right for our children, which arguably is one of the most important things that we do in this building, whether we're up here or downstairs or anywhere else in the government. I do have a concern about cost. And I understand that we have created a two-year opportunity here for our school districts to try and address that. That said, I have the same concern as Senator Kissel. Going back to a district -- And I'm a former Board of Ed guy, having spent four years in that role in one of, in my hometown. And I know that any unfunded mandate that comes back is looked at with a lot of criticism, despite the very honest
and genuine and important intent of what we're doing here. So I think as Senator Kissel spoke to as well, I need to be a no vote today, and it's not because I don't like the bill and like the intent. The legislative intent of this bill is very genuine and important. But I have to address with my constituency back home how they're going to manage this and see maybe next year when we come back, because we have this two-year window to adopt this and put into play, that we may be able to -- If there is truly deep concern about that cost, we may be able to do something as a legislative body to help our school systems address that cost. And I think that as long as we can have that dialogue going forward as well, then we're doing, we're still doing the right thing by the children that we are ultimately empowered to protect. So thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further? Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Good evening, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

I rise in support of this Amendment in the -- which will become the bill. I want to thank Senator Cohen for her leadership, as well as Senator Miner for his
leadership on this bill, and also thank Senator Witkos for actually strengthening the bill. I was in communication -- As Senator Cohen mentioned, this bill originally came from a high school internship I've been running with students to try to educate them on the legislative process. And I had the interns come up with ideas for bills that we proposed, then came up and testified on this bill. And so, I had let them know that we were debating the bill and that an Amendment was proposed to extend it to the colleges, and they were very excited that it will go even further. It should be noted that just last week, the state of Maine banned single-use Styrofoam for the entire state. It wasn't just for the public schools or the public colleges. It was for anyone. They can no longer use single-use Styrofoam. I do understand the fiscal concerns. My interns -- And I should name them. Ming Ma Hu [phonetic] and Critica Copal [phonetic] did tremendous work. They've started an environmental club at their high school. They've been very active in our community, and I applaud them. We had met with our school system and found out that previously they had looked into switching and it was going to cost the school system $35,000 dollars, which is -- Our budget is about $70 million, I believe, for the year. It's over that, but that was when I was on the Board of Ed. An additional, you know, additional cost by switching. However, through research, we found a company in Maine that made trays that through scale and -- well, that was cheaper than that and then if we were able to get regional collaboratives and bring more scale could almost bring the price in line with that of the Styrofoam trays. So I do again thank the senators, the chairs, for their good work on this,
and I am strongly in support of this bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Maroney. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the Amendment, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? And with that, would the Clerk please announce the vote? And the machines will be open. And I do want to say, the Amendment was adopted. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I thank you. Before we hold the votes open, I think Senator Formica would like to say a few words on the, the bill.

THE CHAIR:

By all means, Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And I did support the Amendment and wanted to just make a comment on the underlying bill. So that's why I
waited till after the Amendment. I thank you, Senator Duff, for that. I'm in support, thanks to Senator Witkos in the expansion of this opportunity for public, for all of the schools to move forward, which is only fair. I do want to make a note that this bill addresses only one Styrofoam use. And so it seems a little disingenuous if we're gonna just ban trays, why don't we talk about having the opportunity to look at the costs and the opportunity for cups or of fold-over containers, other things that are, that are out there in use while the public schools are having this. But I didn't want to make another suggestion and further delay the opportunity for this bill. But if we're gonna begin with this, you know, we might as well at least know where we're going if this is, if this is an opportunity to move forward. So I just rise that, and make that a point of, of whatever. Just make the point, and it's late, I guess.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

To make that point and we can maybe think about that next session or as this moves forward. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will, will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, Mr. Clerk, would you kindly call the vote? And the machine will be opened.
An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 229 as amended by Senate C. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 229. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? If so, the machine will be closed and the Clerk will announce the tally.

Senate Bill 229 as amended by Senate A and Senate C.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>34</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Yea</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Nay</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Gavel] Legislation is adopted. Mr. Clerk.
Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, good evening, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you again, Madam President. This bill comes to us through the Judiciary Committee. What it does is it requires that the Sentencing Commission study, the pretrial and sentencing outcomes, and looks at issues of disparity in race, ethnicity, gender, socioeconomic status of the criminal defendant, and report back to the Judiciary Committee with an interim report on January 1, 2020, and a final report on January 1, January 1st, 2021. I would urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I stand in support and wish to be associated with the remarks of Chairman Winfield. Happy to support this bill. The Sentencing Commission does yeoman's work in tackling very difficult issues. Clearly, there are racial and ethnic disparities as far as the
population in our Department of Corrections, and to study every step of the way I think will help us to make informed policies going forward. Happy to support the bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you again, Madam President. If there are not objections and no further comment, I'd ask that this be moved to Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 41, Calendar Number 430, substitute for Senate Bill Number 58, AN ACT CONCERNING GAY AND TRANSGENDER PANIC DEFENSE.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.
THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, I will. This bill prohibits the claim by a defendant that they had a moment of panic because someone was gay or a transgender. And so what it does is it prohibits that claim and says that if someone had an advance to someone or -- that wasn't forced, or that individual simply discovered that the person was gay or transgender and they could not use that defense, and it renders it not justifiable. I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And again, I'd like to be associated with the remarks Chairman and Senator Winfield. This is a proposal brought to our attention by Senator Looney. It's my understanding, the last time that this defense was utilized anywhere in the United States was in Iowa around 2015. But we have a very strong, I think -- I believe, we claim, that was the strongest in the nation, hate crimes bill. I can't, for the life of me, imagine any defense counsel worth his or her salt trying to use this as a defense, but as a policy statement at the least, saying to the people of the state of Connecticut, this is just intolerable, that there's absolutely no way that one could defend themselves because they were surprised
that someone was gay or transgender. I think it is an appropriate public policy and would like to thank Senator Looney for bringing this to our attention. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further? Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Speaking in support of the bill, I want to thank Senator Winfield, the chair of the Judiciary Committee, and Senator Kissel, the ranking member for the strong bipartisan leadership of the committee on this, on this bill. It is important I think to note, three states have already enacted legislation of this kind. California, Illinois, and Rhode Island have banned the use of the gay and transgender panic defense. And according to research from the Williams Institute at the UCLA School of Law, these defenses have been used or attempted to be used in approximately half of the states at one time or another. We've had reports of it in Connecticut, especially in circumstances where someone solicits a prostitute and the prostitute turns out to be other than the customer intended and reacts violently and assaults that person. And again, it's generally the -- The defense is not used on its own. It's generally part of a claim that the defendant, learning that the victim's sexual orientation or gender identification at that point being shocked by that, became violent in the heat of the moment, or suffered some sort of temporary mental breakdown or
diminished capacity. So this usually becomes part of a, the diminished capacity defense, which of course is often used in the, in the criminal context, that drove them, that this drove the defendant to violence or, or somehow believed that upon learning the sexual orientation or gender identity of the victim that the defendant was in danger of immediate bodily harm. So the result in this and many cases has led to a reduction in charges for some offenders. This is somewhat baffling that in a discussion of this issue, Congressman Joseph Kennedy of Massachusetts commented -- And this is in relation to what, close to what Senator Kissel had said, is that murdering or assaulting anyone because of their sexual orientation or gender identity is not a defense. It is a hate crime. And if we don't recognize or limit or debar the use of this defense, we are in effect eviscerating our own hate crime statutes, which is I think nothing that this General Assembly would want to be a part of, because I think we're quite, quite proud of the stance we've taken in support of the Hate Crimes law and its expansion that we have passed at various times. So, so carried to its logical extreme, a defendant could seek to use irrational bigotry as a defense against charges of violence potentially directed against any member of any racial, ethnic, or religious group. And, as I said, the outcome would be the evisceration of our hate crimes statute. So I would hope that we will join California, Illinois, and Rhode Island, and prohibit the use of this abhorrent defense. And I want to again thank the committee for its bipartisan support. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Looney. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. If there is no further comment or objection, I would ask that it be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing none. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 2, Calendar Number 52, substitute for Senate Bill 807, AN ACT CONCERNING THE LEGISLATIVE COMMISSIONERS' RECOMMENDATIONS FOR REVISIONS TO THE PUBLIC HEALTH STATUTES. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):
Thank you, Madam President. This bill does several things. First of all, there are some various technical changes to the public health-related statutes. It also extends by one year to January 1st, 2020, the reporting deadline for a very important task force on the needs of and services for adults with intellectual disabilities. It also addresses a deadline for dental assistants to pass a Dental Assisting National Boards on Infection Control Examinations. The Clerk is in possession of an Amendment, LCO Number 7997. I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO Number 7997, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the Amendment and ask its reading be waived and seek leave of the chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):
Thank you. This Amendment is to address two things. First of all, in Section 13, for the dental assistants, it does expand the dental procedures that dental assistants can perform. And it also addresses the need to extend the timeline to allow dental assistants to pass the Infectious Control Examination. And, in addition, it allows for some flexibility with the examination by also adding a possible assessment for them to pass. And I believe that those are all good changes to that section of the bill. The second part of the Amendment is creating a new category for oral health care providers, called the "dental therapists." In this Amendment, dental hygienists with advanced education at an accredited institution, 1,000 hours of clinical training under the supervision of a licensed dentist, and passage of an exam can practice only in public health settings, I think that's an important part of it, under the collaborative agreement with a dentist to perform education, preventive, and therapeutic services. I believe that this addresses a need that we have in our state for some of our citizens who are underserved in their health care needs, children, the disable, veterans, the elderly. We have a program in this state that happens once a year with dentists called Missions of Mercy, which is an incredible program. And I applaud the dentists for their work in that. In the last one that was done in 2018 in Willimantic, it happens in one part of the state annually. Approximately 100, or 800 patients showed up for services. In the one that just happened a few months ago, that -- According -- They haven't had their statistics out yet. But in the Hartford Courant, they reported that in three hours, 400 people had been there. Perhaps some had even waited overnight for services. So we have some
underserved people in our community that I hope this will address. I also want to make clear that they can only again practice in public health settings, which includes things like group homes and senior centers and Head Start programs, as well as community health centers. I think the other wonderful thing about this is that we're allowing people to advance in their profession. Many of the people that become dental assistants, dental hygienists, and now hopefully dental therapists are women. And I think this gives them a good economic opportunity and a good way to advance themselves in the profession. So I do think that this is an Amendment that should pass, and I very much thank the ranking member of Public Health for her support and hard work on this and also to the Senate Republican leader for his help and work on this as well. Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Will you remark further? Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of the Amendment. This is an initiative that we have been working on for close to, this'll be the third year. This is something that the Department of Public Health feels very strongly about also. And I will share that we have a very large underserved population without access to dental care. And oral decay has increased in the state of Connecticut. And as many of you know, the teeth are sort of the window or pathway to disease. Not having proper oral care leads to cardiovascular
disease, diabetes, rheumatoid arthritis. So if we can seek and see younger people within our public health settings that they have access to more types of care, it's a benefit for all of us here in the state of Connecticut. I would like to speak to the dental therapist part, which again, along with the good co-chair of Public Health, we've spent a lot of time speaking to, right now, they are hygienists. They've worked in the field. They have a license. They will go back to school and take advanced courses in dental health. They will have to pass a competency exam. And they will have to be able to enter into an agreement with a dentist who they will work under. Again, this is just limited to the public health setting where the need is great. In our cities, in our socioeconomic areas in my town that are socioeconomically depressed, in our school-based health clinics, it offers students or children or elderly people or veterans that go in and have their teeth cleaned, now they will be able to do more for them at the time of the visit. I think this is a very positive step for the state of Connecticut in making sure that oral health is something that we take seriously and we provide to as many as we possibly can. In addition, it also is a very large expansion of the timeframe for our dental assistants, which are different than, obviously, hygienists or therapists, to be able to pass a competency exam. Many of them have been working in this field for years and years, and there is a hygiene competency exam that is given. And one of the issues we've had is it's given in English, and many of the women that are working, mostly women, speak English as a second language. So it has been a difficult exam for them to pass, even though they are absolutely competent in their skills. So we are looking at ways to be able to
make sure that we have the confidence that they understand the hygiene process and what is required, but without necessarily having to pass this type of exam that is not in their language that is the most strong. They could do it through a competency exam. And this is something that I think will be able to allow these individuals to keep their jobs. And we are very excited about this. And I hope that the Senate will support this Amendment. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Thank you. Just a couple of questions to the proponent of the Amendment. Can you inform us of the staff, the qualification, educational qualifications for the dental hygienist currently?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

The academic qualifications for a dental hygienist.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

I believe it's an associate degree, but I'm not, I don't know actually. I know that they are licensed
through the Department of Health, but -- Public Health, but --

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCORY (2ND):

And for -- I'm trying to understand -- And I'm just asking questions 'cause I'm writing down -- I heard the term "dental hygienist," which we currently hear. I heard the term "dental assistant," and now this new pathway called "dental therapist." What educational qualification would a dental therapist have? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If you, if you can refer to the Amendment, if I can find the spot, it talks specifically about the fact that they would need to attend an accredited dental school in order to receive this particular certification. And they would also need to pass an exam. I hope that answers your question, Senator.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCORY (2ND):
Yes, just one more question. Will the dental hygienist be qualified to do the work of the dental therapist if this Amendment, this bill is passed? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. They will not. Not until they have the advanced education, the 1,000 hours of clinical training under a licensed dentist, and also the passage of the exam.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

And lastly -- And I had this conversation with Senator Abrams. I just it to be on the record. Currently, so there's a pathway for the dental hygienist currently, but we do not have a pathway for the dentist therapist currently. Is that correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

This would be the pathway to become a dental therapist.
THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I just have a few questions about this, this bill before us too. I know that this was potentially going to be discussed yesterday, and then it kind of got put off. And it took me by surprise today, and I had really intended on taking a harder look at it before we ended up debating it in the chamber. But here we are. I share some of the concerns that were just mentioned. I understand that we have a dentist, which a designation is DDS, which is someone who is a Doctor of Dental Surgery. And then we also have classifications for hygienists and therapists. Or rather this bill would create this new designation for dental therapists. Can someone explain to me exactly what a dental therapist is and how that differs from a dental hygienist? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams.
SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you. If you look on the Amendment in line 16 through 30, it spells out some of the functions that a dental therapist -- Oh, I'm sorry. I apologize. I was looking at the wrong spot. If you look on line 77 to 109, it spells out some of the procedures and functions that a dental therapist would be allowed to do.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

I'm sorry. What lines numbers again? Through you, Madam.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

77 to 109.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

I see -- Thank you, Madam President. And thanks to the gentlelady for that answer. So it looks to me, going through this list, that there are some significant dental procedures being done here, some of them of a surgical and potentially irreversible nature. My understanding is that dental hygienists are in the business of doing dental prevention. You know, they clean teeth, that sort of thing. And they give advice about making sure people do not develop, you know, cavities and further dental complications. Whereas, a dentist is an actual doctor who deals with surgery. What are the education requirements for a dental hygienist, a dental therapist, and a dentist? Through you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

I cannot answer all of the educational requirements for all three of those categories. However, again, if you look at the Amendment, lines 120 to 142, it spells out what the requirements would be for the dental therapists.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Rather than requiring me to stand here and read this, would you mind filling me in on exactly what those requirements are? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senators Ab -- Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Through you, Madam President. A dental, a dental hygienist licensed per our statutes can obtain a dental therapist certification by attending a higher education accredited facility by, accredited by the Commission of Dental Accreditation. Let's see. It would be full-time instruction equivalent to a post-secondary college level, incorporates all dental
therapy practice competencies. They would then have
to show that they had completed that program
successfully and make that available to the
Department of Public Health upon request. They
would have to complete a comprehensive examination
that's prescribed by the Commission on Dental
Competency Assessments or its equivalent,
administered independently from any institution that
offers the program of dental therapy. They would
also need the completion of 1,000 hours of clinical
training under the direct supervision of a dentist,
and also complete 6 hours of continuing education
and, at which point they would then be eligible to
enter a collaborative agreement with a dentist.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And thank you for those
answers. So what I'm understanding is essentially
what we're going to do is we're going to take
someone who is presumably a dental hygienist
currently and allow them to take a course with 1,000
hours' worth of additional training and we're going
to give them the authority to do many of the same
things that dentists do, including dental surgery
and actual irreversible dental procedures. I don't
understand why we would be doing this. It seems
like a serious change in what we define as the scope
of practice for dentists and dental hygienists. And
why would we be creating something in between and
certainly without the necessary training? It
doesn't sound to me like dental hygienists from the
start get anywhere near the type of training that
someone who is a Doctor of Dental Surgery, a DDS, gets. So why would we take someone who has a completely different training mode of prevention and give them a small bit of training and then let them loose to actually practice dentistry? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I apologize if I characterized it in any way that made it sound simplistic. We are asking people to have the dental hygienist license first, which I was just given this, and a dental hygienist, they receive a diploma or certification of graduation from a dental hygiene program, which is a minimum of two academic year's curriculum. This certification would include a -- Let me read it again. Would be issued by an institution of higher education accredited by the Commission on Dental Accreditation after successful of the Dental Therapy program that includes in accordance with the Commission on Dental Accreditation standards for dental therapy education programs full-time instruction or its equivalent at a post-secondary college level and incorporates all dental therapy practice competencies. So if I somehow characterized that to make it sound simplistic, I apologize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Senator Sampson.
SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I thank the gentlelady for her answers. I don't believe it's simplistic in any way. It sounds like a lot of words, but in there I didn't see anything that led me to believe that someone should be practicing dental surgery. The functions of a dentist that are significant with nothing more than an associate's degree and something that we have yet to create in this dental therapist accreditation. I wish I knew more about this industry and about this bill. But I will tell you that this raises many red flags for me. When I saw this thing come before me creating a mid-level provider, I think it was described as, something in between dental hygienists and dentists, it immediately made me wonder why that would happen. And I understand that some argument is being made for access. But I don't believe that I've ever had trouble finding a dentist who would treat me. I don't think this is necessary. I think it is something that really needs more investigation before it passes this chamber today, Madam President. I will certainly be voting no, and I will track this bill as it goes through the House. And I will certainly be on top of my colleagues down there to make sure that they investigate this thoroughly before it becomes law. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the Amendment? On the Amendment, will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I would just like to say that to be a dental hygienist in the state of Connecticut, you need a minimum of two years of experience without a dentist's supervision. However, most of the people with a dental hygienist have a four-year bachelor's degree. And they go through many, many different aspects that have not really been touched on today, including they have to pass a board-approved exam by a dental hygienist. They have to complete a national board exam. They have to complete many, many hours of education training. And they also have to get licensed by the Department of Public Health. They take things like how do you administer dental anesthesia. All those things are required to be a hygienist. What we're asking for here is a dental hygienist that takes advanced courses, has to pass a competency exam, and that is administered by someone who is a qualified administerer [sic] of the exam, which is a licensed clinician, which is a dentist. They have to have a collaboration agreement that is agreed to by a dentist. So if a dentist is uncomfortable with their education requirements, they don't have to sign the agreement. Very similar to what we have with a PA and a physician. We are asking that these individuals with advanced degrees are able to work in a public health setting where I would very much disagree with my fellow senator that there is not a need. There is a huge need. If there wasn't a need, we wouldn't be turning people away from the Mission of Mercy that we see. There are so many children, people that are veterans, and people that don't have access to dental health care that come to our school-based health clinics. They come to our federally qualified health care centers looking and seeking dental care. And I can tell you personally,
I have met so many folks that are in the IDD community that cannot get a dentist to service them. They are Medicaid recipients, and they have nowhere to go for their oral health care. I had one person actually in my district with three teeth that were rotting in her mouth. She could not get access to care. I tried to help her parents through our system. And this is exactly the type of community that these dental therapists serve. They are doing it because they currently work in the public health setting. They see the need, and they want to go back to learn more, to have, to be competent in what they do so they can help that underserved community. And there are other states that are looking into this same type of mid-level position. It's not trying to take the place of a dentist. No one is doing that here. It's working underneath a dentist's supervision. And I just want to highlight to you some of the things that a dental therapist would be able to do. They can do things like oral health and education and how to prevent gum disease. They can chart your oral cavity. They can do impressions for mouth guards. They can do simple extractions. If you're cleaning someone's tooth in this particular setting and you see that a child has a baby tooth that's just about to come out, you would then have the ability to take out that tooth. They can do -- They can seal fissures. They can look at fluoride washes. They can check the density of the teeth. Those are all things that they are not able to do right now with a hygienist. I would also -- as a -- with a hygienist license. I would like to also say that dental assistants work under a dentist. They are trained under a dentist. They're very different than a dental hygienist. I know it might be confusing. But a dental assistant has to have very little training as compared to a
hygienist. There are different categories. It's complicated. But this is something that we have been working on for three years in public health. The Public Health Department felt so strongly about this that they have been working with us to try to make sure that this bill is crafted in a way that provides access for those who are truly in need without touching the ability or the authority or usurping anything that has to do with those who go into dental school like you would for an MD. As I said, it's very similar to what we would use an analogy as a PA and a physician. So with, with all due respect, I think this is something that is a true need here in the state of Connecticut. If you can catch gum disease at an early age and correct it, it can have significant -- it can improve a young person, or as they age, an elderly person's lifespan, and it can prevent disease going forward. I will say, I have a spouse who is a physician and he actually wants to pull everyone's teeth, because they are such a nidus for infection and the cause of so many diseases later on in life. So I fully support this Amendment and I hope that we can see fit to pass this here in the Senate. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the Amendment, please signify -- I'm sorry, Excs -- Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

My apologies, Madam President. I'd like to ask for a roll call vote.
THE CHAIR:

On the Amendment?

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

On the Amendment. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. With that, we will have the Clerk please call for the vote and the machine will be open. And the vote is on the Amendment.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment A, LCO Number 7997. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Amendment A, LCO Number 7997.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted?

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? If so, the machine will be closed and the Clerk will announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate LCO Number 7997, Senate Amendment A.
Total number voting 34
Total number voting Yea 33
Total voting Nay 1
Absent and not voting 2

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So in summary of the bill as present, it includes the extension for the task force on studying the needs of the intellectual, intellectually disabled adults, some technical changes to our statutes, and now some changes for our dental assistants and the addition of the dental therapists. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Good evening.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):
Good to see you. Madam President, I rise to express concerns and somewhat disappointment in the manner in which this bill has been presented to us. I haven't had a lot of time to learn about the subject or the creation of dental therapists in Connecticut. But in the time I have spent on this, I've learned enough to understand that this is an opportunity, and I believe it's an opportunity lost if this bill were to become law as it's currently written. And I'm here, I've been here long enough to be part of helping dental hygienists do a lot more than what they could originally, which is good. It's been good for Connecticut, good for our residents. But the problem is when you have an emerging field like dental therapists where this bill requires that dental to be a dental therapist, you have to be a dental hygienist, that that is causing greater cost to be imposed on folks who currently go to federally qualified health facilities, because a hygienist will charge more. And now they'll have an advanced degree to be able to do the work that a therapist would do. And that will put more cost onto the system and onto those that are seeking those services. Some states are doing it this way. Other states are allowing the hygienist to continue to do their work and therapists, or to do the work of ather -- as a therapist, but also to have the therapist be able to be licensed alone. And they're finding in those areas that there's much more activity that the therapist is serving because they're doing, they're doing repair work, where the hygienist does prevention work. And they're enhancing the environment in the FQHC. More people are coming in, they're actually bringing more money in. They're actually hiring more dentists and more hygienists because of that. There's no question in my mind the likelihood if this bill becomes law that
the chances of having a therapist be licensed separately from being a hygienist will be greatly diminished. Because the industry that is the therapy, the hygienist industry, will work hard to prevent the therapists from being able to be employed. It is a growing field. It's an opportunity for people to move into a field with, with, that currently they could not if they have to be a hygienist first. It's also an opportunity to serve areas of our state that are underserved. And there are many, many people who don't have the resources who suffer greatly with dental conditions. I hear about it a lot in my district. But this is a rural problem as much as it's an urban problem. And it's an opportunity lost here. I wish we could've taken a little more time to get this right so that we can open the door to both having hygienists have that opportunity to be licensed to be a therapist, but also for therapists to be able to do their work and help the most needy communities in our state to have this opportunity to create a field of employment that would open up for therapists as well. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Will you remark further? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And now that the Amendment has passed, and I see I was the only Nay vote, I've had a chance to just kind of go through the section that describes the additional items that a dental therapist would be able to perform in that capacity. And it concerns me. Because as I -- My
first reaction, it looks like a lot of things that should be reserved for someone who has gone through the proper medical education of a dentist. Listed among the items here are not just the items that my colleagues listed about prevention and charting of the oral cavity, etcetera. If you read further, you discover that they will also be able to dispense and administer different types of medication, including applying desensitizing medication in the oral cavity, which I assume means giving someone Novocain. And simple extraction of erupted primary teeth, that sounds to me like pulling teeth. And the preparation and placement of direct restoration in primary and permanent teeth, which sounds to me like filling a cavity. It goes on to include crowns and many other things that I think are pretty clear that they fall under the category of something a dentist would do and not a hygienist. And, forgive me, but the list of additional requirements that are going to be necessary to promote a dental hygienist to a dental therapist does not sound in any way equivalent to me to what is necessary to be a Doctor of Dental Surgery, which is what a dentist is, with the full complement of a medical education, understanding of the interaction of drugs. And further, why on earth would anyone go to the trouble of becoming a dentist if you can perform all of these things and make money as a dental therapist? I am fearful that this will produce a lower level and quality of care in the future if we have fewer dentists and more dental therapists. I don't want to rain on anyone's parade. And I, as I said from the outset, I am no expert on this subject. But when I see a scope of practice issue come before either chamber in this legislature, it makes my ears go up immediately. And this is a huge one. This is a giant red flag for me. We have been getting along
just fine with the way things are where, we have legitimate dentists who have a medical education and hygienists that perform their duties in preventive care. I don't think we need a third option and I'm afraid where we're headed with this. I'm also curious to know -- And I won't even ask the question, but I know others will speak after me. I hope someone who knows tells me exactly how many states actually have dental therapists. Because I've never heard of this until today. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I just wanted to point out a couple of things. First of all, to my knowledge, this area of dentistry has been looked at since 2006, for over 13 years. And as my colleague, ranking member, and the Public Health committees stated previously, they've been working on the similar legislation for at least three years in this House. So I think there has been time to talk about this, and I feel for those people that while this has been talked about have been suffering. I would also like to point out that with this bill, there is no obligation for anyone to use dental therapists. So if there are organizations that don't want to avail themselves to this, they're certainly under no obligation to do so. And that no dental therapist can practice without a collaborative agreement with a licensed dentist. That collaborative agreement includes things such as identification of what exact
public health facilities that they would be serving in, what populations would be served, the limitations of those services, what age groups they could work with, what procedures they could or could not do in collaboration with the dentists, how they would keep dental records, how they would manage medical emergencies, how they would monitor care of their patients, how they would dispense and administer medications, and requirements for consultations prior to care, what the criteria would be, and the supervision of dental assistants, what that would be. Those are all part of the agreement that they would have with the dentist before they could even begin practicing. That collaborative agreement needs to be, be reviewed at least on an annual basis and revised as necessary. So they're certainly not off on their own working in any way. They would be under close supervision or close collaboration with a dentist. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Will you remark further? Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I would like to address some of the questions that have come up. First, I'd like to say that there is no evidence whatsoever that having a dental therapist work in your federally qualified health center is going to increase your cost. If anything, the data that we have shows that it decreases cost. And more people are able to provide and have access to the dental care that they need. One thing that hasn't been discussed is that this program, the educational
system, has all gone in front of the Public Health Organization. They've approved that this is something that should move forward. So these are the folks that are right now licensing the hygienist and then looking at the additional educational requirements that would be required to become a dental therapist. So it has gone through a review process with the Department of Public Health. It's been now three years that we've been talking about this with the Department of Public Health. Other states have passed dental therapists, and they are implementing it. I realize that there's a lot of fear by dentists, because they're afraid that this is gonna encroach on their work. But the reality is, if you are a dentist and you're not comfortable with the idea of a dental therapist, don't sign the agreement. They have to work underneath you like you do if you are an MD and a PA. They cannot work independently. They cannot go and get this advanced degree, pass a competency exam, and then work unless you as a dentist sign the collaboration agreement. So that's the big stick that you have. And you have to be comfortable that that person is qualified in your opinion, you can lay out exactly what you will allow them to do and not do. So this is actually a win-win. This happens every single day in health care as far as the changing scope of the nature of how health care is delivered. This is not trying to replace a dentist or a dentist that can perform surgery. This is simply allowing someone who is licensed here in the state of Connecticut with a bachelor's degree or a two-year degree as a dental hygienist, allows them to take additional classes that are required and approved by the Department of Public Health, take a competency exam, and then have to have a signed collaboration agreement with a dentist in order to practice underneath their
supervision. That's what it is. So many of the qualified health centers that have used dental therapists have actually found they are more profitable. They are able to see more patients. There is no shortage of hygienists. So there is nothing to say that every hygienist is going to go for this advanced degree. In addition, the Department of Public Health and the Public Health Committee have absolutely talked to the dentists who were actually in on this conversation, by the way. They asked if we would set up a working group to study a direct pathway. And we said, yes. And we are committed to doing that. So you wouldn't necessarily have to have your hygienist licensure before you went to learn and to study. In a -- It would take you longer to be a dental therapist. So I want to stress that. I want to make sure that anybody who has questions that are based in fact rather than fear, please feel free to ask them, because we want to make sure everybody's comfortable. This is the right thing to do. Think about how many people are turned away at the Mission of Mercy. Most of them are socioeconomically depressed. They do not have access to dental care. Oral care is super expenses [sic], as we all know. They are minorities. They are women. They are children. They are elderly. They are our veterans. Again, this is not something that you do, you get licensed, and you're out the door. You have to come to an agreement with a dentist that feels your credentials are competent, they feel comfortable with you, and they can lay out specifically what procedures they are going to allow you to do, just like a doctor can with a PA. If a doctor is not comfortable with a PA prescribing, they don't put that in the collaboration agreement. So there are checks and balances here. This has gone through the
Department of Public Health. And oral decay is rising in the state of Connecticut. There are more and more children that don't get oral care that need it. So I implore you to think about what's best for the state of Connecticut's people, the IDD community, those with intellectual disabilities that have a very difficult time having access. And I urge you to support the bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you would please call the roll and the machines will be opened.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 807 as amended by Senate A. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 807 as amended by Senate A.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? With that, would the Clerk -- The machines will be closed. And would the Clerk please announce the tally?

CLERK:

Senate Bill 807 as amended by Senate A.
Total number voting 34
Total number voting Yea 28
Total voting Nay 6
Absent and not voting 2

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, would the Clerk please call -- I'm sorry. I want to mark an item go and then the Clerk can call that item. Calendar Page 9, Calendar 139, Senate Bill 72.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 9, Calendar Number 139, Senate Bill Number 72, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TAX CREDIT FOR EMPLOYERS THAT MAKE PAYMENTS ON LOANS ISSUED TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES BY THE CONNECTICUT HIGHER EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL LOAN AUTHORITY.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bergstein.

SENATOR BERGSTEIN (36TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move the acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR BERGSTEIN (36TH):

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession an Amendment, LCO 8228. I move the adoption of the Amendment. Oh, no, sorry. I move -- Will the Clerk please call the Amendment?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

SENATOR BERGSTEIN (36TH):

8228.

CLERK:

LCO Number 8228, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bergstein.

SENATOR BERGSTEIN (36TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Every year, thousands of young people graduate from the excellent institutions of higher education in Connecticut. We want them to stay here. We want them to put down
roots, to get jobs, to pay taxes, to contribute to the future economic growth and prosperity in our state. This is a bill that would do that. What it does is gives a tax credit to employers who repay the CHESLA loans for students that have graduated from Connecticut institutions or from other institutions outside the state, but come to Connecticut, get a job, and start putting down roots and paying taxes here. What the Amendment does is caps the employer's contribution to $5,450 dollars a year, which aligns it with federal legislation, and at a 50 percent tax credit that would be the equivalent of $2,625 dollars a year in tax credit to the employer.

THE CHAIR:

Sustain. I'm just gonna stop you right there. If we could have quiet so that we can hear what you are saying about the Amendment. Please proceed.

SENATOR BERGSTEIN (36TH):

So it aligns the legislation with federal legislation, caps the contributions, the annual contributions, and allows students to participate in the program immediately upon graduation when they have a full-time job. So, Madam President, I move the adoption of the Amendment and -- Sorry [inaudible 04:43:43]

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Bergstein. The question is on adoption of the Amendment. Will anyone remark further on the Amendment? Senator Formica.
SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. One question for the proponent of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. Good evening.

SENATOR BERGSTEIN (36TH):

Good evening.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

The bill, the notes that I have -- And I'm sorry, I don't have the LCO open -- says per -- the tax credits were for corporations. Does that preclude LLCs, small businesses?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bergstein.

SENATOR BERGSTEIN (36TH):

Thank you, Madam Chair. It is not intended to exclude small businesses, no. The only exception, as I read it and understand it, is that the employee cannot be a -- child of the owner of a company. So for instance, if somebody owned a company, they
couldn't send their own child and repay their own child's tuition expenses.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, s --

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you very much for that clarification. Thank you, Madam President. I'm sorry to interrupt you. Thank you [crosstalk]

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the Amendment, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATE:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Amendment is adopted. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to refer this item to the Finance Committee, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. So ordered.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I would like the Clerk to please call the items on our Consent Calendar followed by a vote on the Consent Calendar, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk, kindly call the items.

CLERK:

Consent Calendar Number 1. Page 6, Calendar 100, Senate Bill 777. Page 6, Calendar 105, Senate Bill 953. Page 18, Calendar 238, Senate Bill 1048. Page 28, Calendar 346, Senate Bill 521. Page 34, Calendar 388, Senate Bill 843. Page 34, Calendar 391, Senate Bill 1008. Page 41, Calendar 430, Senate Bill 58. Page 44, Calendar 452, Senate Bill 504. And Page 48, Calendar 290, Senate Bill 140. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar Number 1. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar Number 1. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar Number 1.

THE CHAIR:
Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? Seeing that they have, the machine will be close and, Mr. Clerk, if you could kindly announce the tally.

CLERK:

On Consent Calendar Number 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Yea</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I thank you, Madam President. Madam President, before we adjourn for the day, just a brief announcement. We're -- The Senate Democratic Caucus will have a brief caucus immediately following adjournment. Immediately following adjournment, brief caucus immediately following adjournment. And I will now yield to any points of personal privilege or announcements.

THE CHAIR:

Any points of personal privilege? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):
Thank you, Madam President. And for the Senate Republicans, we will caucus tomorrow at 11:30 in the Caucus Room. Tomorrow, 11:30.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just a note for the Calendar that Senate, Senator Kelly was traveling on business and could not attend today's session. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Any further announcements? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It's our intention to convene tomorrow at noon, and with that, I move that we adjourn subject to the call of the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. We are adjourned. [gavel]

On motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 7:27 p.m. adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.