The Senate was called to order at 2:55 o’clock p.m., the President in the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

The Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda No. 1, dated Tuesday, May 21st, 2019.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move all items on Senate Agenda No. 1, dated Tuesday, May 21st, 2019, to be acted upon as indicated and that the agenda be incorporated by a reference into the Senate journal and the Senate transcript.

THE CHAIR:
So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you. Madam President, for the purposes of markings?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar Page 1, Calendar 487, Senate Joint Resolution No. 36, go. On Calendar Page 1, Calendar 516, Senate Joint Resolution No. 37, go. On Calendar Page 2, Calendar 517, Senate Joint Resolution 38, go. On Calendar Page 2, Calendar 518, Senate Joint Resolution No. 39, go. On Calendar Page 2, Calendar 519, Senate Joint Resolution No. 40, go. On Calendar Page 5, Calendar 78, Senate Bill 590, go. On Calendar Page 7, Calendar 99, Senate Bill 706, go. On Calendar Page 10, Calendar 157, Senate Bill 745, go. On Calendar Page 14, Calendar 189, Senate Bill 816, go. On Calendar Page 17, Calendar 225, Senate Bill 789, go. On Calendar Page 18, Calendar 234, Senate Bill 1040, go. On Calendar Page 22, Calendar 277, Senate Bill 586, go. On Calendar Page 23, Calendar 303, Senate Bill 1069, go. On Calendar Page 24, Calendar 306, Senate Bill 1060, go. On Calendar Page 29, Calendar 358, Senate Bill 383 -- I'm sorry, 388, go. On Calendar Page 32, Calendar 386, Senate Bill 347, go. On Calendar Page 33, Calendar 394, Senate Bill 1087, go. On Calendar Page 33, Calendar 397, Senate Bill 1100, Madam President I move that item to our Consent Calendar.
THE CHAIR:
So moved.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar Page 41, Calendar 450, Senate Bill 138, go. On Calendar Page 63, Calendar 359, Senate Bill 659 -- I'm sorry, 859, go.

THE CHAIR:

All of those items are so noted. And if I might, a point of personal privilege, I would like to invite my intern, Meghan Andrews. She is from Newington. And I wanted you all to see her. She is one of our best and brightest at the University of Connecticut. And she has been working very diligently for the last semester in my office as an intern, and all of my staff has come to rely upon her, especially in connection with our Women and Girls Council. She has helped us organize, not just our 27 commissioners and constitutional officers, but more than 100 organizations that have been participating along with our legislators on both sides of the aisle. Meghan is gonna be spending the summer at Travelers. She has just secured a much sought-after internship there. And I just want you to remember her name, because she is studying political science. So expect to see her in these halls in some capacity very soon. And I would like to ask our chamber to give their traditional warm welcome and congratulations to Meghan Andrews. [Clapping]

THE CHAIR:
Have a great summer. Meghan, thank you so much. And with that, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 1, Calendar No. 487, Senate Joint Resolution No. 36, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF MARISSA PASLICK GILLET OF WEST HARTFORD TO BE A UTILITY COMMISSIONER OF THE PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Senate Committee's favorable report and adoption of the resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And will you remark?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, this is a full-time, salaried position. This is her initial appointment. Ms. Gillett was voted upon favorably in her March 14th nomination hearing. She is a, has a degree, a BS in bioengineering with honors from Clemson, a JD with honors from University of Baltimore at Law School. She has spent her career working in the field of regulation
related to energy and environmental issues, spent many years at the Maryland Public Services Commission as an energy policy analyst as a commissioner, commission advisor, senior advisor to the chair, and her most recent position was energy source association in Washington, D.C. She is new to Connecticut. She's familiar with Connecticut's energy landscape. I've had a conversation with her yesterday and feel very strongly that she will do a great job at PURA, brings new, a new perspective, and somebody who I think will work very hard on behalf of our entire energy infrastructure, helping consumers, and making sure that we have cleaner, cheaper, and more reliable energy. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further on the resolution? Senate Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just wanted to say that I would concur with the remarks made by the Majority Leader and ask for adoption of the candidate's nomination. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Witkos. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the resolution before us? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
I thank you, Madam President. I think we need to have a roll call vote on this nominee, please.

THE CHAIR:

A roll call has been ordered. So, Mr. Clerk, would you kindly call the vote? And I will open the machines.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution No. 36. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution No. 36. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? If so, the machine will be closed. And, Mr. Clerk, would you please announce the tally?

CLERK:

Senate Joint Resolution No. 36.

- Total number voting: 35
- Total number voting Yea: 34
- Total voting Nay: 1
- Absent and not voting: 1

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] The Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk.
Page 1, Senate Joint Resolution No. 37, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE JAMES W. ABRAMS OF MERIDEN TO BE A MEMBER OF THE JUDICIAL REVIEW COUNCIL.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I thank you, Madam President. I want to, I'd like to yield to Senator Daugherty Abrams, please.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Daugherty Abrams, do you accept the yield?

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. And I'm going to recuse myself. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. And the record will note that Senator Daugherty Abrams has recused herself and is leaving the chamber. And with that, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and adoption of the resolution.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on adoption. Will you remark?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This is a part-time, nonpaid position. It's a four-year term. Judge Abrams was a state rep, sat on the bipartisan Select Committee, was voted unanimously in the affirmative in his May 16th hearing. He's a graduate of UConn Law and also Trinity College. He's both chief administrative judge for the Civil Division statewide and administrative judge for New Haven Judicial District. He -- Before becoming a judge, he worked in private practice, was court counsel for the city of Meriden, and chief counsel to House democrats. Many of us know Judge Abrams now. I have served with him when he was Representative Abrams. Always found him to be just a really a wonderful and learned individual, a very patient -- He was -- At the tail end of his legislative career, at the beginning of my legislative career, and took somebody like myself under his wing and always very, very willing to explain and to help and to be patient, and he has been an excellent judge from I think all accounts. Everyone can agree on that. And I believe he will do, and I know he will do a good job also on the Judicial Review Council. So, Madam President, I urge adoption of the resolution.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further on the resolution? 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 Judge Abrams. I had the pleasure of serving with then Representative Abrams on the Judiciary Committee. Back in the day, he was one of the only members of the Judiciary Committee that wanted to dig into bills dealing with the Uniform Commercial Code, and we were all very thankful that he had that interest. But just a generally very good guy. I had an opportunity to review his nomination when I sat on the committee. And it's been a number of years, and I actually bumped into him on a couple of court cases and just a generally outstanding jurist and very happy to support his nomination here this afternoon. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much. Will you remark further? Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good afternoon. Speaking in support of the resolution, as was said that Judge Abrams is really an extraordinary, extraordinarily gifted member of the Superior Court and his talent has been recognized by having become the state's chief judge. In terms of civil
administration, he was the administrative judge presiding in civil cases in New Haven for a quite a period of time. Became known by both the plaintiffs of Defense Council as someone who was just excellent and inciteful in helping to foster agreements and settle cases in ways that were reasonable, focusing on the strengths and weaknesses of both sides, cases, in the pretrial procedure and making sure that neither side had an unrealistic expectation about what the case might be worth. And so he brought that practical skill after the -- His career here, obviously, is both a very distinguished member of the House of Representatives and also had served as chief counsel to the House democrats. He had a, quite a diverse legal practice prior to his appointment to the bench. And I think that what is important in terms of his willingness to take on this additional assignment as a member of the Judicial Review Council is that this is a challenging and difficult and potentially sensitive assignment, because it involves evaluation of allegations of misconduct against other judges. And you have to have great courage, great integrity, great insight, great understanding of human nature and the practical implications of behavior in order to make a fair and accurate judgement in these cases that can be of such a significant impact on the careers of fellow jurists. So I can't think of anyone other than Judge Abrams who I think will inspire universal confidence being in this position and making those difficult decisions that require the wisdom of Solomon in many cases. And I think he's the right person to be there and brings to it the qualities that we all know are essential when someone is making a judgment in these kinds of cases where you sometimes have very, very passionate
allegations, sometimes coming from people who feel harmed by it, the process, without necessarily understanding all of the nuances of the process. So I think that we can have great confidence in what he will do there, as well as in what he has been and is been doing as a judge of the Superior Court. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Will you remark further on the resolution? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the vote and the machine will be open.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution No. 37. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Joint Resolution No. 37. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked. And, Mr. Clerk, would you kindly announce the tally?

Senate Joint Resolution No. 37.

| Total number voting  | 34 |
| Total number voting Yea | 34 |
| Total voting Nay      | 0  |
| Absent and not voting | 2  |
[Gavel] Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

Page 2, Calendar No. 517, Senate Joint Resolution No. 38, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE LAURA F. BALDINI OF WEST HARTFORD TO BE AN ALTERNATE MEMBER OF THE JUDICIAL REVIEW COUNCIL.

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

Thank you, Madam President. This is a part-time, nonpaid position, which is a four-year term. Ms. Baldini lives in West Hartford with her family. She was voted in unanimously in the affirmative in her May 16th hearing. She currently serves on the Judicial Branch Wiretap Panel, Pre-Bench Faculty, and others, is involved in many community service organizations. She has gone to Yale and seen how
law, as a Yale alumni fellow, and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Duff. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the -- Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection, I'd like this item to be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 2, Calendar No. 518, Senate Joint Resolution No. 39, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE ANNA M. FICETO OF WOLCOTT TO BE AN ALTERNATE MEMBER OF THE JUDICIAL REVIEW COUNCIL.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and adoption of the resolution.
THE CHAIR:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Again, this is a part-time, nonpaid, four-year term. Ms. Ficeto lives in Wolcott with her family. She was voted on unanimously in the affirmative in her May 16th hearing. She is a, has gone to Mount Holyoke and UConn Law. She began her career in private practice, but has spent most of her career with the state of Connecticut in a number of legal and senior roles in the Department of Civil Protection, Public Works, Department of Administrative Services, Governor Rell's office, and as a PURA commissioner, has been a judge since 2012, and has served in Hartford and the GAE '14. I would move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):
Yes, I rise to support the nomination of Judge Ficeto and would like to add to the record that she is an individual who has for many years been a state employee serving on the bench. Her demeanor is one that has always been complementary to those who have appeared before her and to the mission and the charge of the bar. She also is very, very involved civically and in her religious community, and she -- I highly recommend her and am very happy to see this nomination. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Hartley. Will you remark further on the resolution? Will you remark further? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection, I'd like this item be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 2, Calendar No. 519, Senate Joint Resolution No. 40, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF MELISSA KANE OF WESTPORT TO BE A MEMBER OF THE CONNECTICUT COMMUTER RAIL COUNCIL.

THE CHAIR:
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption. Will you remark further?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Again, this is a part-time, nonpaid position. It's a four-year term. Ms. Kane was voted unanimously in the affirmative in her May 16th hearing. She's a selectwoman from Westport. She's been spoken very highly in her hearing by the House member that represents Westport and also our senator who represents her as well. She's been to school at Mount Holyoke. She's owned a small business for over ten years. And again, I believe she will serve very, serve us very well on the Commuter Rail Council. I know Ms. Kane as well and find her to be very passionate about a number of issues and somebody who loves to serve her community and her state, and will be a fine addition to the Commuter Rail Council. Thank you, Madam President. I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further? Senator Haskell.
Thank you very much, Madam President. I rise today in support of Melissa Kane's nomination to the Commuter Rail Council. First and foremost, Madam President, I want to thank Senator Looney and Senator Duff and the leadership of this chamber in pursuit, in moving forward with her nomination. I've known Melissa Kane for a number of years. She is a widely respected and admired voice in our community as a selectman as a passionate for others. You know, she wanted to be here today in person to watch the vote, but in fact, she's in Washington, D.C., lobbying federal representatives for commonsense gun violence prevention. Her passion extends to a variety of issues, but nowhere is it more on display I believe than in improving the quality of life of Fairfield County. And part and parcel of that, Madam President, is ensuring that we have adequate 21st Century infrastructure. That's why I believe her voice is desperately needed on the Commuter Rail Council. I've spent a lot of time chatting with Melissa Kane about how we can speed up our trains. You know, I have here in my hand, Madam President, a 1977 train map of the New Haven line. It's a timetable that shows that the train back then was actually faster than it is today. You can see it gets slower in this 1982 train map when they, its -- But it was still under an hour. Now, the train from Westport to Grand Central is over an hour. And I can tell you that minutes matter when you talk to commuters, when you go to the train station in the morning or in the afternoon, they tell you that an extra ten minutes on the train, it adds up. It means that they're not
able to eat dinner with their kids. For those who work late, it means they're not even able to get home before their kids are in bed. So it is time that we modernize our infrastructure. It's time that we bring Wi-Fi to Metro-North. On the busiest commuter network in the entire country, we're not even able to allow commuters to be efficient as they travel to and from their desk. I know that Melissa cares deeply about these issues. I know that she is gonna be a passionate and engaged voice on the Commuter Rail Council, and I'm thrilled to support her nomination. I urge my colleagues to do the same.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Haskell. And I'm quite sure you were not alive in 1977 or 1982, and it is impressive that you have those documents with you. Will you remark further on the resolution that is before us? Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this nomination as well. Knowing Melissa as a first, as a selectman in the town of Westport that I also represent, she has been a tireless public advocate. So we know her skills and experience will be a major contribution to the Commuter Rail Council. And it is also an opportunity to perhaps plug the importance of the Commuter Rail Council within our transportation of long-term planning. These are individuals that ride the trains, use the trains, and understand the nuances and the challenges that they encounter. So having a voice
in southwestern Connecticut, particularly from Westport, is very much a welcome. So I encourage support of this nomination. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Hwang. Will you remark further on the resolution that is before us? Will you remark further? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection, I'd like this item be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 5, Calendar No. 78, substitute for Senate Bill No. 590, AN ACT CONCERNING THE SELECTION OF CATERERS FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO RENT STATE-OWNED VENUES. There is an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Can the Senate stand at ease for a moment?
THE CHAIR:

Certainly. The Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If we can return to the call of the Calendar, please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. That item has been called. Shall we call the next? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I believe the Clerk had called Calendar Page 5, Calendar 78. Please return to that, yes.

CLERK:

Page 5, Calendar No. 78, substitute for Senate Bill No. 590, AN ACT CONCERNING THE SELECTION OF CATERERS FOR INDIVIDUALS WHO RENT STATE-OWNED VENUES. There is an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen, good afternoon.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):
Good afternoon, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. This bill would allow those who are renting a state-owned venue to use a caterer of their choice. Currently, there are two state-owned venues, Harkness State Park, as well as Rocky Neck, who require a renter of their facility to choose their caterer from a preapproved list. But recognizing that perhaps somebody has a favorite caterer or perhaps a special dietary need, the Environment Committee develops legislation in coordination with Senator Osten's good work to develop a process by which those who want to rent at these two facilities can go ahead and do so by applying to have their special caterer preapproved at least one year prior to the event. It was unanimously voted out of committee, and I urge my colleagues to vote in favor of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Will you remark further? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I remember when the bill came before us. There was a
lot of concern expressed about whether or not people with special diets whether they had individuals that they had used in the past for catering services felt comfortable with other vendors and then as we listened to the testimony we were trying to provide a pathway for some of those individuals that could demonstrate that they were qualified in terms of having a license, an appropriate license, appropriate insurance, if they could demonstrate to the agency that they were qualified, that in fact an individual could choose a different caterer other than the one that's on DEEP's preferred, or Department of Administrative Services preferred list. During that conversation, I think we, at least in the screening conversation, we were torn between how much latitude we should give an individual. And as I recall, there were some concerns expressed about how some of these venues are special and how they have limited facilities, perhaps no kitchen facility. And then for those reasons, having a certain period of time for the agency to vet an applicant made some sense. As I described to the Chair of the Environment Committee, I think the committee works very well when we're trying to find a pathway for legislation to get through the committee. It doesn't always play out in our respective caucuses, and to that end, Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of LCO No. 7410. If he would call it and I'd be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:
THE CHAIR:

The question is on adoption of the amendment. Please proceed and summarize.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, what this amendment does is states plainly that if a licensed caterer submits a, the prescribed paperwork for catering services, that the DEEP shall permit that caterer as requested by the renter to perform those catering duties on behalf of the renter. What it does is it does away in my reading of it with the one-year requirement. So, conceivably, if someone can demonstrate that they're appropriately licensed and can meet the requirements of the agency, that the one year would not be necessary. And I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I appreciate my good colleague's attempt to make the process a little bit easier for folks out there who are looking to rent these facilities. But I can also appreciate the words of our agencies and those who oversee these state-owned facilities and parks.
These are historic buildings requiring specialized knowledge, equipment, preparation, and planning. They have very narrow hallways by which caterers need to navigate. It is also important to note that these two facilities do not have kitchens, as most caterers would come to expect. And so it would be very necessary for all of these caterers to meet very specific and specialized requirements as set forth by our Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. It's for these reasons and for those that I had stated that I think we've come to a really great understanding and a great bill that provides language by which folks who want to use the caterer of their choosing can do so by following a process a year in advance. Many of us know that when we're planning these special events, such as weddings, we do so with ample time. And it's for these reasons that I urge my colleagues to oppose the amendment. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, through you to Senator Miner.

THE CHAIR:

Prepare yourself, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):
I'm used to it, Madam President. [laughing]

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed. I'll bet.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, Madam President. Absent this amendment, as I understand the bill, who would be in charge of saying no to a particular caterer, absent your amendment? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

I believe the decision is made jointly between the Department of Administrative Services for purposes of whether the appropriate licenses are in place and then the DEEP to determine whether or not the vendor could meet certain criteria that they have.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

And through you, Madam President. And once they make that decision, is it appealable or is it just a
final decision to the best of your knowledge? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

I don't remember any testimony about an external appeal. I know that there was an appeals process with regard to individuals who had asked for a different vendor, and that was denied. So unlike a DEEP order or something like that that has a very prescribed appeal process, I'm not aware of one here.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

So through you, Madam President, to Senator Miner. So in your -- what your amendment does is allow people to meet some criteria to be allowed to use that public facility without having to go through a more rigorous and arbitrary decision by agencies and the bureaucratic process. Is that the import of your amendment? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Yes, that is the import of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I thank Senator Miner for the amendment. I think the issue here is the fact that I think caterers are pretty much cognizant of a facility. I know that in my business, when people want to rent out the facility I have, then the caterers would come down check it out, and if it fits their criteria, they'll rent it from me. They're not gonna take on a facility that either there's narrow passages or there's no cooking outside so they bring their machinery in to cook. I mean, you could go down Long Wharf Drive and find all sorts of vendors who are out there who don't have cooking on-site. They do it in the truck. Right down here on Bushnell Park. Right? All the trucks are lined up. They have cooking out there. The problem is is the arbitrariness for which this could be used where someone wants a caterer come in to a public facility and bureaucrats are gonna say no. By the time you say, well, why? Well, we don't think your equipment can do this or we don't think you have that. If you want to ask for insurance, I think that's more than appropriate. If you want to check to see if they're a good business, I think that is appropriate. But I doubt DEEP or another agency can look at a business and say, you are ill-equipped to do cooking at a
party on that facility. Who are you to say that? You don't know their business. Madam President, this is a taxpayer tax, or I should say a property owned by the people of the state of Connecticut, and if somebody wants to get a caterer who can prove or could give insurance for liability, we don't need this process, which is arbitrary in nature. Thank you, Madam President. I support the amendment and ask for a roll call vote.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. A roll call vote will be ordered. Will you remark further on the amendment? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the roll?

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 590, Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 7410. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 7410. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Amendment A, LCO 7410. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked and, Mr. Clerk, if you would please announce the tally.
CLERK:

Senate Bill 590, Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 7410.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Yea</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] Amendment fails. Will you remark further on the legislation that is before us? Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And through you, a couple of questions for the proponent of the bill?

THE CHAIR:

Yes, please prepare yourself, Senator Cohen. Please proceed, Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

And through you, Madam President. If a caterer was planning on using the facilities and they were not on a current list, how would they get the opportunity to cater at these two facilities? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you. They would have the opportunity at the request of the person renting the state-owned venue, and then they would go through the same process that DEEP goes through with the other lists of approved, preapproved caterers to ensure that those caterers are indeed set up to use these facilities.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Osten.

SENATOR Osten (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And through you. What would be the process for a caterer to appeal the decision of the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, and through you, Madam President. The appeals process would be set up within the Department of Environmental Protection and they would need to come up with that process upon passage of this bill.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I have no further questions for the proponent of the bill, but I just have a statement for both legislative intent and my consideration. So this bill came about as a result of one of my constituents not able after 12 years of acting as a caterer down on Rocky Neck was denied by the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection consideration from being a part of the caterers, even though he is an active caterer in the area. And this has caused considerable distress for people that were considering weddings and other such events at Rocky Neck. For three years, I attempted to get the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection to reconsider their position on this caterer and a couple of other caterers that brought similar concerns forward. I'm gonna vote for this bill, but I leave open the opportunity for me to come again before this body if the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection does not provide equal access to caterers who already have all necessary equipment, who have never had any problems catering anywhere, who have letters of recommendations from other Department of Energy and Environmental Protection professionals saying what a good caterer they were and how well they treated the facilities. So I understand Senator Cohen's concerns about the historical nature of the property. I have concerns on the small business aspect of this and believe that the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection's past behavior on this has led to some, some concerns on my part of them picking and choosing not by the best person by,
but by whether or not someone turned in a colorful application. So again, I will be supporting this piece of legislation, and I do, I perfectly understand the position of Senator Cohen, but if the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection is not fair in their access to these facilities, I will be back again. Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further on the bill? If not -- Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and good afternoon to you.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you. I rise for a purpose of question for the proponent of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, please proceed. Senator Cohen, prepare yourself.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):
Thank you very much, Madam President. Thank you, Senator, for bringing this bill forward. There are a lot of caterers who have not been able to take advantage of the opportunities here. My question related to the 12 months, and why 12 months, as if -- If you decide to get married in July of one year, then for a June wedding the next, this bill would prohibit you to be able to participate in that? Through you. As a caterer? Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and through you. Yes, the 12 months was chosen in partnership with the agency who obviously had great concerns over this bill being brought forward at all. Commissioner Dykes did write in opposition of the bill. But in talking with the agency, it was determined that 12 months would be a reasonable amount of time in which to sit down with a caterer, allow them to apply, and allow them to make any corrections necessary without having to go through some sort of appeal process. There is, as I say, some specialized equipment that would be necessary in order to cater at the said facilities, and so 12 months seemed to be a reasonable amount of time in which to get everybody prepared and on board to cater such an event. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Formica.
SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. With all due respect, Senator, I think 12 months is a reasonable amount of time only in government. If you're in business, you gotta do things much quicker than in 12 months. And I have some concerns about what's gonna happen at DEEP if we have to go down there as a caterer, make an appointment, go sit with somebody, go through something on a, some procedure that might involve who knows what, an application form, when you have caterers that have perhaps been doing this for decades upon decades who have equipment that they travel to many places without kitchens, much less a place that the public owns, and be able to go in there and -- With especially these particular two venues that you mentioned. Which will bring me to the question, Madam President, why weren't those two venues if they're the only ones without kitchens, mentioned in this bill? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you. We discovered that they were the only two facilities that were impacted upon greater research with the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. Through you, Madam President.
Thank you, Senator. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I have a lot of difficulty with some of the details in this bill, but I think it's better than the process where we, you know, where people had to operate prior, including a business that, you know, that I was involved in. Sometimes I just don't understand how government works and why we have to go through all these hoops just to do business here in the state of Connecticut. But, thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the bill? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the roll and the machine will be open.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 590. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 590. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 590. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:
Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators votee? The machine will be closed and the Clerk would kindly announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 590.

| Total number voting               | 35 |
| Total number voting Yea           | 29 |
| Total voting Nay                  | 6  |
| Absent and not voting             | 1  |

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] Legislation is adopted. Senator Needleman for a point of personal privilege. I see you have a very smart, good-looking, energetic group with you.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

I do, Madam President, and thank you for acknowledging this today. As a point of personal privilege, I would like to recognize the young people from the Colchester Bacon Academy, young Democrats, along with their two fine teachers, Angie Parkinson and Megan Kehogreen, who are dedicated. Colchester Bacon Academy is very, very politically active school. I think they have groups on both sides of the aisle who work for candidates, and I can honestly say that I'm here because they worked so hard on my behalf. So I want to recognize them. Thank you. Welcome to the Senate. This is where it all happens. You'll be here someday. And I thank you.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. And I do see Senator Anwar has gravitated over to that part of the room, because I didn't notice that many of these young people also were helpful to Senator Anwar and the governor and I, and I'm sure Joe Courtney also say thank you to you. And if our chamber could kindly give these young people a warm welcome, we'd appreciate it.

[general applause]

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And I'd also like to welcome the Bacon Academy young dems as well. They follow me on Twitter, so I -- They have a good online presence. So welcome. Madam President, if we could for just a movement in our markings or recalling, if the Clerk can now please call Calendar Page 57, Calendar 99, Senate Bill 706, please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 57, Calendar No. 99, substitute for Senate Bill No. 706, AN ACT CONCERNING EPINEPHRINE AUTO INJECTORS. There is an amendment.
Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

Thank you, Madam President. This bill makes various changes regarding the administration of epinephrine auto injectors. The Clerk is in possession of a strike-all amendment, No. 9080. I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment.

Mr. Clerk.

LCO No. 9080, Senate Schedule A.

Senator Abrams, would you like to summarize?
SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam Clerk [sic]. This bill allows for profit and nonprofit entities who have a person or persons with training work to establish a medical protocol with a prescribing practitioner to obtain and maintain epinephrine cartridge injectors from wholesalers.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Will you remark further on the legislation?

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

I move --

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the amendment and ask its reading to be waived and seek the le -- Oh, I'm sorry. I did that. Excuse me [laughing].

THE CHAIR:

No problem.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):
I would like to ask that this be put on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. And -- So, so we're on the amendment. And let us ask first, Senator, if there are any other senators, since you have summarized the amendment, who might like to remark on the amendment that is before us. Will you remark on the amendment that is before us? Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this bill in this amendment. This amendment will allow those who feel that it's proper to have epinephrine readily available for a situation that could arise. We do know that there is an expiration date on epinephrine, so it does not necessarily describe when, how much, and at all locations, but it does allow organizations, nonprofits, and actually state employees to be held harmless if they administer epinephrine. It does require once it has been administered to call 911 so that proper medical attention can be taken. But this is an opportunity for us to save lives here in the state of Connecticut. And we've seen in many times -- I know that there are senators in here that have severe allergies -- how it can be life-savings, and I support the, the amendment fully. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Somers. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the chamber? Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise for a question, please.

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

So, thank you, Senator. Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. Good afternoon. Just a qu -- Is there a requirement that public places have these epi pens? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

There is no requirement.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

[crosstalk]
SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

There is no requirement.

THE CHAIR:

Senator --

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Ma -- Thank you, Madam President. And if we, if public places choose to have an epi pen there, this bill prohibits them from administering it? Or they give it to somebody who's having a reaction? Or what is the process for distributing this pen to the person who's having the reaction?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Basically, you have -- Thank you, Madam President. I'm sorry. But basically, I'm going after liability here. Thank you.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Okay. Yes, there is a process and there is language in the bill that covers liability. It grants immunity from civil and criminal liabilities for the prescribing practitioner who gives the entity the prescription to obtain the epinephrine, also for any
trained person who is acting in good faith in using it.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator, for your answers.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, both. Will you remark further on the amendment? Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I was not gonna speak on this, but you raise a very important question from Senator Formica. Through you, to the proponent of the amendment. Some questions.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. On the question of liability, I think the clarification was a approved medical practitioner that was allowed to prescribe it. But indeed, if we were going to put it into a public place and at a point of emergency, the potential liability of anyone being able to access it and utilize it to save lives, but if something goes awry, where does that liability -- Does that, does this statute still afford the liability protection for non-medical practitioners, non-prescribing
medical practitioners, a goodwill citizen, doing so? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hwang. Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

It does provide the immunity to anyone who's acting in good faith in using the injector.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you, Madam President. Where is that on the statute and is it clearly delineated? I just want to simply ask that, through you, Madam President, for legislative intent.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hwang. Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

I believe you can find that from lines 77 through 96.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you, Madam President. If the good proponent could read that for me.
A person with training who is an employee or agent of an authorized entity that acquires or maintains a supply of epinephrine cartridges injectors, pursuant to subsection, of this section may in accordance with the established medical protocol provide an epinephrine cartridge injector to an individual or to the parent, guardian, or caregiver of an individual whom the person with training believes in good faith is experiencing anaphylaxis, regardless of whether the individual has a prescription for the epinephrine cartridge injector or prior medical diagnosis of an allergic condition. Would you like me to continue, sir?

No. Through you, Madam President. I want to thank the proponent for sharing that legislative intent. I appreciate her information. Thank you, Madam.
are not a lot of medications that are out there that can save an individual's life in a matter of a few minutes. There is not a medicine that is out there that is available in the community that in a matter of a few minutes you can actually save an individual's lives. And that's going to be the critical piece that we have to recognize. Whether we like it or not, the number of people who have allergic reactions to either medications, bee stings, or even food are increasing. We don't have an understanding why that's happening, but that's a reality that's there. If there is increase in easy access to some of the medications, we are going to be saving lives. So I would suggest strongly that we should support this bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Anwar. Will you remark further? Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in support of the amendment and the underlying bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes. I want to thank Senator Abrams, Senator Somers, leadership of the Public Health Committee
for moving this legislation forward. I also want to thank the Department of Consumer Protection and the Department of Public Health for working with the committee to make sure that we have a robust bill that protects public health, that saves lives, that helps children and other folks, including as we learned in the last few days myself, people living with severe allergic conditions. I think this bill will save lives, and we were able to put together a strong, robust bill that has a number of safeguards that protects public health. It establishes this medical protocol and I think it works for the state of Connecticut. And as Senator Formica pointed out earlier, this is an optional bill. There is no requirement that entities stock epinephrine under this bill. This is simply allowing entities to do so, if they choose to do it. But I, my hope is that a lot of entities will choose to do that and as a result, we will see in all kinds of places, in summer camps and workplaces and other places across the state, entities stepping forward to stock epinephrine and help protect people with potentially life-threatening allergic reactions. I know that there's been some attention in the press over the last few days to my own story. I don't think this is about me, and in fact, I do think that a lot more attention should be given to the proponents in the House, folks like Representative Robin Comey, who've been really trying to push this legislation forward. And I have a great appreciation for their efforts and hope that this legislation receives broad bipartisan support today. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Lesser. Will you remark further? If not, if the Clerk could please call — Oh, we need to, we need to, we need to weigh in on the amendment. So with that, if — Please let me try your minds. Please signify if you would like this amendment adopted, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. As my esteemed colleague said, this bill has a lot of support in both the House, the Senate, and Republicans and Democrats alike. And so I would ask that if there's no objection, that it be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, we have a number of items on our Consent Calendar. If the Clerk can read the items on the Consent Calendar, followed by a vote, please.
THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:


Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar No. 1. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked. Mr. Clerk, if you could announce the tally on the Consent Calendar, please.

CLERK:

Consent Calendar No. 1.
Total number voting 35
Total number voting Yea 35
Total voting Nay 0
Absent and not voting 1

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if the, we can PT the next two items, we'll go back to them right after the next bill, which is Calendar Page 17, Calendar 225, Senate Bill 789.

THE CHAIR:

We will PT those items, and Mr. Clerk, if you could call the next item.

CLERK:

Page 17, Calendar No. 225, Senate Bill No. 789, AN ACT CONCERNING REIMBURSEMENT TO LAW ENFORCEMENT UNITS FOR TRAINING CAUSE. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bradley, good afternoon.

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

Good afternoon, Madam President. It's a pleasure to see you this afternoon. Madam President, I move
this item be accepted of the Joint Committee favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

The question is on passage. Will you remark further? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. We're going to just put this item for now. And we can go back to the other two items, which are higher education bills.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 10, Calendar No. 157, substitute for Senate Bill No. 745, AN ACT REQUIRING A FEASIBILITY STUDY ON THE ESTABLISHMENT OF AN ENVIRONMENTAL AGRICULTURAL PROGRAM AT PUBLIC INSTITUTIONS OF HIGHER EDUCATION.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. This bill would study whether or not it's practical to establish controlled environment agricultural programs at Connecticut technical colleges. I believe this bill is an important piece in making sure that we have a, that our education facilities are rapidly responding to the needs of a 21st Century workforce. And as many members of this circle know, agriculture is an ever-growing part of Connecticut's economy. So I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Haskell. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this bill. I had a wonderful time testifying in front of Senator Haskell on this bill. And this provides an opportunity for us here in Connecticut. As many other states, and actually countries like Canada, have moved to growing marijuana versus vegetables, we have an opportunity here in the state of Connecticut for controlled environment agriculture, which is basically high-tech horticultural greenhouses. If you go into some of them, they look like a nuclear submarine. It's all climate-controlled. And we can give our young people an opportunity to get into another growing field here in the state of Connecticut. And the demand is there. And so I fully support this and I know that many institutions are interested in having this curriculum added to their programming, including UConn. So I hope that this bill can move forward. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It's a privilege to be a ranking member in higher education to be able to speak about this bill. And I rise in support of this bill. But it's also important to recognize the
major proponents of this bill, which was UConn and the Ratcliffe Hicks School of Agriculture, which is an associate's degree program at Storrs with a stellar international reputation. And their testimony was incredibly helpful, but also insightful in what we have done already at UConn and the ability to be able to share that within our community colleges along with our advanced manufacturing, as well as other areas of educational focus toward career paths, is really a credit to their advocacy on this. So I rise in strong support, because as we look at job creation, it is not simply a four-year college and going on to graduate program, it is the focus on vocational-technical apprenticeships and also farming and agriculture as an integral part of being able to contribute to our economy. So I want to thank the chairs for their advocacy. But I want to repeat again, I want to thank UConn and the Ratcliffe Hicks School of Agriculture and their proponents in really educating us about the importance of agriculture. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good afternoon. Through you, I have a question of the proponent.

THE CHAIR:
Yes, please proceed. Senator Haskell, prepare yourself. Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, Mr. Chairman, I believe last year we had a bill that might be similar and might not. I believe it was a study of Long Island Sound, an environmental study of Long Island Sound. I'm wondering if in fact that study is approved that this would be done in conjunction with it. If not, would this expand to include Long Island Sound? We had rather dramatic presentation as to the condition of the sound and its future impact on the state of Connecticut. It was obviously before you were here, but I'm not -- I don't know the answer to that, if it's not included or we're not doing anything. Maybe Senator Hwang might have the answer to that, because I believe he was there. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And I thank the good senator, my colleague Senator Cassano, for his question. I certainly share his passion for protecting the Long Island Sound and making full use of its wonderful resources. As somebody who grew up in a town that falls right on the Long Island Sound coast, it's a tremendous asset for Connecticut and I would hope that this study also encompasses the many opportunities that may lie on that coast. I will yield, Madam President, to either Senator Hwang or
Senator Somers who know far more about this bill and the work that may or may not have been done on it before I got into the building.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang, do you accept the yield?

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. I do. And thank you to the good senator from Westport. In regards to the question about the Long Island Sound Blue Plan, it was a bill that was passed through in the legislature over four and a half years ago. And I'm happy to report that through the collaborative work of the task force that was convened from the Long Island Sound Blue Plan, there is a Blue Plan that encompasses a comprehensive analysis of not only the topography of the sound, but also the riverways that feed into it. So it is an integral part of ensuring it's not only the aqua agriculture, but the lines of water and supply to help our farming communities throughout. And there obviously is a concern in regards to the water trust, but ultimately, we do have a Long Island Sound Blue Plan, and in fact, right now, we are currently under a review period until the end of June for people to offer input. And this would be another vehicle for farmers and agriculture to be able to offer their input on the impact on Long Island Sound and their ability to conduct business. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hwang. Senator Cassano.
SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, and through you, Madam President. Back to Senator Hwang. I appreciate that explanation. It was interesting, you know, people didn't realize -- many of us in this circle didn't realize that when you look at Long Island Sound, stuff is being dumped from Canada that's come all the way down the river, the Connecticut River and so on, and it's been a problem. We used to have a lobster population. We're concerned about shellfish and so on, and so this is a natural tie-in, I think, with this bill potentially simply because of what goes into the sound. So I'm excited about this bill because I think it makes a big difference in the, in the environmental future of Connecticut. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cassano. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the legislation that is before us? Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I -- Before wrapping up, Madam President, I just want to thank my colleagues, both on the Higher Education Committee and those around the circle for their hard work on this bill. Senator Somers, thank you for your advocacy as well as Senator Hwang. It's been a pleasure working with you on this, and if there's no objection, Madam President, I move this item be placed on the Consent Calendar.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 14, Calendar No. 189, substitute for Senate Bill No. 816, AN ACT ALLOWING THE CONNECTICUT HEALTH AND EDUCATIONAL FACILITIES AUTHORITY TO MAKE LOANS FOR THE COST OF RELATED HEALTH CARE INSTITUTIONS. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President, I move the, 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 further?

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Currently, CHEFA, which stands for the Connecticut Health and Education Facilities Authority, cannot finance out-of-state projects for Connecticut health care institutions. This bill would health care
institutions that are eligible for CHEFA funding assistance to receive assistance for projects that are outside of Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell. Will you remark further? Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I want to thank the chair for his good work in the Senate and also within the House on this. It was a interesting study in this in the sense that it is another quasi-public organization. Through you, Madam President, just for legislative intent, there are some questions to the proponent of this bill in regards to clarity.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hwang. Senator Haskell, prepare yourself.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. The acronyms that we use in this building all too often gets a little confusing. But, through you, Madam President, what is the difference between CHEFA, C-H-E-F-A versus C-H-F-A, CHFA? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Hwang. Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Through you, I will certainly agree with my colleague that it is alphabet soup in this building. For clarification, CHEFA makes loans to health care and education facilities, whereas CHFA, just reading from their website, it's their mission to increase the supply availability retention, and retention of affordable housing for individuals and families in Connecticut. So, Madam President, while one quasi-public is focused on making sure that they, that housing is available and making loans to eligible housing authorities, the other is narrowly focused on education and health care facilities. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you, Madam President. What is the definitive role from a standpoint of quasi-publics within our state? Is the role focused on issues and matters and institutions within our state? Because of the unique quasi-public relationship, the focus that I always thought was that it would serve the greater public interest and goods of the people within Connecticut. Through you, Madam President, would that be the focus?

THE CHAIR:
Thank you. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I thank the good senator from Fairfield for his questions. The concept of this bill is that it allows CHEFA to finance projects if their headquarters are based in Connecticut, but they're seeking to build a health care facility perhaps just across the border in Medford, New York, or in Rhode Island or in Massachusetts. CHEFA currently can provide tax-exempt bonds for hospitals and universities only in this state. Now by expanding their coverage to health care institutions that are headquartered in this state but might be located outside, it gives CHEFA a clearer picture of the credit and projects of such health care institutions, because CHEFA will be involved in the institution's entire debt portfolio rather than those that are narrowly limited to the geographic of Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. I want to thank the good senator for that answer. And that's important when we look at the vehicle. And I am full of praise for CHEFA and its board of directors and the incredibly capable managers and finance analysts that provide the product in evaluating projects. But nonetheless, the basis of it is it continues to be a quasi-public
and that the bonds that they issue would be called, would be backed by special capital reserve fund project in support of the new projects that we're talking about. To what extent are these special capital reserve fund, SCRFs, backed by? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hwang. Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I thank the good senator for his question. I'm actually thrilled to be able to answer this question. It is important for every member voting today to know that the state's credit is not being used on the bonds. It is entirely the credit of the borrower, for example, Yale University or Hartford Hospital or any other health care institution that might be seeking this sort of assistance from CHEFA. I'll also note that there are annual financial statements disclosed to the state in which CHEFA regularly reports the, the quality of its health -- I'm sorry, the financial quality of the projects it's currently undergoing. And I will note that according to their most recent report, they do have a AAA bond rating. So CHEFA has been incredibly effective, not only at what they do, but also in spurring economic development within the state, making sure health care is affordable and accessible, making sure that education is affordable and accessible to all. I asked CHEFA for a brief summary of their ten-year economic impact, and in 2013 they found, Madam President, that they had created 6,405 jobs, that they had generated $387
million dollars in labor income, and that they had -- It's really been -- that they were responsible for $554 million dollars in gross domestic product annually on average between 2003 and 2013.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. I do agree that the talent and the expertise within CHEFA is to be lauded and the track record with the AAA rating should be the envy, even within our own state. That being said, I would direct and ask the good proponent of the bill on a, on this bill's OFA fiscal note, the background stipulates that the SCRF-backed bonds are a contingent liability on the state. It is not free and clear. And that is important to distinguish. And then on the fourth sentence down the page of the OFA analysis, it says that the draw on the general fund would be deemed appropriate and is not subject to the constitutional or statutory appropriation gaps of the legislative body. So, through you, Madam President, I think it is clear from this OFA fiscal notice and the background in regards to the SCRF fund, it is not free and clear of the liability of the state. That ultimately, should there be a shortfall, it is ultimately a liability, that bond of the state of Connecticut drawing off of the general fund. Through you, Madam President, is that correct?

THE CHAIR:
Senator Hwang to Senator Haskell, if you would respond.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I thank the good senator for his question. This, the SCRF fund, as it's, it seems to be known around the building, is available. It's used for CHESLA and CSCU only. If for some reason the bonds fail, Madam President, the state may step in to utilize the bond fund. However, I'll note, and this is the most important part, it has never been utilized and there's no expectation that it will be utilized due to the exceptional and stellar record of CHEFA and CHESLA over the past many decades.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you, Madam President. Just, again, and I hope we never have to use that bond for the lauded talents that we talked about earlier, but nonetheless, statutorily, should the bond be called into question and the fund is drawn down, is it not a liability of this state as a back bond and the funds will be drawn from our general funds without any constitutional legislative cap oversight? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Hwang to Senator Haskell, would you respond?

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. While I understand the good senator's concern, given that CHEFA's investments are subject to a credit risk and have an average rated by Standard & Poor's of a AAA in their most recent financial disclosure, I am not concerned that the SCRF fund will be utilized should the bonds fail for any reason.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you, Madam President. I would take that as a yes answer in understanding that the risk is minimal, but ultimately, as within any investment vehicle, there is risk. And, and it is clear for us in this body in this circle to understand that as we pass through this statute and expand the scope and capacity of a stellar performing investment background and performance record, the bottom line is we have expanded the risk. Risk, that's the key word. And ultimately, should catastrophic things occur, this is going to ultimately, as we said earlier quite a bit, quasi-publics have a unique status in a relationship and liability within our state, but sometimes operating outside of it. This is another example, should we hope never occur with CHEFA, but nonetheless, they are a guaranteed bond issuer with the liability on the state of Connecticut. So I think that's an important
distinction as we evaluate quasi-publics. No matter how well they do, they are a collaborative partner where the state has a stake in their performance and in some cases, for me, Madam President, some oversight of them as well. So I will reserve further questions down the road and allow others to ask about this bill. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hwang. Will you remark further on the legislation that is before us? Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not -- Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Madam President, if there are no further questions from my colleagues, I would ask for a roll call item on this bill, a roll call vote on this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 816. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 816. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate, Senate Bill 816. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 816. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Bill 816.
THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked, and Mr. Clerk, if you would please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 816.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Yea</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] Legislation is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 18, Calendar No. 234, substitute for Senate Bill No. 1040, AN ACT CONCERNING THE STATE EMPLOYEE CAMPAIGN. There is an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer, good afternoon.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

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

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the bill before us today makes some important changes to the Connecticut State Employees Campaign for Charitable Giving. It transfers authority over the campaign to the Connecticut State Employee Campaign Committee. It removes federations from our charitable campaign, which is an outdated model. It allows participating nonprofits and organizations to demonstrate that they, or it requires that they demonstrate that they are serving people here in the state of Connecticut. It makes sure that any administrative expenses associated with the running of that organization are no more than 15 percent if they're going to participate in this campaign, and it also changes some appointments to the committee that will be governing the campaign. Overall, this piece of legislation is important. These changes modernize this program, and I believe that they are important to ensure the future success of the State Employee Campaign for Charitable Giving. And if these changes are not made, I have concerns about the way this program will continue to function. This, this legislation enjoyed broad support in our committee and I'm hopeful it will do so today in the state senate. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark further? Good afternoon, Senator Sampson.
SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I will just stand up in support of this bill briefly and say that the chairman of the GAE committee did a fine job explaining what is happening in the legislation before us. This is a good proposal. I think it is going to take the State Employee Campaign and put its control where it belongs. And I encourage my colleagues to support it also. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the legislation that is before us? Will you remark further? Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I just rise in support of this proposal, the bill before us. I chaired I think it was four years ago GAE. This was a bill that came before us. This is a bill that was a mess then. Because of the new technology and the changes in voting procedures and all that, we just never got to the bill. So I applaud the committee for making the effort to get this out and to make these changes and to do it right. A job well done. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cassano. Will you remark further on the legislation that is before us? Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not,
Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly -- Ah, Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Madam President, if there's no objection, I move that we place this bill on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if we could call the next bill as Calendar Page 24, Calendar 306, Senate Bill 1060. And after that if we can PT Calendar Page 22, Calendar 277, Senate Bill 586.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 24, Calendar No. 306, Senate Bill No. 1060, AN ACT CONCERNING THE REGULATION OF STORMWATER. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. And Senator Cohen. Good afternoon.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):
Good afternoon, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark further?

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. This, this bill requires DEEP by February 1st of 2020 to submit recommendations to reduce the fiscal burdens with respect to MS4 regulations. Those are the municipal separate sewer systems regulations which reduce pollution related to stormwater runoff. Municipalities are right now feeling burdened by some of these requirements, both from a fiscal standpoint and a regulatory standpoint. The intention of the bill is to have DEEP go back to the drawing board, as they say, and come up with a plan to move forward and hopefully relieve some of the burden while keeping in mind all of the environmental considerations that make MS4 really a great program in some ways, but again, really creates some fiscal burdens for our towns and municipalities throughout the state. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR MINER (30TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I too rise in support of the legislation. We heard testimony. I just heard some more testimony. [laughing] But we heard testimony from many chief elected officials about their concern over regulation of stormwater. Not that they don't want to do the right thing. I think we heard from everyone that they do want to try and make improvements when they, especially when they will benefit the environment. But what we have heard over time from chief elected officials, public works directors, is that the DEEP, either through regulation or through policy, more often than not, creates a force of law. And it just seems to them to be rather heavy-handed, especially around the area of MS4. So I think this is an opportunity for us to say, come back to us next year with some ideas. Let's be more clear about what it is that you're gonna propose. Let's not have chief elected officials wondering about when the hammer is gonna come down. And for that reason, Madam President, I support the adoption of the language. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further? Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in favor of this bill also. As a chief elected official, I can tell you that, that the burden on small municipalities and all municipalities is so great that most municipalities don't actually comply with the law,
because they can't afford to. It requires onerous provisions to keep mapping and cleaning things out that may or may not be causing problems in the groundwater. In Essex, for example, all stormwater goes one place. It ends up in the Connecticut River, and we're mapping it knowing that it goes to the Connecticut River. We spend endless hours trying to do this as best as we can. I believe we are compliant, but I know most municipalities have actually never been able to comply with this. And after the initial legislation was enacted, I think in 2004, this came, the DEEP came back through this legislature and asked for enhancements to that law. This legislature did not vote those enhancements and DEEP enacted those enhancements anyway. So we need to review this. We need to make this common sense. We all want our water clean. But this really goes too far as an undue burden on our towns. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Will you remark further on the bill that is before us? Will you remark further? Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if the Senate could stand at ease for a moment.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if we can PT the next item on our list, Calendar Page 23, Calendar 303, Senate Bill 1069, and go back to Calendar Page 22, Calendar 277, Senate Bill 586. Can we just stand at ease just for a moment?

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The Clerk can call the item I just previously marked go.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 22, Calendar No. 277, substitute for Senate Bill No. 586, AN ACT CONCERNING THE CONTROL OF NUISANCE WILDLIFE.
Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. 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 COHEN (12TH):

Yes. Madam President, I'd like to at this time yield the floor to my colleague and ranking member, Senator Miner.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner, do you accept the yield?

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Madam President, over the last I think it's four years perhaps, the Environment Committee has considered a number of bills intended to try and
manage problems associated with bear populations. And to be sure, as we've listened to the testimony, the effect of bears on the population in the state of Connecticut is not the same in all jurisdictions. Bears seem to have entered from Massachusetts and New York into the northwest corner and they've taken up residence probably over the last ten or so years, but have built in quantity to a point where many of my constituents, in fact I think some of Senator Slap's constituents, probably have felt the impact more than some others. I will tell you that the testimony has been compelling, both in terms of people's urging that we learn to live with this bear population and compelling with those that say, we don't mind living with them. We just don't think we can live with this many, certainly not in this limited location. Madam President, we heard testimony from officials in the towns of Simsbury, where the animal control officer I think told us that he himself had gone on 98 bear-related calls and had tried various methods of trying to repel the animal from the residences that they seem to be most comfortable sunning themselves in front of, and didn't mind that. But frankly said in his estimation, that was not sufficient in all cases. We heard testimony from people in Sherman, Connecticut, that had a chicken coop torn apart, chickens killed. We've heard testimony from people that have lost sheep, lambs, calves. I have a constituent in Kent that lost a donkey a couple of years ago, a full-grown donkey. It was a long-time resident of that, of their farm, and they were heartbroken. People that have apiaries all over the state of Connecticut have also been impacted by the bear population. What we hadn't heard in previous years was that live agriculture, that is animals,
was not the only thing that had been impacted. We heard testimony, received testimony from people that farm corn and that sweet corn in the quantity of somewhere around 15 acres over a period of, short period of time would be decimated by bears. We also heard testimony that people that grow grapes for purposes of making wine lost tens of thousands of dollars' worth of inventory in grapes, specific to a certain kind of wine. And so, Madam President, it wasn't even a situation where you could start over. The crop was lost. DEEP has provided testimony over the last three or four years and various stages of support for some kind of an organized, methodical, legal hunt that would be done generally through the recreational hunting opportunity. And when we listened to the testimony this year, the statistics that they presented to us seemed to be consistent with what I was hearing from constituents. In fact, some of my colleagues around the circle here have been hearing from theirs. It's not just bird feeders, Madam President. It's not just trash. Although the statistics are compiled on an annual basis by the agency, and in fact, things like bear versus garbage can complaints have gone from somewhere around 82 to 632. In fact, I have constituents that will tell me that the bear knows when the garbageman's supposed to be there. So if he forgets, he knows the bear's waiting for the garbageman even if he doesn't put the garbage out. But Madam, Madam President, individuals have lost pets, they've lost livestock. As recently as yesterday, I think we all heard the story about the dog in Burlington. Prior to that, there were five goats that were killed in the very same neighborhood, I believe. Home entry was a number that I found rather striking. The agency has
confirmed that last year 21 incidents occurred where bears were actually found in people's homes. They've caused structural damage, over 100 incidents. Broken into cars, 13 last year. And so the list goes on, Madam President. One of the things that I've learned about bears is that they are pretty resilient. And so from the time of their birth in the first year, about 70 percent survival rate. Every subsequent year after that, it's in the 90s. So if you imagine that, the older the bear gets, the more likely it is that it's gonna live to maturity. Sixty-three road kills were reported last year. So for those that don't think bears will succumb to any form of harm during the course of their life, 63 incidents where a human made contact with a bear in an automobile, and I would suggest that death is probably more violent than any that I can think of, other than perhaps poisoning. Some people may claim that we've moved into their neighborhood. I've been alive in Connecticut I think probably somewhere around 55 years, and up until recently, I never saw a bear. And when I was a child, I never saw a deer. And so I think it speaks well to the conduct of the state of Connecticut that we have a very robust deer population. Some say that's helped the bear population. They're a natural predator for young fawns. And so the home range that may have existed here a hundred years plus ago really has not existed here. And so they have reacclimated themselves to Connecticut, and in fact, they've been found in 153 towns out of 169. So it's not really just a Litchfield County problem. It's not as acute in other parts of the state of Connecticut it is, as it is in western Hartford County and Litchfield County. The committee struggled frankly, Madam President,
with trying to find a balance. And I think many of the individuals on the committee that had heard the testimony in years past were concerned that an opportunity to hunt bear without a limit and for no reason was not something they were willing to support. And as the committee did in this case and had done in some other cases, we tried to find a balance and found the balance around agriculture. Recently this year, we've taken a number of votes in an effort to try and benefit agriculture in the state of Connecticut. We recognize that it's an important part of the fabric of this state. We recognize that people earn a living through agriculture. And many times, we voted to enhance education, provide opportunity for reduced taxes, given certain protections against neighbors who may not like a certain farming activity. And so I think the list goes on and on, Madam President. And so when we sought this balance, I thought the agricultural connection was the most logical. What this bill does is requires a farmer to make a claim to the agency. So if a farmer loses a calf or a farmer loses crops, if an apiary is damaged by a bear, the individual that owns that inventory, that commodity, that animal, has to make a claim to the DEEP. The DEEP, under this bill, would send out either a conservation officer or perhaps a biologist in an effort to make a determination that in fact it was bear damage. Usually, they can tell whether or not the injury or death to the animal was caused by something other than a bear because there are certain telltale signs, if you will. Once that's been done, the agency would make a determination as to whether the permit would be issued. And if the permit is issued, the time under which the permit could be used would be restricted to after August
1st. Some of you may remember from the news yesterday that a bear was killed, shot, and left behind three cubs. And so the agency told us that anytime after August, a cub can reasonably expected, be expected to survive, re-den in the winter, and then come back out in the springtime as an older adolescent and begin to move towards adulthood. So they wanted to try and resist any possibility that there would be an intentional act taken in conjunction with this agricultural opportunity. And so the post-August seemed to be the date at which they felt most comfortable. They've also indicated to the committee that just submitting a report isn't sufficient. What the agency wants to see is that there's no other attractants. The agency wants to see that there's reasonable precaution being extended so that in the case of beehives, there's an electric fence. In the case of grazing cattle, there'd be an electric fence. The only thing that they concede that reasonable alternative may not be possible is in the case of something like sweet corn. It's my understanding that these will be issued on a one-on-one basis. It's my understanding that the language in the bill would permit a farmer to take the life of a bear on property that they own or property that they lease in conjunction with that permit. So once you've demonstrated damage, then you'd have the ability to get the permit. It's also my understanding that the plain reading of the bill includes an opportunity for those that just don't believe they have the ability to harm a bear to assign that to someone else that may work for them or a next-door neighbor. And to be honest, I have farming friends and farming constituents that could not do this. But at the same time, they are tired of having to sit back and take on the expense in
total without having some recourse. I think I've done the best I can to describe what the bill does. I'm happy to take any questions if that's what someone would like to have happen so they don't get them. I see a head nod. And I would appreciate support of this legislation. I think the time has come. I think the opponents to the bill have not changed. They have stated as their concern on many occasions that they don't think anyone should take the life of a bear. In fact, many of them would say that you shouldn't take the life of anything. And so, when we got testimony, it was kind of consistent right straight through. So I thank the gentlelady for giving me the opportunity to state what I think the bill does, and I am happy to answer any questions. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the legislation that's before us? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. A few years ago, I was opposed to any euthanization of wildlife. But the bear population in our neck of the woods in the northwest corner and the central region of the state has become so great, and I'm in fear that it's going to take a human being to be mauled or harmed or killed in order for us to pass legislation. So I want to thank Senator Cohen and Senator Miner for working on a agreeable language to bring something out that starts to address some of the things that our farmers are working on, that have issues with
right now. And I will tell you that there are other bills out there. I hope they come forward, because my communities are screaming, asking for action, because there is, they're at their wits' end. The bears have become so accustomed to the only predator, which is man, who aren't doing anything. In one of my communities, they are spending tens of thousands of dollars in police overtime, because the bears will go -- There's a group of three cubs that will go to the school, sit on the school property while the kids are in session. Basically, the school has to go into lockdown. The police will arrive. They'll put their sirens on. The bears are used to it. They don't move. They might move 10 or 15 feet. They'll go and they'll get beanbag rounds. They'll shoot the bears with beanbag rounds. They'll move another 20 feet and they sit down on the lawn and they just play with each other. You know, it's a cute picture. But imagine if somebody was to get hurt. And law enforcement is there to protect life and property. When they're called and they say, put their hands up. I'm sorry, there's nothing we can do. State law won't prevent it or do something about it. So then you contact DEEP, Department of Environment and Energy Protection, and they say the way the statutes are worded, there's nothing we can do about it. We are asking you folks to give us permission. We have scientific evidence that our bear population is doubling every four years. These bears are traveling a hundred miles a day. They're in New York, they're back up in Danbury, they're back up in Kent, they're over in the farm and the valley. While -- And I say to myself when I -- I met with the DEEP officials, that they said, you know what, you're never gonna get anything passed in this chamber because there's some
folks that have never seen a bear and that's what they want to do. I wish I could see a bear. What I say is, come spend your tourist dollars up in the northwest corner and you're gonna see plenty of them. I think the bears are underreported. I will tell you, I see at least two a week, at least two a week. I don't call it in anymore because they're just moseying through or at a bird feeder just walking around. But I have talked to some of my colleagues who have had the duty to respond to break-ins of homes. In one case, one woman was awoken from her bedroom and there was a bear in her bedroom. How scary is that? She didn't leave food out on her nightstand. Oftentimes, you can just look on social media. You can see folks posting bears that have gotten through the screened-in doors. So if you can't even be the ward of your castle, your home, protected inside your own home, what can you do? You know, law enforcement doesn't want to put anything down. And I understand where the opponents would say, well, we don't want a mass eradication of bears in our state. And that's not what this piece of legislation does. It's, I think it's carefully constructed. It's easily identified and trackable, and now is the time we start putting some piece of legislation in place. And I strongly support the bill before us. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Will you remark further? Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I have question either to the chair or to Senator Miner, advice chair. Senator Witkos just referred to the state statutes, and we've heard state laws and so on, but nobody said what they are. At least I don't know what they are. I'm told that people, if you're trying to protect your animal, the best way to do that now is go get a permit. And if we get a permit, then you can shoot the bear who's attacking your goat or your dog. If I don't have a permit and a bear is attacking my goat or my dog, I think the natural reaction of most people is to protect their dog.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I thank the gentleman for his question. So under current law, it's my understanding that a farmer that is witnessing their animal being harmed has the right to take the life of the bear. They don't have the right to keep it. So the agency has taken the position that they need to leave it where it is. And I have a corn, sweet corn farmer that said, what am I supposed to do? Leave it in the middle of 15 acres of corn? As I tried to explain earlier, so, many of my agricultural friends don't own the property that their agricultural purpose is on. And so under this language, which is different than current law, if I had an apiary or someone that raised bees had an apiary in, on your property and the damage occurred on your 20 acres, then the animal, the permit would be filled out and then the animal could be taken on
that leased or licensed land and it could even be taken by you if you chose to want to take such action. So under the current law, it's confined to the farm that you own. Under current law, it's confined to the farmer. And under current laws, we understand that you're not permitted to keep the animal. The agency can come and take it, but no one else can take it. I don't know if that answers your question. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, through you, Madam President. It is a beginning, and I appreciate that. We, you've talked about the farmer. I'm a homeowner. I have a dog. If there's a bear coming across -- I don't have a gun, so I'm not gonna be able to shoot him, but if I had a gun and this dog, this bear is attacking my dog or coming after my dog or my cow or whatever it might be -- I guess I'd be a farmer if I had a cow. My pet. I don't think I can call the DEEP to get a permit in that moment. But I'm gonna protect the dog and I shoot the bear. Am I gonna be arrested? For protecting my property? My dog?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):
Thank you, Madam President. It's my understanding it's a case-by-case basis. Each time there's an incident, I'm told that there's a full evaluation done of the individual's property. And so if there are circumstances where the bear wasn't enticed to come to your house in some way -- I have neighbors that feed bears. I think we'll probably get a chance to talk about another bill after this that is going to suggest that we should not do that in a little stronger terms. So, provided the circumstances of our plain fact, it's my understanding that you may not face arrest and you may not be penalized. But each is on a case-by-case basis. And I have many constituents that have said to me they're not gonna wait for law enforcement. They are willing to take action and would take action. And we run into this quite often. We haven't -- We have not addressed that in this bill, however. It does not include pets.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

All right. I think -- Through you, Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Yes, Senator, thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

And that is helpful. I had a situation where we had a rabid caccoon, rancoon, raccoon, and we called the police department and it indeed was a rabid racoon, which she dragged down to the garden and shot. Because she's allowed to do that. Obviously, I
wouldn't want to go after a rabid raccoon, but it's clear that you can call law enforcement. I don't know if they could come in and shoot a bear on your property if he's attacking or doing something, but what I'm hearing is that there doesn't seem to be any real consistency, and at least, there doesn't seem to be any direct communication from DEEP to the public as to what they can do, what they cannot do, what they should and should not do. And that bothers me more than anything. I think that's the first answer we need. Shooting the bears? I grew up in Nantucket. Everybody knows Nantucket for a beautiful place to visit, and I know it for many things. I know it for a different reason as well. It is the home of the deer tick. And the first Lyme disease was found in Nantucket. It is the home of Lyme disease, unfortunately. And it is such a serious problem that during deer hunting season, Nantucket has been given special exception by the state. They hunt both male and female deers and there's a two-week hunt period. And so people come from around New England to Nantucket to hunt Lyme-diseased deer, potentially. But this is their way to curb the Lyme disease issue by dealing with the problem of ticks. Settle the situation. But the state got together with the medical community. They made a decision as to the way to deal with that. Was it a good answer or a bad answer? Well, they didn't have to change anything except to extend the period, because they already were hunting deer, as they are in Connecticut. But I don't see that here from the state. I would assume that we have the right to protect our home, our children, our pets, and if a bear or a dog or anything attacks any of those, I, as a homeowner, I would have the right to protect and shoot that animal if necessary or do
whatever I can to protect them. And I haven't heard that that is the real legislation. And so I'm really bothered. I'm totally confused on this. I want to do the right thing, but I don't think anything has been laid out clearly as to what we can and cannot do, and perhaps what we should and should not do. Because having that would make it a lot easier for me to make a decision on this bill. So, I understand where you're coming from and I sympathize where you're coming from. I don't want to just go up and shoot bear to shoot bear. That's, that's not me. That's -- I don't believe in that. But I clearly believe we have the right to protect ourselves and our animals. And when I've seen some of these stories of the guy with the little donkeys and these other kinds of things, it isn't right that we seem to be able to do nothing. And so I appreciate you bringing this forward. It's one of those things I just, I, I'm having difficulty with it. And I'm glad you've brought it forward, because I think a lot of us in Connecticut are having difficulty with it. We need to do something, and hopefully the right thing. And I think DEEP should be right at the lead in this issue. It's a two-year session. I would hope something that comes out of this second half is very, very specific, very early, very communicative to the general public, because I don't see that now. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cassano. Will you remark further? Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):
Thank you, Madam President. Good afternoon. I would align my comments going forward with those of Senator Witkos and in part with Senator Cassano, because I think we brought out some very interesting issues for continued debate here. You know, I represent another part of Litchfield County, a little further south than Senator Witkos. But we certainly deal with in the county the, what is arguably reported to us as the highest bear population. And I get calls from constituents almost on a daily basis about bears that are in their yard, property damage, damage to gardens, damage to livestock, damage to pets, loss of pet, loss of the use of their property. And we most recently had a school go down, go on lockdown during what was supposed to be an outside activity for the kids in the school because there was a bear in the parking lot. So the kids are forced to stay inside because we have no really good measure, it seems, despite what we, I guess what we believe is the measures under the law through DEEP and through various animal control agents in our respective towns to take care of our bear problem. But I think we've seen enough evidence over the last couple of years that those solutions don't really work. You know, when you have a bear that comes back with a tag that's been applied by DEEP and keeps coming back and get relocated and everything, it's not working. Okay, the bear is smart. The bear knows -- Senator Miner has taken enough time to explain to me how bears actually live amongst us. And I would argue that that living amongst us is not, not working. You know, the proponents of protecting bears say that we've invaded their space and they're defenseless. And I would ask anyone who's listening to this debate today to take a look
at a picture of a black bear in Connecticut. And I think it would be very hard to argue that that is a defenseless animal. I spoke two years ago on the floor of this chamber from right here to the same thing that Senator Witkos said. And that was that I do not want Connecticut to be the first place where we see a YouTube video posted of someone being mauled by a bear and dragged into the woods. And then we come back on some emergency basis because all of a sudden, we now have a person who's been killed in Connecticut by a bear. And we say, oh, my God! We have to fix that. And in fact, a couple of years ago, a college student in New Jersey was out for a hike. And New Jersey's, some of its geography is similar to ours. That college student was stalked and killed by a black bear. A black bear very similar to what we see in Connecticut. And I would go back to what was the original intent of SB 586, and that was to offer a pilot for a bear hunting season in Litchfield County with a very limited number of kills, but in an attempt to see if bear hunting, very much like we do with a deer hunting season, a coyote hunting season, a turkey hunting season, a fox hunting season, a rabbit hunting season, would do anything to control the bear population. And what I hear in response to that is that we were trying to pass a bill that was going to be game hunting or trophy hunting for bears. And I'll finish with what Senator Cassano spoke to a moment ago. I think that we have an inalienable right to protect our property. And we have a responsibility and a right to protect our loved ones. And right now, I'm unclear as to what the law actually allows me to do as a homeowner. But I think that it would be very unfortunate that if I were to take action against a bear who is
attacking my 12-year-old or my 15-year-old or my 84-year-old father in my yard, that I would go to jail or be arrested for defending and protecting people that I care about and that I love. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Berthel. Will you remark further? Senator Martin. Good evening.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I rise just to perhaps just to share a couple stories. I live in Bristol, 61,000 people in the city. And where I raise my children, four children, we -- It's a beautiful neighborhood, very populated with nice homes. We lived a quarter of a mile from the elementary school, and we had bear, bears multiple times in our neighborhood photographed by neighbors, seen from my family members in our backyard, as well my neighbors' as well where they, the bear mauled a bird feeder. Moved out of that home and moved to another location, and just last year my wife and I are away on vacation, and once again, a bear on our back patio actually. Mom's 84 years old, lives with us in a little apartment, and the bear's photographed on the back patio next to the sliding door while we are away. So I, as I'm listening to the conversation taking place here today, and I'm wondering too, how would I, what would I have done had I seen that black bear. Kind of hard to say. And most recently, received a letter -- Well, while we were beginning this session, received the, an email from a friend who lived on the other side of
town and saying that they, he had a black bear in his back yard and wanted to know what we were going to be doing about it here at the capitol. And lastly, last week, my son lives maybe two miles away from us, very dense housing area, 10,000-square-foot lot. So you can, you know -- The lots or the homes are close to one another. He's about ready to send his dog out, opens the back slider door. It was dusk, and the dog takes one step out and starts to bark and bark and bark. And my son looks up, and there's a black bear. And he photographed it and sent it to me. It's just time. I mean, with the number of sightings that we are experiencing, I think this bill, it's a small step. It needs to go further than what we've got here in front of us. So that's just my little stories I wanted to share with the chamber here, that we needed, we need to do more than what we are currently doing here under this bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin. Will you remark further? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. For the second time, I wanted to try and make clear that the DEEP has for a long time had a position that the population is expanding at a rate that needs to be managed. But they've also been clear that humans can do a lot in helping them try to manage the population by not leaving bird feeders out in the summer, by being more conscientious about garbage left around. So there's been no, there's been no mixed message that
I'm aware of in terms of the agency. The agency's testimony is crystal clear. There is no other predator. There is no other opportunity. And unless we figure out some way to manage the population, the numbers are gonna continue to increase. Males move about 40 miles away after birth. Females move about 5. So if you can imagine, this population is gonna keep filling in a checkerboard all over the state of Connecticut. What's happening in Litchfield County and western Hartford County is gonna happen in other places in the state. It's not a matter of whether it'll happen. It's a matter of how long it will take for that checkerboard to fill in. My constituents love living amongst bears and everything else. There isn't one of them that has used the word "hate." There isn't one of them that has used "eradicate." There is not one of them that has used "eliminate." Not one of them. Even people that have lost livestock understand that there's a, there's a good thing in balance. And to have them amongst us is a good thing. But I have to tell you at the same time, the Farm Bureau is clear. They support this action. So all the action that we take, and we tout the Farm Bureau, this is another one we could take, and the Farm Bureau would support it. My constituents go outside their house at night after dark and don't know that there's a bear there. There's no alarm. No one knows. You can't smell them. And having had one come within five feet of them, I can tell you, you can't hear them. And so the risk is real. The risk is real. And so I'm asking this chamber, I'm asking you to provide my constituents and other people in the state of Connecticut that have an agricultural purpose an opportunity to maintain balance, an opportunity to
re-instill a respect amongst bears, which they no longer have for human beings. And that's what this bill is about, trying to reprogram the way surviving bears will learn. And that's really, if you look statewide, nationwide, that's what this bill is all about. So once again, Madam President, I thank the chamber for listening and I would appreciate the support for the bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the legislation that is before us? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, for me, this is a difficult bill, because I am a professed animal lover, but I don't think that's the right issue that's before us. I think the right issue before us is a safety issue. I find it difficult because to me it's a very difficult balance. I have always grown up with animals and love to see the animals in my backyard, although I have yet to see a bear in North Haven, at least in my neck of the woods. We certainly have a lot of different animals that run about. But this is something I think that Senator Miner brings to our attention because of the world that he lives in. And it is that bears can be dangerous, and it is that we are not allowing people just to shoot them on sight. There is a procedure, and it runs through DEEP. And we do a lot of things through that to make sure that the permits are given out in a very a narrow fashion, if you would, in essence to make sure that we don't overuse this permit against the
bears. But on the other hand, as Senator Miner said, we have a generation of bears that don't understand interaction with humans can be dangerous to both. And it's a reprogramming it, which is a very interesting analysis by Senator Miner. Madam President, we do have a problem with bears in Connecticut. And if someone gets attacked by a bear and if someone is killed by a bear, I assure you that there'd be many legislators tripping over each other to grab the microphone at a press conference saying, that's horrible. We have to get proactive. I assure you that's gonna happen. This chamber, this legislature predominantly is a reactive mechanism. And here we have for the second time I believe, if not the third time, this issue in front of us. And it's always rung true to me when Senator Miner said, I think it was last session, that someone is going to get killed. And I think there was a news story about a man who came home, walked in and found a bear in his kitchen, tearing the kitchen apart. I don't remember what town that was. All but fortunate that he was not attacked. It's going to happen. All we're asking is let DEEP, who is the authority in these things, who will review each and every application, limit the number. It specifies the purpose, and at her discretion, the DEEP commissioner can make a case-by-case determination if it is warranted, and issue the permit or not. Once again, this is not a Republican-Democrat, this is not a policy issue that is subject to political ramifications. This is about protection and this is about changing that aspect of wildlife. And it's difficult for me to vote yes, I will tell you, because of how I feel about nature and animals. But when I weigh the balance, I have to side on the side of caution. So,
Madam President, with that, I'll be voting yes on this bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Fasano. Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the roll and the machine will be open.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 586. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 586. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 586. Immediate roll call vote. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 586. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 586. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 586. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 586. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 586. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

So I see that so many senators are excited to vote on this bill. Because I see that we have many senators present who have not voted, I think we should -- We'll have one more call, Mr. Clerk, and --
Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 586. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? Thank you for bearing with us. The machine will be locked. And, Mr. Clerk, if you would announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 586.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>33</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting Yea</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, would the Clerk now please call Calendar Page 29, Calendar 358, Senate Bill 388?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.
Good evening, Senator Abrams.

Thank you, Madam President. I would like to yield to the vice chair of Public Health, my colleague Senator Lesser.

Senator Lesser, do you accept the yield?

Yes, I do.

Please proceed.

Yes, Madam President, I want to move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.
And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, Madam President. Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 9112. I ask that the Clerk please call the amendment and I be granted leave of the chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9112, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed to summarize.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, I thank you, Madam President. Madam President, this bill is intended, though this amendment which will hopefully become the bill, is intended to protect intersex individuals in the state. It does principally three things. It allows the designation of intersex persons as nonbinary on birth certificates. It creates a task force to evaluate medical interventions. And it prevents discrimination against intersex persons. I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Lesser. The question is on adoption. Will you remark on the amendment that is before us?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

I'm happy to summarize it. It is a five -- It is five amendments, five amendments, five sections doing three things. But I asked that when the amendment be taken that, oh never mind. I'm happy to answer any questions.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the chamber? Will you remark further on the amendment? If not, let me try your minds. Senator Somers, would you like to remark on the amendment?

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes. I just rise in support of this bill. This will provide an added layer of protection for those who are born as intersex, and I hope the circle will support it. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Will you remark further? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying, "Aye."
SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The amendment is adopted. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Thank you, Madam President. That was a strike-all amendment, and since the bill now is the amendment, I urge all the colleagues to support the bill. If there's no objection though, I would ask that it be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Would the Clerk return to the call of the Calendar?

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 32, Calendar No. 386, Senate Bill No. 347, AN ACT CONCERNING CONTRACTS FOR THE SALE OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED IN THIS STATE.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Good evening, 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. This is a bill that comes to us through the Judiciary Committee. Under the current law, financial institutions or sellers of property can offer a buyer incentives for using their preferred vendors. What this bill does is it prevents that. It's good policy. It came to us on a very positive vote from the Judiciary Committee and I would urge passage.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, sir. Will you remark further? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I would like to associate myself with the remarks of Chairman Winfield. It's a good bill. I urge my colleagues to support it. That actually will clarify some things regarding practices regarding real estate sales. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the bill that is before us? Will you remark further? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you again, Madam President. If there's no further comment or objection, I'd ask this be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 33, Calendar No. 394, substitute for Senate Bill No. 1087, AN ACT CONCERNING SERVICE OF PROCESS ON OUT-OF-STATE FINANCIAL INSTITUTIONS, LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANIES AND REGISTERED FOREIGN LIMITED LIABILITY COMPANIES.
THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you 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?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. This bill before us also comes from the Judiciary Committee. What it does is it allows for additional methods for service of process financial institutions in the title. It is a very good bill. Again, it should, I urge passage. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Winfield. Senator Kissel, will you remark?

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I'd like to associate myself with the remarks of Senator Winfield. In our modern era, as technology moves ever forward, you know, when we charge our marshals and say you're in a small practice or any size practice and you give the marshals a paper for
garnishment of an account, there are financial institutions that are not present in our state in brick and mortar form. Fully functional online and a lot of folks are moving in that direction, but how does the marshal effectuate service of process on an entity that's not physically present? So they came, they testified before our committee. They said, please give us this new tool in our toolbox so that we can effectuate service, make our, the attorneys that we work with happy, and their clients happy. And this just moves Connecticut one step forward into acknowledging that some entities just aren't here in a physical presence, but we need to be able to effectuate service on them. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the bill that is before us? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Sorry about that. I was pulling some information. If there is no further conversation or question, I'd ask that it be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered. Mr. Clerk.
Page 41, Calendar No. 450, substitute for Senate Bill No. 138, AN ACT MODERNIZING THE STATE'S COOPERATIVE ASSOCIATION STATUTES.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? 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 further?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. Another bill that comes to us through the Judiciary Committee. What it does is it modernizes the statute governing the formation of these cooperative associations in the state to allow for a better usage of that business model. This is a bill that had a lot of discussion in the Judiciary Committee, all positive. Senator Kissel, many of the people who were on the committee were very happy to see this bill. It's a great bill and I would urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further? Senator Kissel.
Thank you very much, Madam President. Again, I'd like to associate myself with the remarks of Senator Winfield. This is a nice little bill. Our co-op statutes right now are antiquated, even so much so that a new business that's formed as a cooperative in Winsted area actually went up to Vermont to get itself organized. This will bring us into the 21st Century. And there was some great testimony, all positive, as Senator Winfield indicated. And a big shout-out to Christian who started his testimony by saying, I've been going to a particular co-op, Fiddlehead, since I was young. Turns out upon further questioning, Christian was only ten as he's testifying before us hearkening back to his earlier days. But the whole family came up and so we have some thriving co-ops. And the other thing that I just want to point out is that if we move forward with this legislation to make it a lot easier to form a co-op, there's an ancillary benefit, because a lot of these food co-ops, they utilize the local food producers in the area. And so in the areas where there's been success stories, there's been also a very tangible benefit to the farmers and their local produce being utilized for the co-ops. So there's a lot of net benefits, no down side.

Urge my colleagues to support this bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the legislation that is before us? Senator Winfield.
SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. And just one further comment. As Senator Kissel indicated, Christian was scary good. If there's no further comment or question, I'd ask this be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 63, Calendar No. 359, Senate Bill No. 859, AN ACT CONCERNING COMMUNITY HEALTH WORKERS, as amended by Senate Amendment Schedule A, LCO No. 8246. There is an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams. Good evening.

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 further?

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):
Yes, Madam President. This bill establishes a certification program for community health workers. Community health workers are public health outreach professionals with an in-depth understanding of a community's experience, language, culture, and socioeconomic needs. They perform specific tasks, service liaisons between community members and health care and social service providers, and provide a range of services, including outreach, advocacy, and care coordination. Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of Amendment LCO 9076. I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO 9076, Senate Schedule B.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed to summarize.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):
This is a very simple amendment. It just changes the effective date from January 1st, 2019, to 2020.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, let me try your minds on the adoption of the amendment. All in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The amendment is adopted. Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

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

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. I have two more bills to mark as go. Before I do that, I'd like to mark some items for referral, please.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar Page 22, Calendar 264, Senate Bill 957, I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar Page 17, Calendar 226, Senate Bill 424, I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If we could stand at ease, please.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. For the purposes of markings, we have two more items to go.

THE CHAIR:

Okay.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Two additional items, I'm sorry.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you. Madam President, on Calendar Page 27, Calendar 342, Senate Bill 1103, I'd like to mark that item as go, followed by Calendar Page 22, Calendar 278, Senate Bill 894, if we could have those marked as go, and if the Senate could stand at ease for a moment, please.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, and the Senate will stand at ease.
Senate Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If the Clerk could now call those two items, please.
THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 27, Calendar No. 342, substitute for Senate Bill No. 1103, AN ACT CONCERNING INTERAGENCY DATA SHARING.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer, good evening.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Good evening, Madam President. 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 FLEXER (29TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the bill before us builds on the important work that this legislature did last year to improve the ability of our state agencies to share data amongst themselves. The Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO No. 8881. I'd ask the Clerk please call the amendment and that I'd be given the opportunity to summarize.
THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. Senator, would you repeat the LCO number?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Yes, Madam President. Madam President, the amendment's LCO number is 8881.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8881, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Flexer, please proceed to summarize.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Yes, Madam President. Madam President, the amendment before us makes some changes to the bill that mitigate the fiscal note that was in the
underlying bill. With this amendment, the bill is improved and there is no fiscal cost, but the goal of allowing state agencies to share data amongst themselves in the most effective way possible is still here. And I urge my colleagues to support this amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Senator Sampson. Good evening.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Thank you very much. I'm standing in support of the amendment that is before us. It makes some significant changes to the underlying bill, effectively simplifying it and making it into a much more palatable item. To be honest with you, I'm gonna support the amendment and -- I just -- The reason why I'm hesitant is because I, I don't even understand why we need a bill for this, to be honest with you. It's a very straightforward thing that we're putting into our law and it basically says that the chief data officer in consultation with the attorney general and the executive branch legal counsel shall review the legal obstacles to sharing high-value data of those agencies. It seems to me like anything, it should be able to be done without putting a law in place. But I also don't have any objections to it. So I will support the amendment in the bill assuming the amendment is adopted. Thank you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Will you remark further? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the adoption of the amendment, please signify by saying, "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:


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 No. 278, Senate Bill No. 894, AN ACT CONCERNING THE NONLETHAL MANAGEMENT OF THE BLACK BEAR POPULATION IN CONNECTICUT.

THE CHAIR:
Good evening, Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Good evening, 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 COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This bill would require DEEP to submit a report by February 1st of 2020 on the best practices to employ regarding the nonlethal management of black bear. We heard from my colleague, Senator Miner, a little bit earlier on the increased incidences of black bear sightings within the state of Connecticut. And we also heard during public hearings on this particular bill about the habituation of black bear into more heavily populated areas. My understanding is that DEEP does employ certain types of aversive conditioning when it comes to black bear management, but there are many other methods which are able to be used, and are in fact used, in other states and areas where black bear have become again a little bit more habituated to heavily or densely populated areas. So I urge my colleagues' support of this bill so that DEEP can go ahead and do some work and some study on this and come back to us with some recommendations on how they might move forward. Thank you.
Thank you, Senator Cohen. Will you remark further? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, we did hear testimony during the public hearing phase on all sorts of options with regard to limiting the possibility of the chances that we would have negative contact with bear, the bear population. Madam President, I'm not opposed to this language. I think it is especially helpful that the agency kind of step up its game in areas where bears don't currently exist or where bear sightings have been very limited, such as down on the shoreline. It is my intention to support the language, but I would be remiss if I didn't state for the record that this is not gonna change what's happening in Litchfield County. This is not gonna affect my constituents in the least, because they already do all this stuff. They carry bear spray when they walk, they watch their dog when it goes outside. They are concerned about the number of bears in Litchfield County. And if this chamber feels that this is a good alternative to the bill that failed already, then that's their right. Again, I don't oppose the bill, because I think there's some parts of Connecticut where it would be important for the agency, as I said, to step up their game. But eventually, this is not gonna be enough. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if there's no objection, I ask that this placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Madam President, I'd ask for a roll call.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

THE CHAIR:

With that, Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the vote and the machine will be open.

Consultation Report

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 894. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 894. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.
Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked. And, Mr. Clerk, would you kindly announce the tally, please?

CLERK:

Senate Bill 894.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</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>31</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total voting Nay</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If the Clerk can now call the items on Consent Calendar No. 2 followed by a vote, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk, please announce the Consent items and open the machines.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar No. 2. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar No. 2. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Consent Calendar No. 2.

THE CHAIR:

All right, to the members, we have the wrong, we have the wrong signage on the board. So we will close this vote out and we will put the correct legislation up and we will have a redo. So, Mr. Clerk, would you clear the board, put the appropriate legislation up so that everyone's clear they're voting on the Consent Calendar No. 2. All right. So let us call the roll and the machine will be open.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar No. 2. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar No. 2. Immediate roll call vote on Consent Calendar No. 2.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the senators voted? Have all the senators voted? The machine will be locked. And, Mr. Clerk, would you kindly announce the tally?
Consent Calendar No. 2.

- Total number voting: 34
- Total number voting Yea: 34
- Total voting Nay: 0
- Absent and not voting: 2

Senator Duff.

Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to yield to members for points of personal privilege or announcements, please.

Senator Maroney, do you have a point of personal privilege?

Yes, Madam President. I rise for a point of personal privilege. I would just like to make the announcement that tomorrow is the annual Veterans Committee Help a Hero event. We'll be collecting donations and stuffing a Humvee for homeless veterans. So if you can bring something up tomorrow, it would be appreciated. We're looking for personal care items, socks, T-shirts, gloves, boots, hats, umbrellas, gift cards, health care and hygiene items for both men and women. So just a
reminder that that will be tomorrow, and thank you very much, and hopefully we --

THE CHAIR:

And is that somewhere at the capitol, Senator?

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Yes, that will be in the state capitol parking lot. There’ll be a Humvee in the capitol parking lot. Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Any other points of personal privilege or announcements? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. For a general notation, Senator Champagne missed votes due to business outside of the chamber and Senator Kelly missed due to a medical condition.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Any other announcements? Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Government Administration Elections Committee will reconvene its meeting from this morning in here in Room 2B.
THE CHAIR:

And will that be immediately following?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Fifteen minutes following the end of the last session.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just for a note of order. I missed the vote. I was in the building just down the hallway here. I did not hear the call. It's the first vote I've missed since my election in 2015. And I hope the newfound sense of urgency will be kept for all the future votes. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Any further points of personal privilege or announcements? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, that concludes our business for today. It's our intention to have a Senate Democratic caucus tomorrow at 11:00 followed by a session at noon.
And with that, Madam President, I move that we adjourn subject to the call of the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Go forth and govern, while it's still light.

On motion of Senator Duff of the 25h, the Senate at 6:30 p.m. adjourned subject to the Call of the Chair.