The Senate was called to order at 3:43 o’clock p.m., Senator Looney of the 11th District in the Chair.

ACTING CHAPLAIN BENITA TOUSSAINT:

This is the beginning of a new day. We have been given this day to use as we will. When tomorrow comes, this day will be gone forever; in its place, something that we have left behind—let it be something good. Amen

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon, Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. As the co-chair of Public Health I am thrilled to have this bill called today, but I would like to yield my colleague,
Senator Flexer, because of the great respect I have for her advocacy for this bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Do you accept the yield, Senator Flexer?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President, yes, I do.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon. Please proceed.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the bill before us today is a critical initiative for the State of Connecticut to protect our young people from the incredible and difficult addiction to nicotine and tobacco products. I am thrilled that we are debating this bill in the Senate today. This bill that is before us passed the House of Representatives by a huge bipartisan margin and that's because this has been a bipartisan issue. For many years, this legislature has been looking towards the policies that are included in this bill, the most important being the increase of the age of purchasing tobacco products from 18 to 21. This bill has been worked on for several years and this year, there were members of the House of Representatives, members of the Senate, Democrats and Republicans who worked diligently to make this bill happen and I'm grateful that today, we are debating this proposal.
The bill before us, as I mentioned, raises the legal age to purchase all tobacco products including electronic cigarettes and various vaping products from 18 to 21. It also has several new regulations with regard to dealers and sellers of these products, making sure that they are licensed and that if they are not abiding by the law, if they are in fact selling these products to people who are under this new legal age, that there is enforcement and penalties to make sure that this law is being adhered to. Right now, our law is very strict with regard to traditional tobacco products, those combustible smoking type products. The bill that's before us today modernizes our statutes and makes sure that we are including vaping products, electronic nicotine delivery systems in our laws to make sure that those sellers are licensed and that there are compliance checks and there is enforcement by state agencies to make sure that those products are being monitored as carefully as the traditional smoking combustible tobacco products have been monitored. Under our current law, that isn’t happening.

It also makes sure that we're not criminalizing minors who are attempting to buy these products, but instead, focuses on penalizing the people who choose to ignore the law and sell these products to people under the age of 21. It makes various other changes to our state law regarding the sale of these products. It bans smoking and the use of electronic nicotine delivery systems, vaping products, electronic cigarettes if you will on the grounds of childcare centers and schools. It has new restrictions with regard to the advertisement of these kinds of products. This is a comprehensive
bWindow President, there are a number of people who worked diligently on this bill and I wanna thank first and foremost our Governor, Ned Lamont, who started this session by introducing this policy as a key initiative of his administration and because of him, the various state agencies who deal with these issues were at the table working diligently to make sure that this legislation was not just before us, but that we were putting a regulatory system in place that could achieve the goals of making sure that when we increase this age from 18 to 21, that it's actually enforceable and that we are actually ensuring that these products are staying out of the hands of our young people so we are very grateful to Governor Lamont for his leadership and the various people in the state agencies who worked diligently on this bill. Without them, we wouldn't have been able to achieve this measure that's before us today.

Madam President, I just want to speak broadly about why this bill is so important. We know that close to 90 percent of people who begin a nicotine addiction, whether it's a traditional cigarette addiction or these new and very dangerous vaping products, we know that most people who begin this kind of addiction do so before the age of 21 and so this policy will ensure that in the future, fewer and fewer people are addicted to tobacco products. In recent years, while we had seen declining use of traditional cigarettes among young people and among our population overall, what we have seen is a skyrocketing level of use of electronic cigarettes among our young people. Nationwide and in Connecticut, electronic cigarette use among middle school and high school students is higher than traditional cigarettes, and it's increasing in
alarm ing rates. Between 2015 and 2017, the current use of electronic cigarettes more than doubled from 7.2 percent to 14.7 percent and everything we've heard in the time we've been working on this legislation shows that that number is just continuing to increase.

We've heard stories in the Committee when we were debating, when the Public Health Committee was debating this bill, that schools are now having to set policies that most of the bathrooms in a school building will be closed because the vaping in middle and high schools is so rampant. So many young people are choosing to engage in this and they're choosing to engage this because frankly, it's been marketed to them and because there is a belief among some young people that this vaping product, these electronic cigarettes are safer and the fact is we just we know that's not true and we don't know the full totality of the health effects of the use of these products so Madam President, this bill before us is a real effort to get at an increasing public health crisis that's facing young people in our state and so many of us have been working on this legislation. I'm so grateful to the leadership of the Public Health Committee for their work on this legislation and I'm hopeful that many of my colleagues this afternoon will choose to support this bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark further on the bill that is before the Chamber? Senator Somers, good afternoon.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):
Yes, good afternoon, Madam President. I rise in support of this bill. Coming from Public Health, this is something that we have been working on for years and it has now become critical because of the epidemic that we face, not only in Connecticut but in our country vaping and how so many young people, even starting in middle schools have inadvertently become addicted to nicotine because of the way that the product is delivered. There are cases where a young person can get up to 169 times the amount of nicotine that they can from a cigarette so we as a Public Health Committee felt very strongly that we need to help protect the youth in our state, protect them not only in their current age group, but going forward because every puff that you take on a cigarette takes seconds off of your life. You can actually measure it in the lab, somebody who's a nonsmoker versus a smoker and all of the data that has been collected on those who suffer from addiction to nicotine, even now, it's clear from the evidence and you can find it on the NIH and other healthcare sources, all these folks started young. And I dare anyone in this circle to meet somebody who is having trouble breathing in their later years to say geez, do you wish you started smoking. Everyone that you talk to will say no because of the health consequences and the cost to the State of Connecticut also in the care for these individuals. So I fully support this bill. I want to thank all of those who worked on this. It was not easy, I know, that Senator Flexer and Senator Abrams along with other members of the Public Health Committee worked tirelessly on this bill. It encompassed many different departments to come together and on board and I want to thank this circle for having the fortitude to bring this forward because this is the
one thing we can do in this legislature. We all talk about changing peoples' lives and impacting them in a positive way. This is the one thing that we can do that will be measurably, which we can measure in a short time period. We will be able to measure the difference that we're making by passing this bill and I fully support it. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this bill. Throughout this process I've heard many peoples' stories, very moving testimony from young and old about the devastation of a tobacco addiction on their families and loved ones. It was very difficult to hear because most of us have also experienced that ourselves and we know what it can do and many of these addictions are developed at a very young age. Ninety-five percent of people who have tobacco addiction in their adult life began when they were young so I don't think that we can ignore that fact.

As an administrator, a high school administrator, I saw the vaping phenomenon explode, just become exponential over the past few years and I hear from my old colleagues about the struggles that they're facing in helping students understand what this could mean to them long-term in their health and to take some control over it. Young people, parents, educators, they have all reached out to people in
this body to say that they needed legislative help and that's what this bill will do. It will hold people responsible to keeping our children away from what should be an adult product and I ask my fellow senators not to pass up this opportunity to positively impact the lives of our children and for generations to come. So I strongly support this bill and I ask my fellow senators to do the same.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams? Will you remark further?

Good afternoon, Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON(16TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I rise in opposition to the bill before us, but I want to start by saying that I'm certainly not an advocate for cigarette smoking. For me, this issue has virtually nothing to do with smoking at all. Much like the gun control bills that find their way to this Chamber periodically, I feel that this bill in some ways is a triumph of emotion over reason and in some ways, it symbolizes everything that is wrong with our state government. Our job, as I repeat often in this Chamber, is to make good public policy. It should be consistent and it should be based on reason and not just feelings.

This bill suggests that the people in this building are smarter than the people outside and based on the State's finances, that is more than suspect. It also presumes that we have the position of deciding for others, and those others are our bosses. In fact, they are adults. I heard the word children mentioned several times by the other speakers, but
this bill has nothing to do with children. It has to do with adults. And since we're on the subject of changing the age to purchase cigarettes from 18 to 21, I wonder why 21. It seems rather arbitrary to me. And in fact, I might say that if we were changing the age of adulthood in all of our policies to determine that the majority age in our State would be 21, I could find my way to supporting this bill, but that's not what we're doing. The majority age is 18 in the State of Connecticut. So why 21? I actually had this idea, Madam President, that I was gonna come in today and I was gonna offer a series of amendments. The first one would be to raise the age to 22. Just out of curiosity, how many people in the room would support that? After all, if we're saying that this is to protect people from smoking, why would we not want to protect 22-year-old's as well as 21-year-old's? And then if that passed, why wouldn't we do another amendment to make it 23 and then 24 and then 25 and so on?

The point is that we have already made this determination. The majority age in Connecticut is 18 and because of that, this bill before us actually violates the rights of peoples who are adults between the ages of 18 to 21. It's not a joke to even say that this bill is age discrimination. We wouldn't go out and pick out another three-year period in someone's age range. We wouldn't say people 67 to 70 are restricted from doing something all other adults aren’t, but that's precisely what this bill does.

I want to keep making this very, very important point; 18 is the age of majority. We consider the age of 18 appropriate for voting. That's very important. The significance of that is that we
I trust people who are 18 years old to cast a vote in elections and to make important decisions. Trusting someone with the right to vote basically says we trust you to make good decisions so why would we say we trust you to make a good decision when you're gonna vote and I know there's some people in here who have advocated for making the right to vote begin at age 16, but I ask why are we saying that you're smart enough, you can make your own decisions on who you're gonna vote for at 18, but this decision cannot be made. You're just not smart enough yet. You need to be protected by the people in this building. Those people get to vote and in essence, get to influence every decision we make in this building based on the votes that they cast during elections. If that's the case, then why can't we trust them to make their own decision outside this building on whether they're going to smoke or not, since no one's forcing them against their will?

I know that there's a lot of people that are in favor of this bill. I know it passed out of the House by large margins. I know that there are towns across the State that have passed various ordinances on the subject, but I don't think people have really thought this through. First off, it's not gonna prevent smoking. I started smoking when I was 13 years of age. I don't even know what the lawful age to purchase cigarettes at the time. It might've have been 18. It might even have been 16. I don't know if it ever was but it certainly didn't stop me from getting cigarettes. I had complete and utter access to cigarettes and I'm quite certain that no matter what we change the age to, that will not change.
I want to also point out that I agree; minors should be restricted from purchasing cigarettes, but the term is minors. I don’t want to blur what we consider to be an adult and a minor in the policies we pass in this legislature. It is dangerous to do so and arbitrary. So I started smoking at 13 and it was certainly a bad decision, but it goes to show that even if the age was 18 at the time, it didn’t stop me and if we change the age to 21 I don’t think it’s going to make any difference and I've heard people say over and over again that the reason why we're raising it all the way to 21 is because we want the 15-year-olds to stop. If that's how we have resorted to making policy, it's just madness. Maybe it's just the extreme hypocrisy of this legislation that bothers me the most. This bill supposes that smoking is such an extreme health risk that we need to restrict the sale of cigarettes. I don’t even know that I would disagree with that, but for now, cigarettes are a legal product and this body taxes cigarettes and when I say this body taxes cigarettes, that is an understatement. I don't know that there is a product that we tax more than cigarettes and the argument is always, well we're taxing cigarettes because we want to restrict people from being able to get them. That makes absolutely no sense, Madam President. The money that comes in from those taxes presumably is spent on government programs that everyone in here things are important so people that support taxes on cigarettes must support the purchase of cigarettes necessarily because they want that money for the programs they believe in. That includes anti-smoking and cessation programs by the way. What blatant hypocrisy. There are plenty of other health risks in our society, bad foods. What about driving? People may die from ailments from smoking, but many,
many more people die in automobile accidents and we provide driver's licenses to people who are as young as age 16.

But I guess the ultimate question is why carry on this hypocrisy. If everyone in this room is so passionate and so caring for the youth in our State that they don’t want people to smoke, then why is there not a bill before us to ban smoking? Why not? I don’t see that bill. I see well, we care about 18 to 21-year-olds, but 22-year-olds can fend for themselves. And what about marijuana? Are we serious? Really! This body is poised to pass laws legalizing marijuana in our State at the same time, and I've seen it on the same day in the same committee, the discussion, legalize marijuana, raise the age for cigarettes to 21. I don’t even have to get into it. Anyone listening understands the hypocrisy.

Madam President, what is our job here? We are the Representatives of our constituents. We should never forget that. They elect us and give us the trust to represent their interests and presumably, adults over 18 who have the right to vote are able to make decisions for themselves. They can be sent to prison. They can get a tattoo. People far younger than 21 can have an abortion. That’s ironic. I hear all the time, my body, my choice. I don’t disagree but in this case, somebody's who's 21 years old, who is a majority age, an adult in our State, they're not getting that choice in this case. We are deciding for them. And maybe most importantly, Madam President, they have the right to serve in our military and potentially die for our country. I printed out something off the internet just before we started today and it is from the
United States Selective Service System. It is the law in our country that men, interestingly enough, must register with Selective Service, within 30 days of their 18th birthday. It goes on to say that in a crisis, men would be called in a sequence determined by random lottery and year of birth and they could be inducted into service in our armed forces and potentially serve on a battlefield somewhere and die for this country. I don't know if there is a greater measure of adulthood than that.

If this bill passes, Madam President, it will send several messages to our constituents. First, that this body, the people in this building believe that we have the right to regulate the personal health choices of our adult citizens, that the State essentially has rights over your body and that it can choose which adult citizens are allowed certain rights based on their age, even though they're adults and where does that stop ladies and gentlemen? Will we be next regulating the purchase of sugary drinks, candy bars? I'm sorry, Senator Sampson, you’ve had your allotment of red meat this month. Will there be a low we pass someday that says you must put a hat on before you go outside on a chilly day. I didn’t mention it, but in the substance of the bill, I will note that there's a lot more going on here than just raising the age from 18-21 for the purchase of cigarettes. There's also the concept of vaping which I promised myself I wasn’t gonna get into during this conversation, but that's a worthwhile conversation also since many people take up vaping in an effort to stop smoking. And there are fee increases in here too on businesses in this State that are already struggling. We are doubling the fees for them to be able to distribute cigarettes. I'm awaiting an
amendment, Madam President. I don’t have it yet. I hope it will be drafted before this debate is over so I can offer it, but since I don't have it in my possession, I'm just going to close my remarks and look for the opportunity to get that amendment in my hands and offer it.

The bottom line, Madam President, is that I will not take the rights of my constituents away from them. I just won't do it. Even if some of them ask me, there are plenty others who believe that they are adult citizens who can make their own choices and I think if we actually thought hard about it individually, none of us would decide that we have the right to decide for other adults either. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this bill and want to thank my colleagues, Senator Flexer for all of her hard work on this bill over the years and Senator Daugherty Abrams as well. I started smoking at 14 so my friends and I had just entered high school and I thought hey, wouldn’t it be cool if we tried this. We see some other kids doing this around school, another friend easily purchased a package of cigarettes. We went outside, lit up the cigarettes and a couple of us enjoyed our first puffs and some of us didn’t like it. Unfortunately, I loved it and there began my long addiction and battle and struggle to overcome an
addiction to nicotine. Fifteen years later I became pregnant with my son and knew that I had to quit smoking and it was the hardest thing I've ever had to do. And to this day, I still miss smoking. I liked, I can feel it, I know anybody who's had a cigarette knows exactly what I'm talking about, but it's very hard to overcome that feeling. Every time I walk by somebody who smokes I think, oh, I could easily get right back there and start smoking again and so I'm telling this story because I think we have a responsibility. I think we have a responsibility to our youth. I'm hard-pressed to think of another product on the market that has the known detrimental health risks and addictive qualities that tobacco has.

Ten years ago I watched my father pass away of lung cancer. He started smoking when he was 12 and certainly didn’t know at that time the health risks associated with smoking. Many, many years went by of my father smoking his non-filtered Camel cigarettes and there were times where he wanted to quit smoking when he found out about these health risks associated with it but just simply couldn’t quit and as somebody who, as I've said, struggled with that addiction myself, I know how hard it is to do and how hard it was for him to try and overcome. It wasn’t until he got that diagnosis that he put out his last cigarette, but unfortunately, it was too late and I watched him struggle with this disease and I can't help but think had this law been in effect for him or for me, that neither one of us would’ve picked up the cigarettes as early as we had and become addicted. I think having the age set at 21 makes a significant difference and will most definitely, I wholeheartedly believe that this will most definitely save lives because we all know that
teenagers have lapses in judgement from time to time.

I just served recently on the Board of Education in Guilford and watching now these vaping products becoming such an issue amongst our youth is really quite frightening. I sat down with a group of teenagers from the high school about a year and a half ago and asked them what some of their biggest concerns were and they told me they couldn’t enter the bathroom at the school without somebody using a vaping product and asking them if they wanted a hit off of these vaping products. So I think this is the responsible to do. I think we are protecting our youth and now as the mother of a teen and a pre-teen and another 9-year-old little girl, I want to do everything that I can possibly can to protect them from harm. So again, I rise in support of this legislation and thank you so much, Senator Flexer and my colleague, Mary Abrams, for bringing this legislation forward and I hope to see its passage today. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Will you remark further? Senator Bizzarro to be followed by Senator Haskell.

SENATOR BIZZARRO (6TH):

Thank you, good afternoon, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in opposition to this bill and in particular, I rise simply to set the record straight regarding why I intend to vote no. Just to be clear, I abhor cigarette smoking. I hate it in every way imaginable and I do believe that it poses
a significant health risk to smokers and nonsmokers alike and I quite frankly wouldn’t mind if cigarette smoking were banned in its entirety, but that's the point, Madam President. Not to belabor everything that my good friend, the Senator from the 16th said, but he's got it all right. I mean if at the age of 18 we can ask young men and women to serve in the military and put their lives on the line so that they can defend our freedom and our liberties, our freedom to sit around this circle and debate things that are or aren’t good for them to do to their bodies, and if at the age of 18 we can lock some of them up in prison and in solitary confinement, and if at the age of 18 we can ask them to contribute to our campaigns and vote for us and give them a driver's license and tell them they have to pay tolls, etc, etc, then at the age of 18 they ought to be allowed to make the decision to smoke as well. So for those reasons, I'll be voting no, Madam President, and I just wanted all of that on the record. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Bizzarro. Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I rise in support of the legislation and I just wanted to briefly thank Senator Flexer as well as Senator Daugherty Abrams for their hard work on this legislation, as well as Representative Steinberg, who I have the honor of representing Westport alongside who's been a fierce advocate for this bill for many years and led its passage, its bipartisan passage in the House.
I just want to share briefly, Madam President, that the job that I had before this one was at a convenience store in a state with the highest tobacco tax in the country. Connecticut, I believe is the second highest and I was in the District of Columbia. I'm sorry, not a state yet, but perhaps one day. Anyways, at that convenience, I worked there for four years and in my senior year, we began to sell Juul products which for those who aren’t familiar, perhaps the most popular vaping product. It was unbelievably discouraging to see how many of my peers would come in not just once a week, but once a day spending an inordinate amount of money on products that are quite blatantly marketed towards young gen-, uh, young citizens, towards the next generation. They're lured into this deadly habit under the guise of fruity flavors and it's incredibly disheartening to see how the vaping epidemic has not just spread to college campuses, but as I began campaigning, as I came home to Westport, as I went to high schools and middle schools talking to students about my new job as a State Senator, how I hear from them to echo the comments from Senator Cohen that in bathrooms, in high school and middle school bathrooms, students are taking time out of class because they're so addicted to vaping that they can't go the full 45, 50 minutes of a class period. I knew in college, Madam President, so many of my friends who would have to step out of their lecture, their 50-minute lecture so that they could vape in the hallway or in the bathroom. This is an epidemic and I'm incredibly proud that today, in this Chamber, we're thinking about the next generation, we're taking action because we know that 95 percent of adult smokers become addicted before the age of 21. I
think that this bill is long overdue and I'm grateful to work in a Chamber where there are so many fierce advocates for this legislation on both sides of the aisle. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Thank you Madam President. I rise in support of the legislation just to talk very briefly. I heard one of my good colleagues refer to this process as State government at its worst and I respectfully could not disagree more. If you look at how State government and how we are supposed to operate as public servants and when we come to craft legislation, it starts I think with listening to our constituents and hearing what they're concerned about and this winter, I held a community conversation with parents at Hall High School in West Hartford and it was a frigid evening, I remember it and we had dozens and dozens of parents who came out to Hall High School and talked about how scared they were for their children and how concerned they were that there was gonna be a new generation of teens who were gonna be addicted to nicotine and they asked what could we do? What could State government do to help protect not only their children but children all across the State of Connecticut?

Well it wasn’t too many weeks later that I attended and spoke at another community forum, this one at Conard High School on the other side of town in West Hartford and we have very much similar type of
conversation where parents not only were asking what can State government do, they were demanding action because they know what their teenagers and what their middle schoolers are telling them when they get home from school about how they're afraid to go to the bathroom because of all the smoke and what all their friends are doing and the dangers of withdrawal. We heard from public health experts talk about how these young teenagers are already going through these incredible health challenges because they're addicted to tobacco and they're vaping as well so all sorts of problems and they're demanding that we take action.

We also heard that this is an emotional response but this is rooted in science and rooted in fact. The former head of the FDA says that it points to evaluation that this is a public health crisis, an epidemic and we're gonna stand by and do nothing and we see what is at risk, an entire generation being addicted to nicotine. So we're listening to our constituents, we're doing our research, the solutions are based in science and fact, and then the last part I would point to in terms of process, in terms of state government at its best is that we're working together, bipartisan, collaborating, listening to each other and finding solutions together and not just talking past each other. I think that is state government at its best and I am so proud to vote for this legislation. I wanna thank Senator Flexer, Representative Steinberg, Representative or Senator Abrams I should say and all the folks. You know when I got to the Senate just a few months ago and I was listening to you know the folks at the public forums in West Hartford and I said oh my gosh we have to do something and I arrived here and I realized that there were already
so many dedicated public servants on both sides of the aisle already working far ahead of where I was on a solution so I'm just so pleased to be able to vote for this legislation and I hope that it does pass among strong bipartisan support very soon. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise to offer an amendment. It is LCO 10392. I ask that the Clerk call it and that I be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO No. 10392, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This is a very straightforward amendment. It adds after the last section of the underlying bill, notwithstanding sections of the bill, a member of the Armed Forces who is under 21 years of age, may, without liability to any
person, etc obtain cigarettes, purchase and be sold a cigarette, tobacco product, electronic nicotine delivery systems, vapor products, etc. I move adoption and I ask that when the vote is taken, it be taken by roll.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Roll call vote on the amendment will be ordered. Will you remark further on the amendment before the Chamber? Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President --

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Excuse me, I still have the floor, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson, I apologize. I thought you were done. Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This amendment before us carves out those who serve in our United States Military and treats them as the adults that they are. I think it is unfortunate that this bill is likely to pass and to deprive the rights of adult citizens in our State the same rights that other adults have purely because of their age, but I think it is only appropriate, Madam President, that we take special consideration for people who are
actually signed up to risk their lives for our country.

I'll just make another brief point too. I am also listening to my constituents and that is why I am here. I've had a number of people contact me on both sides of this issue, but I want to just make an additional point that listening to our constituents is only half of our job. The other half of our job is to remember that our primary responsibility is to respect the constitutionally protected rights of every individual that we represent. That is what separates America from everywhere else. That is why we are not a pure democracy; we are a representative Republic because we recognize in this country that adult citizens have individual liberties and we don't just say willy-nilly the majority of people want this so your rights are taken away. We say you are adult, you get to keep your rights and to me that's a lot of what this bill is about, Madam President. I hope my colleagues support the amendment before us. It's the right thing to do. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in strong opposition to this amendment. As has been discussed here during the debate on the underlying bill today, this bill has been worked on for quite some time with a variety of stakeholders, a bipartisan working group of legislators who have
been working on this, this year and for several years and we have looked carefully at the issue of exempting the Military but, Madam President, the fact of the matter is, is that the Department of Defense, the Army, the Navy the Air Force and the Marines are all looking towards become tobacco-free organizations because they recognize the damage that tobacco does to the young men and women who are so bravely serving in our Military. It prevents those members of the Military who are addicted to nicotine from being as ready to defend our country as they could be. They recognize the damage that it does to their health during their service.

Madam President, according to the Centers for Disease Control, tobacco use by military veterans is nearly double the national average and that's because at one point in our Nation's history, and I've learned this from my dad who's a Marine Corp veteran who served in Vietnam, the Military when they gave out what they called their C rations, the meals ready to eat, oftentimes cigarettes were included in those meals, in those packages, those care packages that were given to our veterans and created a large portion of our Military that was addicted to nicotine. Now our Military has clearly come a long way from that and that's why they are looking at new policies to make sure that the members of the Military do not become addicted to tobacco like was the case 40, 50, 60, 70 years ago when the Military gave out free cigarettes to the brave men and women who were serving in our Military at that time. And Madam President, I feel like frequently when I stand up here to discuss the important issues that are debated in this Chamber, I have the great privilege of talking about my father and I'd like to also point out that there was a time
like the time when my father served this country bravely in Vietnam when he was 18, 19 years old, the age to vote was 21 so he didn’t have a say in the people who were choosing to send him to war and luckily, that law was changed. This bill before us is good for all of the young people that we will prevent from being addicted to nicotine products and I'm hopeful that my colleagues will see fit to reject this amendment and preserve the good policy of the underlying bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further? If not, a roll call vote has been requested so Mr. Clerk, if you would call the vote and the machine will be opened.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7200, Amendment A, LCO No. 10392. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate Senator Amendment A, LCO No. 10392. 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 please announce the tally.

CLERK:
House Bill No. 7200, Senate Amendment A, LCO No. 10392.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for adoption</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] The amendment fails. Will you remark further on the bill that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the bill that is before the Chamber? Senator Kissel, good afternoon, sir.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President, great to see you. You know, I'm going to end up voting not but this is not an easy vote. A lot of folks know that historically, probably had that libertarian streak and similar to the issues raised by Senator Sampson, but I also, and I want to commend the proponents, Senator Flexer, Senator Abrams, I told Senator Slap that I thought that was an outstanding articulate set of statements that he made, I was gonna say speech, but, but I have a 15-year-old and he's in his, two weeks from finishing his Freshman year at Enfield High School and I said, Tris, advocates have come to me and they say that there's vaping going on in the bathrooms and stuff like that and I go, is this going on in your high school? Oh yeah, dad, this is what happens. And I said they just renovated the high school and I said is part of the reason why there's no doors on any of the bathrooms in the new facilities that, which I though was
unusual when we went to the opening ceremonies for the school cause they consolidated Fermi which you know exists in name only now with a building but is no longer a high school, but in Enfield we consolidated the schools. And so this is an insidious problem and with this whole Juul issue to which Senator Haskell spoke of, this company's gonna wanna maximize its growth and other vaping companies as well and just we saw with Joe Camel, they're going to try to broaden their base and appeal to as many young people and get them hooked, and when I hear numbers about the nicotine levels in vaping versus cigarettes, that's just huge. That's crazy huge so this is not an easy no vote for me. I do feel that at this point in time, I'm not comfortable enough with raising fees and raising the age to 21 and a big part of that is having men and women enlist to go fight for our country as Senator Bizzarro had pointed out, but I want to say the advocates here in the circle made a strong case and if this doesn't work, we may have to visit this issue more specifically regarding the vaping issue precisely because just as Senator Flexer said, throwing cigarettes into the C rations, hey if I'm big tobacco, I'm happy to do that for Uncle Sam cause I'm building a market for the rest of these men and women's lives so it's an investment. And on the vaping situation, we might just be seeing the tip of the iceberg, the very beginning salvos and if they can get their hooks into our young people, this could just be the beginning of a long war that we're gonna have to fight so to the advocates and folks that spoke in favor of the bill, you have certainly made me think. Not enough to switch my position this afternoon, but there's definitely storm clouds on the horizon and it would not surprise me in the least if we don't have to revisit this issue next
year and maybe rechart a course to go directly, directly at the vaping issue. Forget about the cigarettes and the tobacco. I understand the rationale of moving that away so we don’t have that initial hook but this is a product that seems to me is just beginning to realize the vast profits and I'm happy to learn more as the weeks and months progress. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on this bill that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further? Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I want to thank my colleagues for the robust discussion here this afternoon. I just wanna reemphasize how important this legislation before us is. Despite some of the conversation that's happened here today, the fact of the matter is that tobacco use in this country remains the leading cause of preventable death. Tobacco use kills more people in Connecticut each year than alcohol, AIDS, car crashes, illegal drugs, accidents, murders, and suicide combined. It is the leading cause of preventable death and we were on track ten years ago to be having a chance at a tobacco free generation and as we've discussed here this afternoon, that has changed. We had strong policies that were leading us in that direction and then new products have come on the market, and this legislation goes directly at that dramatic increase in the use of electronic cigarettes among our youth. This legislation will put us back on track to potentially have the first
tobacco-free generation and so I'm hopeful that my colleagues will choose to support this legislation and I'm so grateful and Madam President, this has been a long-term effort and there are a lot of people who worked on this legislation so I just want to go through some quick thank you's.

As I mentioned earlier in the discussion, Governor Lamont, incredibly grateful to him for initiating this conversation and putting this in his key policy proposals for the legislative session. From the Office of Policy and Management and fully from the Department of Revenue Services, we want to thank Sue Sherman, Bruce Adams and Ernie Adamo. From the Department of Consumer Protection, Leslie O'Brien. From the Department of Mental health and Addiction Services, Mary Kate Mason. They all worked so hard to create a strong bill with strong enforcement and we also want to thank the dedicated attorneys in the legislative commissioner's office. This bill is incredibly complicated and all of those agencies and the legislative commissioner's office worked really hard to make sure that what's in front of us is a really strong bill and we're very grateful to them.

I wanna also thank the leadership in the Senate, first Senator Looney and Senator Duff. They have both been committed to this policy for quite some time and they’ve made it a priority and I'm incredibly grateful to have had the opportunity to work with them and to work on this legislation knowing that they were going to make this policy a priority.

I also wanna thank Senator Abrams for her great leadership on the Public Health Committee. As I said earlier this afternoon, her zest and her excitement and her dedication for this issue and her
commitment for this policy and ensuring that we move forward with this, breathe new life into this issue this year and I'm so grateful to her for her work and I also wanna thank the vice-chair of the Public Health Committee, Dr. and Senator Anwar who also was a leader as the Mayor of South Windsor on creating a local ordinance to this same effect in his community when he was mayor so we're grateful to him. I want to thank Senator Fonfara and Representative Rojas and the Finance Committee for their work on this. I want to thank Senator Fasano and his staff for their continued efforts on this legislation and making sure that we were moving forward with this in a bipartisan fashion and I thank him for his commitment to this issue as well and his leadership in this Senate circle and Senator Somers who's worked on this issue for a number of years. We're very grateful to the good work that she did in the Public Health Committee and getting us to this point and my neighbor, Senator Tony Hwang who has made this issue a priority for several years. And this bill is a House Bill and the House of Representatives did a tremendous job convening all of the stakeholders to move this legislation forward this year and that started with House Majority Leader, Matt Ritter. We're very grateful to him, Representative Steinberg, the co-chair of the Public Health Committee and the members of the working group that was developed by the Majority Leader. Representative O'Dea, Representative Kokoruda, Representative Lavielle, Representative Linehan, Senators Abrams and Somers, Senator Slap, Representative Borer, Representative Kupchick and Representative Gibson and all of the members of the Public Health Committee and the Public Health Committee Staff who worked on this legislation.
I also want to thank the advocates and stakeholders who've worked on this. From the American Heart Association, Jim Williams, from the American Lung Association, Ruth Kanovie, the educators, the school principals across the state and the kids who've come up here and talked about this bill. I personally wanna thank the students at Scotland Elementary School who in previous years had come and testified before the Public Health Committee and talked about why this legislation was important to them and it has really been a youth movement in many ways that's gotten us to this point of debating this bill today. Young people from all over our state have advocated for local ordinances and we now have local ordinances in the towns of Hartford, Southington, Wallingford, Meriden, South Windsor, Trumbull, Bridgeport, Milford and New London and we're grateful to the leaders in those communities who advanced the idea of raising the age for tobacco products from 18 to 21. You know, students, we all have the opportunity to greet students both when they come here on field trips and I know that I spend a lot of time with students in the schools back in my district and they talk with us very frequently about tobacco use, about vaping, about moving forward with the policy that is in this bill and they have just been tremendous advocates in fighting for their peers and making sure that their peers don’t develop the addiction that these products cause and young people clearly led the way on this and it's an exciting moment to see something like this pass when you know that the people who are most affected by this policy were the ones creating the change so I'm so grateful to them.

And finally, Madam President, I wanna thank the two people who've put their heart and soul into this
legislation, Bryte Johnson from the American Cancer Society who didn’t believe me when I said oh don’t worry, it'll be Friday, it'll be fine. He was very stressed but here we are at this moment. We've been working on this legislation together for, I believe five years and I am so grateful to him for his dedication, his deep knowledge of the subject and understanding the regulatory scheme that needed to be constructed to make sure that we weren’t just saying we were moving the age from 18 to 21, but making sure that could in fact be enforced and be strict all across the State. Bryte, this legislation will truly impact the health of so many people in our State and it's because of your tireless work and finally, Madam President, I wanna thank Representative Cristin McCarthy Vahey who worked incredibly hard on this legislation, bringing together all of the stakeholders that I just outlined in the thank you's that I've mentioned here this afternoon. She too put her heart and soul into this legislation. We had many a late night phone call worrying how are we gonna do this piece, how are we gonna do that piece, how are we gonna get this one and she worked so incredibly hard and has just a great grace and style to how she's able to bring people together and that's why this legislation is here before us today and hopefully, we're going to have a strong bipartisan vote in a few minutes. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise to support this legislation and I think it's a long time coming and I want to thank Senator Flexer, Senator Abrams, and the whole host of everyone and just associate my comments with Senator Flexer cause I think she thanked everybody and I could never possibly go through that list again but suffice it to say that I thank everybody that she thanked because it was certainly a team effort and I certainly do want to point out Senator Abrams, Senator Flexer, Senator Looney for their hard work and their stalwart efforts and Senator Fasano of course for his work on this. Again, it makes a stronger bill since it's bipartisan and we want to thank everybody who has worked so diligently on this legislation.

The reason for me to rise briefly is just because of the fact as a dad I wanted to talk about why I think this is so important, not only just for the raising the age of tobacco to 21, but the vaping piece of the legislation. We see more and more kids who are vaping and they are doing so without really any knowledge of the fact that this, these products are dangerous. We did not know how dangerous cigarettes were probably when cigarettes were first marketed all over the place when doctors used to market them and say they, and endorse products saying these were the cigarettes that they smoked. Today we would look at that and laugh and say I can't believe that that actually happened. We see with vaping products where students and high school kids and middle school kids, students are older than that who are vaping and not understanding or knowing the dangerous effects of that as well and we see that in school after school where now high schools have to
put in not only smoke detectors, but vaping detectors as well.

At the high school my son goes to, students have had to literally walk out of school many times this year because students are vaping in bathrooms. Students are vaping in hallways when they're passing from class to class. Some are even vaping in the classroom because the products are so small, teachers don't even know what they're doing and so the more we can help raise awareness on these dangerous health effects, the more that we can help people never even get started on this and then get addicted to it so I think this is important public policy today that we're undertaking because I do believe that this is an epidemic right now. And I don't use that word very lightly; it is an epidemic and one which we take strong action on and that is impacting the health and wellbeing of our residents, particularly our young people.

So as somebody who has seen the effects of this as a member of School Governance Council where my son goes to school and we've spoken about this as a council a number of times and how to deal with this in one school, in one community in the State of Connecticut. This is an issue that has impacted probably the entire country as well so in our small state, we can a step in the right direction on this, I'm glad we are and I'm glad to support this legislation, glad that it's bipartisan and I urge everyone around the circle to support it as well. Thank you, Madam President.
Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further on the legislation before us? Senator Looney, good evening, afternoon, we're right on the cusp.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Good late afternoon, Madam President. I rise in support of the legislation. I'm really gratified to see that it is before us today in the State Senate for final action, having already been approved in such a substantial vote by the House of Representatives. It is a long time coming. Together with Senator Flexer and others, I proposed legislation of this kind either individually or as a co-sponsor several times over the years and it's very welcome to see it now on the cusp of final passage because it has become, as Senator Flexer and others said and Senator Duff said, it's not just the conventional smoking that is the problem, the vaping issue is what has now become a crisis among young people with the absence of a recognition that that is so dangerous. They think they're doing something that's safe and relatively entertaining without the long-term consequences of what might have happened to their parents or grandparents through smoking. They think they're gonna be free from that. That's the grave danger of this because they are now in the same mindset regarding vaping that previous generations were regarding smoking and that is a terrible danger and as we've seen, there has also been deliberate marketing toward young people so that the FDA has placed limits on the sale of flavored vaping products to those under 18 because we know they are targeting just those young people in a really concentrated and cynical way. From 2011 to 2018, the use of E-cigarettes by high school students has increased by about 80 percent so it is
just a growing problem in every single high school in every single part of this state and this country. So it is, it is something that not only should we do it today, ideally we should have done this sooner but it is important that we are doing this today.

In regard to some of the arguments and objections made earlier, government is certainly within its constitutional power to adopt regulations regarding public health and safety and the right to determine appropriate age level for certain activities is entirely within the scope of that right and it is not, it is not the universal age of adulthood that at the age of 18 for as we know the purchase of alcohol is only available for those who are 21 or older which we will be going to with this regarding tobacco products. Of course, in terms of relative harm, we know that alcohol is harmful in many circumstances, but beneficial in some. For instance, there’ve been many reports documenting that moderate amounts of red wine, for instance, can be beneficial. Yet, we set 21 as the legal threshold for that product but tobacco, however, is never beneficial in any circumstances and in any amount and the current legal age for that, of course, is 18 which would be changed by this bill.

There was another comment earlier in the debate about well if we're so concerned, why not ban tobacco? Well raising that question in itself I think ignores history and human nature and it's the history of the social experiment of prohibition. Unfortunately, what we saw is that social advocates had in fact identified a real societal problem, that alcohol was causing a significant amount of disruption in homes and work places and criminal activities and the like, but unfortunately, while a
problem was identified, the wrong remedy was chosen because the reality is that people did intend to find ways to drink legally and did so with the creation of a criminal empire outside of the normal system of commerce and that 13-year history of prohibition until its repeal pointed out that in 1933, people did not think that alcohol was any less harmful than they did in 1920, but realized that the remedy had not had its effect, so bootlegging, organized crime, corruption of public officials and police, all of these things had happened and then of course, the resources of those criminal enterprises were turned to other purposes after the end of prohibition. So we know why we have not banned tobacco; for the same reason that it was found to be a mistake in the absolute ban of alcohol. While it certainly would have been a beneficial thing for society if society had been able to make it stick, but they could not which is also the reason why legislators and governments in general have to be, have to be cautious and have to be prudent and have to be circumspect about trying to create by law something that does not have broad and overwhelming community support. If you're looking to regulate behavior in a way that is gonna carry criminal punishments, for instance as an absolute ban would in many cases, the situation also is one that you can't pass something like that if you have a 51 to 49 majority. I mean you can, but you will pass a law that will not be observed. There has to be overwhelming support for something of a nature of that, of that kind which is why as a law professor said once, even murderers and robbers want to be protected themselves by the law against murder and robbery so there is a broad based support of the law even by those who break it in those cases.
But in this case, we are undertaking a reasonable regulation, a reasonable extension of the legal age for purchase of tobacco products to match what we already do for alcohol and as of March of last year, at least five states, California, New Jersey, Oregon, Hawaii, and Maine have already raised the legal age to 21 for tobacco products, and also separately, nearly 300 localities around the country including New York City, Chicago, and Boston have already raised the age so it is a growing phenomenon. We are not at the cusp of this but we are certainly joining something that is the responsible for state governments to do. Again, I want to thank Senator Flexer for her leadership on this over several years and her determination to bring us to this day, Senator Daugherty Abrams and her leadership in the Public Health Committee this year, Senator Duff who has been a strong support, and also the House leadership that has gotten behind this and pushed and brought it to us today with such a strong bipartisan vote so, Madam President, I think this is something we really should celebrate because this is one of the most important things for the public health that we will be able to do in this session. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, the machine will be opened and Mr. Clerk, would you announce the vote, please?

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7200. Immediate roll call vote
has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7200. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7200. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 7200. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on 7200.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be locked. Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill No. 7200.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for adoption</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Can we get order in the Chamber, please?

THE CHAIR:
[Gavel] Could we please have some quiet so that we can hear the next item of business? Senator Duff, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, another item to mark go, one more resolution. Calendar page 65, Calendar 630, Senate Resolution 34, mark go and that'll be the last one of the go's for now. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 65, Calendar number 561, Senate Resolution No. 29, RESOLUTION PROPOSING APPROVAL OF A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT JUDICIAL BRANCH AND THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT JUDICIAL EMPLOYEES, LOCAL 749, AFSCME, AFL-CIO.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Good evening. I was kind of counting on diabetes mellitus, Madam President, but uh, Madam President, I move acceptance of Resolution No. 29 and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you and before you begin, I just want to welcome our guests in the gallery to the Chamber and let everyone know that our rules prohibit the taking of photographs so we would please ask that you respect our rules. Please do proceed, Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President, just a question for the Clerk. Is Senate Resolution No. 28 on his list to be brought before the Chamber also?

THE CHAIR:

Yes.

CLERK:

Yes, it's next.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much. So to the point of Senate Resolution No. 29, this is an agreement between various employee classifications in the judicial branch and the judicial professional employee union. It's a five fiscal year contract. It is a contract that has 122 employees in it. The reserve for salary adjustment account which is where in the budget the funding for this contract would be found will have enough money in it to do so. This five-year contract covering the Fiscal Year 19, Fiscal Year 20, and Fiscal Year 21 would count for $359,165 dollars in year one, $930,035 dollars in year two, and $1,706,104 dollars in year three with
annualized amount of $1,848,991 dollars. I urge my colleagues to support this Resolution. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Will you remark further on the Resolution that is before us? Good evening, Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I rise for some comments and then some questions to the proponent.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Good evening, Senator. I had again raised some concerns the last time we were in front of the circle talking about the contracts that we had previously done. There were six of those that we had one previously and some of the concerns that were raised at that time I think are still germane to the conversation today. The expansion of the roles of the public sector employees with regard to job security, which I think is as problematic as everything else in this particular process and I'll get into that in a minute, but it was during the, one of the initial conversations on the contracts that was negotiated by the previous administration that then Secretary Barnes made some comments in his testimony as he presented it to the arbiter, and some of the
testimony that was raised I think, I think is germane to all, all of the contracts that we're talking about or we're about to talk about today. And the former Secretary said that Connecticut's credit rating has been downgraded nine times in the last eight years and has the third worst rating of all the states and that a poor credit rating impacts the State's ability to access capital at reasonable rates. The Secretary went on to say that Connecticut has a high tax burden as of 2014, the fourth highest per capita tax burden in the State, and then a rating that does not reflect the more recent increase in taxes.

As a percentage of personal income, Connecticut residents pay the second highest rate in the country. In addition, the State's debt burden per capita, Madam President, is the second highest in the Nation. Secretary Barnes went on to say in his testimony that long-term obligations total $80 billion dollars and most of these obligations are related to State Employee Pension and Health Benefits and State subsidized municipal benefits including the Teachers Retirement. The Secretary continued by saying that this increase would have a significant detrimental effect on the State's financial situation.

Another indicator emphasized by under Secretary Barnes is Connecticut's weak economic recovery and again, he talked about an important trend as the outmigration of millionaires, which has increased while the migration of millionaires into the state has decreased. Madam President, I bring this conversation from the former Secretary speaking to one of the previous contracts just to have that on the record and kind of set the table as to where we
are with regard to again, these number of contracts, I know five, six or seven that we're going to be talking about today and in every case, in every case that we have talked about in previous contracts and that we will today talk about in contracts, it does not reflect the good work of the people who perform the work in these bargaining units.

As a long-time employer, somebody who has employed a lot of people over the course of my adult lifetime, I understand the importance of frontline employees. Employees are the greatest asset that we have and I don't have a problem with recognizing that. I do in the fiscal environment that we're in and that's my only issue at this point in time. This contract as the good Senator has talked about has an individual contract total over the years of nearly $3 million dollars. When I was a young boy, and I think I've said this before here in the Chamber, my grandfather who immigrated from Sicily, he used to tell us if you watch the pennies, the dollars will follow and I'm afraid sight of the incremental increases that just keep happening and keep happening and keep happening and as we're gonna go on with these other contracts that we're gonna be talking about today, Madam President, we're looking at nearly $91 million dollars in extra cost putting on the budget here in the State of Connecticut and I think that there are other things, other more pressing things that we can be talking about.

I think, Madam President, that as we move forward, there are a lot of small businesses out on Main Street Connecticut who do not see any of these or the extent of these benefits that are being realized here by the public sector employees, the least of which is the double digit percent in raises over the
contract period, the $2000-dollar cash bonuses that will be paid as part of these contracts. And then job security. There are a lot of people on Main Street who would love to have three-year job security, but that just doesn’t happen on Main Street.

So, Madam President, I would argue that that job security is gonna hamstring us moving forward. There has been some talk potentially of a recession on the cusp coming up in the next year or two. I have no idea whether that's going to be true or not, but in the event that it is true and we have to downsize, we will be hamstrung by the fact that we will not have the opportunity to reorganize agencies to privatize group homes or to do things that we need to do because we have a certain number of public sector employees that we would have to maintain, unlike in the private sector. And no one likes to provide layoffs, but sometimes it is a necessary, it is a necessary opportunity.

Madam President, the good Senator talked about the Reserve for Salary Account and if I may, through you, ask a question or two of Senator Osten, please?

THE CHAIR:
Please proceed.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The Reserve for Salary Account, Senator, as we both know is an account that's designed to put aside dollars in the event wage increases are incurred. At the time when money is put in those accounts, no one really has an idea because contracts are supposedly negotiated. So
through you, Madam President, what is the level in
the, in the RSA, the Reserve for Salary Account at
this time? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President, and first, let
me correct the record on my colleague. When he is
talking about what the former Secretary Barnes put
in an arbitration is not relative to this particular
contract. In addition to that, the good Senator has
agreed to set the table for increased bonding,
creating additional debt three times that amount
when we talk about the differences in our Department
of Transportation funding moving forward so it
appears to me that the good Senator is already on
board for laying the table for additional debt for
the State of Connecticut and in regard to each and
every one of these contracts, many of these
employees have gone without raises for ten years,
and you cannot minimize their raises by calling out
just three years of an employee's wage history,
saying that these are expensive contracts.

In regard to the Reserve for Salary Account, at the
end of the day, when we finish discussing these
contracts and all of the contracts are paid out,
there will still be $44 million dollars in the
Reserve for Salary Accounts which allows us, which
has been put away for years while these contracts
were being negotiated. This is a negotiated
settlement between the employer and the employees
recognizing that the employees after a decade should
receive salary increases as the State has been doing significant work bringing under control both healthcare and pension benefits and in regard to that, these employees while getting no salary increases, have been seeing significant increases in those costs so when you look at an employee and you say I expect you to pay more for your healthcare, I expect you to pay more for your pensions and I expect you to give more back, these people have.

Now my colleague has also indicated that there is not going to be an ability to lay off workers and that's just an inaccurate statement. The fact is, anybody hired after July 1 can get laid off and reorganizations can happen and the State has done significant decreases in moving services into the private sector, and the private sector has said we can do it for far cheaper, but the private sector is also asking for additional dollars to be moved over there. Now, I agree that they should see additional dollars in the private sector also and we did do a contract last year to forward under the personal care attendants and in the DDS group home, some additional dollars were put into that and later on today, we will be talking about childcare workers and forwarding raises to them, so this is a simple contract for a group of employees who has not seen a significant increase in a decade. There are 122 state employees working for the judicial department to see a raise for the work they've done and it's a nice thing to say I believe you should have one, but eventually we've gotta walk the walk and not just talk about it. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator for that answer. In terms of moving forward for the State of Connecticut, walking the walk and talking the talk is about affordability, it's about accountability, it's about measurability, and it's about the opportunity that we have to move our state in a direction that will be fiscally responsible and not realize budget after budget deficit. So that was point on that. My point also was that you know the insulation of the public sector over the private sector which do not have the opportunity to enjoy some of these, some of these benefits that are being put forth.

With regard to the Reserve for Salary Account, we have some pressures that are being put on other portions of the, of the budget here because of these agreements that we've agreed to and we have a Financial Advisory Committee meeting scheduled for next week that seeks to rebalance some shortfalls, $12 million dollars in the Social Security tax, for example, this has a deficiency as a result of the SEBAC settlement payments of $2000 dollars in related lump sum payments and the extra longevity payments in 2019. OPEB, post-employment benefit accounts is deficient $2.8 million dollars so again, talking about the opportunity to move our State forward in a fiscally prudent manner without creating shortfalls as we move forward which I think is due in part by chipping away a little bit at a time, $3 million, $4 million, $5 million dollars at a time, $10 million dollars at a time, increasing our costs to over almost $91 million dollars as a
result of these contracts that I expect will most likely pass on a party line vote today.

With regard to this contract today that we're talking about, No. 29, these employees will see an increase over the duration of their contract of 20.3 percent; 20.3 percent, Madam President, is not something that's happening to the rest of the Connecticut State employees and the private sector so that is my, that is my argument against this. Again, my argument is not that people have not seen raises and therefore are deserving. Everyone is deserving of raises, but the financial reality is that sometimes, we just can't afford to do so. In the private sector, there are many small businesses out there that are struggling that are watching us closely, that are reading the papers and listening to the radios and watching the evening news and they're saying, all I hear about are new costs that are going to come down on Main Street from this gold dome. And they're waiting. They're waiting to see what happens with the budget, which I understand is close and is coming out shortly and will provide a lot of those answers, but for this moment in time, for this contract that we're talking about, I just find that at this point, it's rich and I don't think that we can afford it and I would urge my colleagues to reject this contract. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Will you remark further on the resolution that is before us? Senator Fasano, good evening.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):
If I could to the Chairperson of Appropriations, Senator Osten, just ask a couple of general questions if I may?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you. The purpose of COLA's, yearly COLA's that are written into these contracts that we are seeing now (coughs) excuse me, and we have seen in the past, what's the purpose of having COLA's in a contract generally? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. They are generally cost of living adjustments. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

And why would one want to put in a cost of living adjustment into contracts? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

They are put in to adjust it for cost of living. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

So in other words, you'd put the cost of living in there because it is conceivable that from year to year, generally, the cost of living is higher. It's not stagnant, it goes up and to keep the contract at the value when you approve it, you need to add this cost of living so that the contract, the money that they're getting is not depleted, as the cost of living goes up, that the salary stays the same. Is that the general theory? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

That's the general concept and in this case, cost of living is also not necessarily a given in all of these contracts on the cost of living it's dependent upon the evaluation of the employee. The cost analysis in all of these contracts are what it would be if every person in the bargaining unit received a
cost of living, that may not necessarily be true. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you and I think if I heard the good lady, she was indicating that the reason why we put this in there is because of the cost of living goes up and they would get an increase. I guess the question, what is the cost of living increase in this contract before us? Is it based upon a definition? In other words, is it based upon looking at the CPI index or is it a set rate and if there is a set rate, what is that set rate per year if the Senator knows? Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. The total dollar amount of the cost of the annual increment in FY 21 is $121,347 dollars. The annual increment in FY 20 is $136,229 dollars. I don’t have it broken down by employee, but should all the employees receive a favorable eval, they would get a portion of those. It would that amount divided by 122. Through you.

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

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

So through you, Madam President, that value, is that based upon the expectation of what the COLA would be or is that a set value? In other words, is it like 2.2 percent, 3.5 percent, 3.0 percent, or is it what they believe the cost of living adjustment would be based upon theoretical CPI index, for example? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President and through you, it is not based on the cost, the CPI. The Consumer Price Index is not this. This is a negotiated rate between the parties and each cost of living, should the employee receive that, would be 3.5 percent. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

I thank Senator Osten for her answers and I appreciate it. Thank you so much, Senator. Madam President, we have six or seven, I've lost track, contracts we're going to be doing tonight. We've done approximately six or seven contracts before this. At the end of the day, and I will circle back
to this, these contracts in total since the very first one are going to add about $91 million dollars to our budget. That would be for Fiscal Year 19, 20, and 21. $91 million dollars for these contracts. Almost $100 million dollars more to this budget and the next budgets that pass the two years. Madam President, when we talk about the cost of living adjustment, the reason why I asked those questions is because in many of the contracts that we have out there for social services, we talk about cost of living adjustment, CPI, etc. and I'm gonna get to that in a second. I do want to hit upon the fact that I think there was argument that there are no raises given to this group of people. Let's talk about that a little bit.

We as a legislature decided not to give managers those raises. Why? Because we could not afford those raises and I've said this before; we just couldn't afford them. But that doesn't mean they didn't get raises. They have step-ups. So in their category for which they work, they get a certain level, they get a step-up, and they get a step-up and now there are some who have reached that peak of that step-up, there are some that have peaked out, but clearly that's not the majority of the folks so to say they haven't gotten raises perhaps may be too inclusive cause that's not accurate. People have gotten raises. It's just that we decided not to give the top step an increase because we couldn't afford it. And when we say we can't afford it, we're saying we believe as a public policy in this Chamber that we need to provide money to mental health, drug addiction, disabled adults, fill in the rest of it, social services, and we can't do that and give out raises. We can't do both so we choose and in this case, we said managers are getting a
pretty good salary, I think top salary of one of the
things I saw was $109,000 dollars, that perhaps the
money would be better spent some place else. We
made that conscious decision based upon our budget
needs. And, Madam President, just the other day
walking through this hallway, a non-profit
organization that deals with people with
disabilities went on to say they haven't received a
raise, working with disabled folks in 12 years; 12
years. These are the folks, by the way, union are
included in these employees so we're not just
talking about nonunion, we're talking about private
sector nonunion employees, haven't received a raise
in 12 years because we won't fund them. These are
the very people that we ask to take care of our
loved ones, we haven't given them a raise in 12
years. Forget about a 3.5 percent automatic increase
when you work for the State. These are hardworking
good people taking care of disabled folks. We have
not given them a dime more in 12 years, although
minimum wage is going up, we don't give them money.
So what do they have to do? They have to cut
programs. Without a doubt, there is no doubt to
this fact, the Program Review Investigation
Committee which no longer exists, the Committee is
split between Republicans and Democrats 50/50, came
out with a report that said the private sector takes
care of our needs better in terms of medical needs,
disability, group homes, better than non, better
than the State. Quality, cost and programs and
we're starving them out of the business. We're
starving them out of the business and yet we sit
here today with a series of contracts at 3.5 percent
for $90 million dollars, $91 million dollars are
budgeted, and we won't give these people a raise
that we haven't them given them in 12 years and they
do the most work out of the non-profits. How does
that make sense in this circle? How does that make sense in this building?

Let me tell you this. We're about to do a budget. Now, whether it's gonna be Saturday, Monday, Tuesday, I don't know when it's gonna be. In that budget, if we took programs like TANF, SAGA, boarding home rates, and we don't even give them a CPI Index increase and freeze them, we should be embarrassed. We should be embarrassed if that budget doesn't give some commensurate increase to TANF, SAGA, boarding homes and other nursing homes and other folks. If we don't do that and yet we can sit here in good conscience, turn and give 3.5 percent increase to State employees on all these contracts, we've got these folks on SAGA, the cost of living goes up and we say we're gonna freeze them a year or two so we can balance our budget, let's just take a timeout and really, really be intellectually honest with what we're saying. And let me tell you what we're saying. We're saying if you work for State government, guaranteed raises but if you are not with the elite in this building, if you are low income, if you are disabled, if you have needs and wants, you don't rise to the level of compassion and necessity as someone making $109,000 dollars in the State of Connecticut, we need to give them 3.5 percent more, and oh, by the way, a $2000-dollar signing bonus off the bat.

Someone once said, someone who we all know in this circle as a whirlwind on the budget once said to me a lesson that I've listened to. A budget is about your priorities. That's what the budget is and every time we do one, we set out what the priorities are and if we're not gonna give raises of at least CPI to residential care facilities, we have made a
statement in our budget as a policy that they're not as important to us as these contracts. I've been a member of this circle for 15 years or so and every one of us has stood with a disabled adult, nursing home facilities, union or not, care workers, and talked our hearts out on how we feel about them all. That's what we've done. The budget coming up is going to tell you whether that was lip service or you really do care about these folks. Now, I don't know what's in the budget because I got a 30,000-foot level packet and I do know we are going up on increasing taxes, not for rates, but broadening the taxes. I do know we're going up on restaurant meals. I do know we're going up on corporate filings although we take some off the record books. We're going up on dry cleaning and a whole bunch of other things. We're nickeling and diming every place we can nickel and dime and someone could argue that's a good thing because we're gonna use that money to help our core services. Fair argument. I'm with you. Reasonable minds can differ whether the policy is good or bad, but legitimately you can take the position of raising the taxes because we're gonna fund our core services. I'm not sure that argument gets to the endgame when you say we're raising these taxes because we've got $100 million dollars more in contract obligations to people who are here, work hard, who have a good pension and the best healthcare policy and insurance I would argue in the country. In the country. That's why we're raising it. This is not a budget about Main Street. This is not a budget about the working people.
Now, if I'm wrong and TANF and SAGA and all the rest of them are going to get a 2 percent COLA increase across the board, everybody, all those special social needs, then a mea culpa on me. I don't think I am. We'll find out in 24 or 48 hours from now. At some point we'll find out as everyone else will where we are, but understand, this is about priorities. This is about priorities. Madam President, I'm actually challenged by how many times can I say the same thing with the six contracts coming up and that is a challenge, but the overall bottom rule is that budgets are priorities and if you're gonna make this commitment on this contract, you need to make a pledge to yourself that you're gonna make the same commitment to those folks who depend upon our system to survive. We need to help people who are difficult places and they need to know that they can rely on us as the construction of these facilities being social services that they're gonna get the help and oh, by the way, if the whole purpose of the cost of living increase is to make sure if you're getting a dollar today, and the cost of living increase goes up, you're gonna get $1.05 tomorrow, otherwise, I'm only giving you 95 cents, that's the purpose of cost of living for which I understand, and apparently that's the purpose that's written into these contracts at 3.5 percent which is well above any cost of living that I know of. In fact, when you look at the cost of living which I have some place on the desk here, if you look at the cost of living, I think nationally it's barely 2 percent, and in the northeast it's below 2 percent, it's 1.8, but we're giving 3.5 percent. Let's be clear, let's be clear, these contracts have a cost of living which is almost double the national average. So we're giving a cost of living double the national average 'cause it's not index, and
we're gonna give no cost of living to the social services that people need to live on day to day who've got families and obligations.

I don't know why and maybe it's me, but it seems a little backwards. It seems a little disconnected with reality. It seems to send this message, it seems to send this message; if you want a guaranteed income and you want a guaranteed raise and you want a great pension and you want great healthcare, start looking through the state websites for a job here in the Capitol because Capitol Avenue is what we as legislators need to protect. The not-for-profits that all of us say do God's work are somewhere last in our budget priorities, somewhere below not even 1 percent, not even half a percent, we're gonna hold them steady and maybe the second year we'll give them a little money, give them a couple pennies but by that time wages in this building, pretty much everybody, have come up 7 percent.

Madam President, I just feel if you remove COLA's for the aged, the blind, and the disabled, so you're removing COLA's for old age assistance, you are making a cut of $680,000 dollars. Understand if that budget doesn't give that increase, you've taken $680,000 dollars out of the pocket. Aid to the blind $9000 dollars, aid to the disabled $1.47 million dollars. Those are cuts. I talked about TANF. TANF, a program for the poorest of the poor. We are making a cut of $4 million dollars. $4 million dollars. There isn’t anybody in this circle that would say I want to cut TANF $4 million dollars, but when you don’t give those raises, CPI index increase, you are cutting it $4 million dollars. SAGA, a million-dollar cut. That's a
total of those alone of $7.4 million dollars to the neediest of needy and the helplessness of helpless.

If we are going to cut those programs, how in good conscience can we give these raises? How can that happen? Madam President, we have more contracts to go so I guess I'll save part two and I'm sure, if the budget is as I believe it to be, although I don't know those parts of the details of the budget, I'll probably have to save this portion of the video so I can remember and replay it. So, Madam President, I certainly cannot support this contract, not until and maybe not even if I understand the direction we're going in the state with respect to social services. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Will you remark further on the resolution that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the resolution before the Chamber? Senator Champagne, good evening.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

I just have a question, maybe a couple of questions for the proponent of the bill?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Through you, Madam President, the step system for this group, can you tell me how many steps that they have? Through you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. No.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam Secretary, uh, President, sorry.

THE CHAIR:

I had that job for quite some time, thank you, no offense. [laughs]

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

I'm looking at this and I see step 9 but I also see 27 groups so I'm just trying to figure out if you move from one group to the next, which make this a never-ending step increase, do you know if that, anything about that? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):
Thank you very much, Madam President. If you could repeat the question?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. I'm looking at the steps that we have for this group and there are nine steps and then there's 27 groups and as you go through the steps and you go through the groups, you start at $32,594 and you end at $113,524 dollars so I'm wondering, do you know how you work through the steps and through the groups?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Thank you for the question. The groups are different job classifications and to move from job classification to job classification it would depend on your level of education or level of expertise in a certain area so you may never move through the groups at all, you may always remain in one of those groups or you may always remain in another group and often what happens is the steps indicate an entry level and you may not start at that entry level and you may never reach the top level. It all depends on if steps are in a collective bargaining agreement and sometimes they are and sometimes they're not so it may take you 20 years to get to the top step and it would
take you no less than a year in between the steps if that is what awarded in the contract, but it would depend on the negotiated agreement between the employer, in this case the Judicial Department, and the employee. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Did they have these steps prior to becoming a union? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

This is a current union. The steps have always been in this union. These workers are accreting into this bargaining unit. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, so if somebody receives a step, they receive a raise; is that correct?

THE CHAIR:
Senator Osten.

SENATOR Osten (19th):

Depending on whatever that annual increment is, then they would receive an agreed upon increase in pay.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you, again, Madam President. I guess I ask you this because you stated that they did not get a raise in ten years and did they not get a raise because they were not union?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR Osten (19th):

Through you, Madam President. They did not get a raise as a result of their being a part of the NP Pay Plan. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Can you, can you, through you, Madam President, can you describe the pay plan you just talked about?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

It is a pay plan that is for nonpartisan staff or those who don’t fit in with the collective bargaining agreements that stand before us today. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President and through you, have other non-union or strike that -- when was the last time somebody who was not in a union got a raise in the State of Connecticut? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Over the last decade, I think it was about five, ten years ago. I don’t have that in front of me. Through you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President and through you for one more question, can you just describe why they didn’t get a raise?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Because it did not get put into the budget. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I guess I have one more question. We're fighting for the unions to get quite a bit of money and in some of these cases, a considerable amount of money and then we talk about the fact that they haven't gotten raises and yet, they didn’t get raises because they weren’t part of the union and we didn’t give them raises just like everybody else who wasn’t. So basically, what we could say is that when they became a union is when we actually paid attention and gave them that raise, correct?
THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTERN (19TH):

So, through you, Madam President, I'm unsure what my colleague is referencing when he says that they became a union. Are you considering them the overall embodiment of a union? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President and through you, no, what I'm saying is you know we have a lot of non-union people and we actually have a lot of non-union people in this building and I noticed that some of them haven't gotten raises in ten years and I'm trying to figure out why we give out in some cases 9 percent raises, in other cases 3.5 percent raises and I know you say it's not in the budget, but why haven't we paid attention to the non-union and given them something?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTERN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Through you, that decision was made by the General Assembly not
to afford raises and if the General Assembly had afforded them raises, the Executive Branch has the ability to not give those out unless there's an agreement between the parties. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. That's my final question. I guess when I look at this and I hear that some government workers haven't gotten raises in ten years, not even a small 1 percent, and I know insurance costs have gone up and then we come before us and we argue for other state workers and we're giving them 9 percent a year and we give them better benefits, better time off, it doesn't sound fair to me and it just makes me wonder, I guess why? I guess I know the answer but I'll keep that to myself. Thank you, madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Champagne. Will you remark further on the resolution that is before us? Will you remark further on the resolution that is before us? If not, Mr. Clerk, please call the vote. The machine will be opened.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution 29. An
immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution 29. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution 29. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate, Senator Resolution 29. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be locked. Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Resolution No. 29.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for adoption</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Page 66, Calendar number 562, Senate Resolution No. 28, RESOLUTION PROPOSING APPROVAL OF A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT JUDICIAL BRANCH AND THE UNION OF PROFESSIONAL JUDICIAL EMPLOYEES, AFT/AFT-CT, CONCERNING INFORMATION TECHNOLOGY AND OTHER EMPLOYEES.
Good afternoon, Madam President. Madam President, I move Favorable Report from Senate Resolution 28 and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

Thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President, this Resolution approves an agreement between the Judicial Branch information technology employees and the Judicial Professional Employee Union. This agreement establishes wage increases in accordance with the 2017 SEBAC agreement. There are 165 employees covered by this agreement. In Fiscal Year 19 there is $430,038 dollars in total, in Fiscal Year 20, $1,256,904 dollars, in Fiscal Year $2,512,971 dollars, in Fiscal Year 22, $3,170,558 dollars, and this, these dollars will come from the Reserve for Salary Accounts and while there was some conversation in an earlier Resolution that we talked about, there is out of the Reserve for Salary Accounts and in Fiscal Year 21, $23,893,500 dollars in Fiscal Year with collective bargaining agreements removing $13,616,973 dollars, and in
Fiscal Year 20, $22,574,814 dollars and in Fiscal Year 21, uh, $33,313,401 dollars and those dollar amounts would come out of the Reserve for Salary Accounts if the agencies do not have additional dollars left in their personal services line items leaving a total of $44,347,938 dollars. That total is 13 and 22 and 33 for 35, $68 million dollars not the $91 million dollars purported by some of my colleagues earlier, and there was some talk about some of the not-for-profit. Last year, we increased dollars going into the not-for-profit community. I would agree with my colleagues that we need to address the issues, but last year we did start that process to raise awareness that our not-for-profit communities where we have transferred many former state service, some 3000 jobs, that they should receive equal treatment. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I rise for a few comments on the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you very much. Thank you, Senator. Again, here we are discussing yet another $7 million plus
dollars in liabilities to the State of Connecticut at a time when we're facing huge deficits and again we'll be talking about this a few more times. Again, these employees are good employees for the State of Connecticut, it's just time and it's just the priorities that we're choosing that I think, Madam President, we need to think about.

With regard to the comments that I made in the last segment regarding the former Secretary, I used those comments just to preface the fact that they were based on the State's ability to pay and that was the argument that the good Secretary was making back in the discussion with that arbiter and his or her award with that last contract. And I submit that would be a germane argument to move forward now, the State's ability to pay because none of those things have really changed. Connecticut's credit rating has been downgraded nine times. Now the outlook perhaps looked better based on the bipartisan budget that is in existence right now and some of the structural changes we made, but with regard to moving forward, Madam President, I would just submit to you that we are at the same place except we're talking about twice as much money for this group that we did in the past, again, over the life of the contract an 18.5 percent increase and job protection which means no layoffs for the next three years which again, I outlined previously the concerns that I have.

Madam President, the FAC, the Financial Advisory Committee that is going to be convening next week to talk about shortfalls again speaks to the fact that the $12 million dollars short in Social Security Tax Account is in deficiency because of specifically the payments as a result of these contracts and I just
put that on the record. I'm happy to leave it on the record, Madam President. Again, I don't know that we need to continue to talk about this each time as we move forward contract after contract after contract, but I would submit that we need to look at what the RSA account is for and if the RSA account is not funding some of these other dollars, then I'm just wondering where they're going to be coming from so with that, Madam President, I just urge my colleagues to reject this contract and I thank you for the opportunity to speak on it.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Will you remark further on the Resolution that is before us? Good evening, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Good evening, Madam President. A few moments ago when I was standing in the Republican caucus room, we looked out and I'm going to say a large group of individuals who were all gathering on the north side of the Capitol to have prom pictures taken and I started thinking about you know high school prom. The high school that my son goes today has graduate and this is the time of year when most people have things like engagement parties and other type of family events. But particularly what struck me is you look at the youth that were out on the north lawn of the Capitol. They were so excited, so happy, so energetic because what they want is opportunity and they want a future that is bright and hopeful. And then you think about what we're doing here tonight under the dome and you say to
yourself it's all about choices. Choices. What choices are we going to make? Are we going to make those types of choices that give our children and the people of Connecticut that hopeful optimism that is so alive this time of year? You see it on the face of students and our children. It's Spring. It's a great time of year and then you come under here and you look at it and you're like what are we doing? Are we doing the same type of business in here that the people throughout Connecticut are enjoying out there?

I can relate to Senator Fasano's comments before that it's gonna be hard to make this argument seven times so I'm not going to do that. I'm going to comment now on this contract with regards to all the contracts, but what we're looking at spending in these seven contracts is $75 million dollars; $75 million dollars more than we have in the past. Connecticut is in a fiscal deficit and it's a structural deficit which means that we're spending more on an annual basis than the State takes in. If we go to our constituents, the middle class household, when they're confronted with the same type of circumstances, doesn't have a taxpayer that they can go to and say give me a raise. They don't have an employer that they can just walk into and say give me a raise. No, the people that put us in these seats, they live life differently. They live in a situation where you live within your means. If the revenue drops, then the expenditures need to drop to balance the budget. Otherwise, the house would be in foreclosure, they'd be in bankruptcy and the car would be repossessed. But that doesn't happen here under the dome. We act in a different manner. We spend money we don't have and that's because it's not our money or at least it's not
viewed as our money because I think if every legislator looked at it that way, we might have a different outcome. But when we put an extra $75 million dollars in contractual agreements onto the budget, that means it's a perpetual issue. It's not just gonna happen this budget and next budget. It's gonna continue into the future because all future contracts are gonna be based off the contract you already have and look at growth from there. So think about that. When we brought out Prioritized Progress Plan, which created an identifiable and sustainable transportation plan that could create and start projects this July, we were criticized because that put obligation and debt on future generations. So does this. So does this. It's these types of initiatives that takes the smiles off those kids having fun going to their prom. That is what it is and what we have to start looking at is if we were going to spend an extra $75 million dollars, is this the buy? In our daily lives we look at things and if I lost revenue, you make the decisions. Do we buy a new car? Do we buy a used car? Do I fix the car I have? Do we buy Cheerios or Oat-E-O's? How do we make the budget work in our own personal lives? Well it's all based on choice, the choices we wanna make.

As ranking member on Insurance, the big issue that we've been trying to grapple with and deal with has been trying to deliver the promise of the Affordable Care Act to the people of Connecticut because that promise has been broken because while the Congress under the Obama Administration promised lower premiums, it never happened. Quite the contrary. Premiums actually went up and went up in significant increases, double digit increases because Congress didn’t fund the promise that was made, but as a
State, we have the ability and quite frankly I think the responsibility to deliver on that promise. We've just learned that Access Health commissioned a study and that study looked at reinsurance and the study came back and said yes, reinsurance is the way to go. Reinsurance can provide premium relief to the people we serve and can do so from anywhere from 5 percent to 20 percent reductions. But that's gonna cost. It's gonna cost the State anywhere from $20 to $77 million dollars. So here's the choice. We could give that extra $75 million dollars we're gonna spend on these contracts to government employees, or we could fulfill the promise of the Affordable Care Act to citizens across the State of Connecticut. We could give them a 20 percent premium reduction with this amount of money. You could do a 10 percent at $38 million dollars. So just think, you could still give 10 percent to the people we serve in premium relief and half the amount in these contracts, split the baby if you will. Salt two pots rather than one. That's not the choice we're gonna make either. We could 5 percent reduction for $20 million dollars and still do contracts at $55 million dollars; $55 million dollars, but that's not what we're gonna do either. No, with these contracts and with this money, we are gonna make the choice if you vote affirmatively for this contract to reward government. The ruling class. And there's nothing for the people of Connecticut with regards to their healthcare premiums and fulfilling that promise on the Affordable Care Act and that's what I see all too often at the Capitol is that many times, it's not the people we serve who come first, but government itself comes first.
When I got out of college, I served in public service. Our family has always been committed to public service because public service in my definition is to give back. It's a noble calling to contribute to your community, to make it better than when you found it and that has rung through to this day in my service in the Senate. But when we see that we're going to be making a choice of government employees versus the people who are struggling for healthcare, these are people that are losing their homes, these are people that aren't getting the care that they need, and that rings hollow. That aspect rings hollow. We're making the wrong choices. We're choosing government over the middle class, as Senator Fasano said, Capitol Avenue versus Main Street. And the same thing rings true when you're gonna start to cut social services, people who actually depend on government to make ends meet. No cost of living there. Nope. Nothing for the people we serve. A cost of living increase for people who work in the government? Absolutely. That's not my choice 'cause the choice in the Kelly household is to put people first and to make sure that the people we serve, that their voice is heard under this dome. That it's not only the interests that thrive and profit and advance under this dome that actually get the reward. I think the choice is easy. We're gonna take care of our neighbor and as I said, there's a way to do so. You don't have to go a whole $75 million dollars on the contract. You could go less than that and give something to everyone. But, no, nope. The AABD clientele, people on fixed incomes, aged, blind, and disabled, they're not heard cause they're not in the room right now. So when you think about these choices, I come back to what I was witnessing looking out the window, where are we going with the State of
Connecticut? We're four or five days from the end of session and can we actually look and say Connecticut is on the right road? It's a road of opportunity, it's a road of prosperity, it's a road of hope and that the kids that are sitting and enjoying prom pictures outside are thinking to themselves, this is the place that I want to stay, this is the place where I'm gonna raise my family. And have we done that and are we hearing that when we walk the streets of our districts? I'm not so sure we do because I certainly don't. I hear frustration. I hear disappointment. I hear rage and anger because I know the middle class family is at a financial breaking point and they don't feel that they're heard and when we make choices like this, it's clear that they're not.

Madam President, I believe that the choice is easy. I believe the choice is clear. Are we going to look for human decency, human dignity and give the people that need help with healthcare the opportunity to participate in the human right that many in this circle believe healthcare is? This is an opportunity to make that choice and make it real but many of the propositions I hear surrounding that whole issue of healthcare wants to put a tax, whether it's on a carrier, whether it's on a policy, on the exercise of that human right and I don't believe that that's the appropriate way to do it. You shouldn't have to have a tax paid in order to participate in that human right, but we're gonna spend $75 million dollars on contracts that could go to healthcare for people across the state and deliver the promise of the Affordable Care Act, but we're not gonna choose that today and enable individuals their human right without a tax. To that end, I would urge my colleagues to think about
the contracts, to look at the contracts and to make the choice to put our neighbors, our constituents first and to put this money into the human services and healthcare that so many people in Connecticut need, deserve, and are entitled to. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Will you remark further on the resolution that is before us? Good evening, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I rise I guess to make a couple points about the increase in general, but more importantly, some of the things we've talked about in the last couple of weeks that to my knowledge, we've not taken action on yet. Probably the most simple of those and easy to understand had to do with the personal needs allowance. I remember when we were debating the personal needs allowance, I think it was a couple of weeks ago, and we talked about the fact that under the Malloy administration, that allowance had been reduced from $72 dollars a month to $60 dollars a month, and in fact, I think it was Senator Kelly that pointed out that the average life expectancy in a nursing home is something just north of two years, and to qualify for this type of a stipend for personal needs, Madam President, you had to have lost everything you own or thereabouts. No car, no house, no residence. You are on the State's good effort to maintain any of a roof and a meal and heat.
Madam President, when I across the line for SR 28, I see $430,000 dollars in the first year, $1.2 million dollars in the second year, that's 2020 and oddly enough, that's the number that it cost to fund the personal needs allowance. The personal needs allowance for people that are relegated to the last something less than three years on average of their life. And so it's not about whether we want to support State employees. It is, as Senator Fasano said earlier, about the choices that we make. Now, I heard a lot of people around this circle say we will revisit that issue, there will be another opportunity and tonight, tonight yet again we're taking up another series of labor agreements collectively and this time at the end of their agreement cycle of 2022, will total almost $91 million dollars, and yet we've not yet found the time to take up the personal needs allowance.

It really is amazing. When I heard Senator Fasano talk about Main Street and Capitol Avenue, it really is true. Every day that we put one of those other issues in the rearview mirror, we begin to focus on what's immediately before us and today, what is immediately before us is these union contracts. These are the choices that we have to make and when we continue to add millions, tens of millions, almost a hundred million over the next two years, these senior citizens are gonna be still in the rearview mirror for the last two and a half years of their lives.

Madam President, I don't think whether it's this agreement or any of the other agreements, we want any of the State employees to think we don’t appreciate the fact that they work on behalf of all the residents of Connecticut. As Senator Kelly
spoke about and I think others, many of our constituents have gone without a raise, any raise whatsoever for years and maybe the minimum wage will an effect on some of them, but I can assure you it's not gonna change life for many of them.

So, Madam President, I can't support this agreement. I can't support it because I believe we can't afford it. I can't support it because I believe it is gonna become a further basis for tax increases or reneging on other tax credits that we have previously built into the budget. I think under the Governor's proposal already this year, there was a retraction of the tax credit, very small amounts of Social Security and for other reasonable tax credits for elder people. Now, whether they find their way into the budget or not, I do not know, but it's clear that after the passage of these agreements, they will find their way into the budget and again, I think it is a balancing act. I think it's unfortunate that we continuously put off those other issues I think that are just as important. In fact, maybe even more important than some of the agreed to increases here which seem based on my read to be 3.5 percent plus steps plus other language, in some cases signing agreements in the $2000-dollar range, I can't remember whether this one has or not. So for tonight, Madam President, I am opposed to this agreement. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the Resolution that is before us? Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, kindly call the vote and the machine will be opened.
CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 28. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 28. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate SR 28. 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.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be locked. Mr. Clerk, kindly announce the tally.

CLERK:

On Senate Resolution No. 28.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Votes</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for adoption</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Page 66, Calendar number 563, Senate Resolution No. 30, RESOLUTION PROPOSING APPROVAL OF AN INTEREST
ARBITRATION AWARD BETWEEN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT AND THE CONNECTICUT STATE POLICE UNION (NP-1).

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President, I move the Committee's Favorable Report on this Resolution and I urge passage of the bill and seek, uh, urge passage of the Resolution and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President, unlike the other contracts that have been negotiated agreements between the parties, this is an arbitration award between the State of Connecticut and the Connecticut State Police Union NP1. The Connecticut State Police negotiated a contract and there are items that within that negotiation that they did not agree as a party. It went to arbitration and the arbitrator awarded the bargaining unit wages and other benefits. There are 913 employees covered by this arbitration award. This is fully 335 less than what had been required in the past to have a fully staffed State Police Department. Right now, in Fiscal Year 19, the contract total is $1,232,719 dollars. In Fiscal Year 20, $11,370,913 dollars, in Fiscal Year 21,
$16,363,958 dollars, in Fiscal Year 22 which is beyond the, this biennium budget, $21,018,182 dollars for an annualized amount of $23,379,836 dollars and I urge my colleagues to support those and we had a large discussion yesterday about the need to support our first responders and I would urge my colleagues to support our first responders, those who run in when others are running out, those who we call on the worst days of our lives, and those who have been willing to put their live on the line for us. The dollars of this contract will come from the Reserve for Salary adjustments. In the cases where there is additional money that is in the personal services line item of the Department of Energy, the Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection, some of those dollars will come through that mechanism. Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Will you remark? Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA:

Thank you, Madam President. Good evening. I rise for a question and then some comments on the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR FORMICA:
Thank you, Madam President. Through you to the good Senator, thank you for the summarizing the dollars that will be expended if this is passed, which by the way, represents a 24.8 percent increase over the next few years of this contract, significantly more than I believe PD's on a local level are getting. First responders on the local level are not seeing double digit percent raises over a period of the next few years, but Senator Osten had mentioned that this was $300 and I believe she said $15 or $35 short of the full complement of troopers that would be required. My question, through you, Madam President, would be the dollars that are here anticipated in cost, would that rise, would those dollars rise if the full complement of troopers are awarded? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President and just to go back to a couple of comments made by my colleague, quite frankly, there are municipal police officers who are not going into the ranks of State Police because they're making more at the municipal level than they would as State Police Officers. In regard to if there were more members of this bargaining unit, would there be additional dollars needed for this contract, that would be a yes but there are fully a third of the State Police Force that are ready to retire in the next four years so we could see a drop in State Troopers of 300 give or take should they choose to retire. Through you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA:

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. I appreciate the answers. So this number as verified by Senator Osten is for those in the count currently or when the contract was finalized or the arbiter finalized the award. There are a number, as I understand, or maybe I should ask, in the budget next year, I believe there were to be two new training opportunities to try to repopulate the ranks of the troopers. Would that be correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President and there could be one or two classes depending on the number of people that qualify over to even be included in the State Police rank depending on whether they pass the rather arduous training program and those dollars are included in the cost of this contract. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA:
Thank you, Madam President and thank you, Senator. I appreciate, I appreciate that clarification. So, Madam President, I would just again remark that this is the third of the contracts that we're gonna be discussing this evening. This is the third substantial raise. This particular contract is significantly more money than the others for the numbers, but the difficulty with this is we all know how hard and what a commitment and what the sacrifice is for these troopers, that they go out each and every day to put their lives on the line to protect us here in the State of Connecticut, and as a former first selectman of a resident trooper town, a resident trooper town that grew from just having two resident troopers decades ago to when I left having 23 peace officers working under the leadership of a really great trooper sergeant. I saw firsthand each and every day what these folks do so it's not that they're not deserving and again, let's just bring it back to where we believe or I certainly believe that it's a question of affordability. It's a question of can we give a 24.8 percent raise over the next few years when so many other sectors, so many other places in our budget can be, not perhaps better served, but served that aren't getting served at all. So, Madam President, I stand in opposition of the dollars represented in this contract. I certainly stand in support of the men and women who serve in this bargaining unit, but I find it very difficult to keep adding dollar after dollar after dollar with these collective bargaining agreements when we and many on Main Street are finding it very difficult to keep their employees moving, to keep business coming in through the door, to recognize and adhere to the pressures that are coming down from this building to
Main Street and people are having to struggle, businesses, residents. So, Madam President, for the third time I'm going to stand in opposition of the contract this evening. For the third time, I'm going to ask my colleagues to reject this contract just based on the fact that we heard from Secretary Barnes when he talked about ability to pay, all the reasons he thought we couldn’t in a previous contract, but I submit that still as an argument, the fact that we have a Financial Advisory Committee meeting next week where we're transferring shortfalls into the Social Security tax account because we can't, they can't afford it, $12 million dollars plus $2.8 million dollars. So, Madam President, thank you for the time. Again, I urge my colleagues to reject.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise for a couple of questions to the proponent of the resolution.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten, prepare yourself. Senator Winfield, please proceed.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. In discussion about this contract, there's been some concern about freedom of information and files associated with the
contract so I just want to ask a couple of questions for clarification. So in Article 9 of the contract, I believe there's a provision that concerns the access to the employee's personnel file that is part of this larger discussion and I guess the question is, is the intent therein to restrict access to the entirety of the file? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. The answer to that would be no.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

And so I guess a followup to that, Madam President, and through you, Madam President is then what does the restriction actually do? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. In the tentative agreement on personnel files, an employee's officer personnel file and internal
investigations with only a disposition of exonerated, unfounded or not sustained shall not be subject to the Connecticut Freedom of Information Act in order to not have an employee judged when he or she has not been found to be held culpable. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you, just for clarity, I think that means that everything else is still subject and for slightly further clarity, does that mean if a portion is substantiated and another portion isn’t, the portion that isn’t substantiated is also potentially disclosable? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Through you, Madam President. If a portion of an investigation is found to have held an employee culpable of an action, that would be FIO able. If a portion of an investigation is found to be exonerated, unfounded or not sustained, that would not be subject to the Connecticut Freedom of Information Act. Through you, Madam President.

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I think there are concerns that many people have hearing what we've learned about these police contracts. I also know that these kind of provisions exist in other contracts and I just wanted to pull out a little bit of the discussion about what we're actually doing here so I thank the good Senator for her answers. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further on the resolution that is before the Chamber? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I kind of felt left out not being involved in the last contract and I'm not gonna talk about the fact that CPI may be frozen with respect to TANF and the others, I'm not gonna talk about the fact that this contract once again crowds out social services, I'm not gonna talk about the fact that we are cutting aid to those who need it most when we approve these contracts. But I do want to talk about a few things in this bill that raises concerns with this resolution. Madam President, there are items in this contract that I think were best left to the legislature and let me just say what those are. In this contract under the State Police Union deal, certain personnel, official personnel folders will not be subject to FOI. That raises some concern as to the ability to look at
these files. FOI to me should not be subject to collective bargaining. That's a public policy issue and even if exonerated or unfounded or not sustained, they're not subject to FOI so those people who talk about transparency have to be concerned that the legislature's not weighing in on this issue. This has been raised by a number of organizations. I know folks down in the House, particularly on the other side of the aisle were very concerned over this issue. In addition, remove from an officer's file is any investigation when it's completed. Once again, transparency which we hear so much about in this building, particularly on the police side has been through collective bargaining taken out and people seem not to care. This is a public policy issue which is left up to us as legislators. Madam President, I would also point out for those who may not be all that familiar with this contract that a new Worker's Comp Committee has been created and this Worker's Comp Committee is made up of the State Police Union President or the designee, DESPP Director of Human Services, and the State Police Colonel. So now we've taken Worker's Comp and moved it to a whole different group of people. I would argue not totally objective from the issue for which they're gonna be a fact finder. Madam President, I believe that issue is in the domain and the control of the legislature, not one for collective bargaining.

Madam President, I underscore what Senator Formica talked about which is the men and women in our uniforms who protect us and I think Senator Osten also gave proper credit to those folks, but we have FOI concerns that truly are a balance of public interest, and we've taken those concerns and we've moved them out of our domain and into collective
bargaining. Now, I cannot profess whether this is the first time or not, but I can tell you, it's the first time I've seen it in a union contract that's come before us that FOI is now subject matter of collective bargaining. I don't think this goes to any of the criteria that I know of in statute so why would you do this? Why would you silence transparency? I don't know the answer to the question but what I do know is it doesn't seem to follow through what I hear in this Chamber. It doesn't seem to follow through in the judiciary bills that have come before us and the debate up here and downstairs, that we don't transparency and that we don't want information that should be revealed held in secret.

As I said, Madam President, at this point I'm not going to repeat all the issues relative to the finances because in this contract, there's something new and different, something that raises a red flag for a few in this circle who talked about transparency of the police. This is something that when you vote for it and if you vote for it, it would be difficult to reconcile that vote with past votes and perhaps even future votes. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Will you remark further on the contact, excuse me, on the resolution that is before us? Will you remark further on the resolution that is before the Chamber? If not, Mr. Clerk, please call for the vote and the machine will be opened.

CLERK:
An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution No 30. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 30. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 30. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 30. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 30. An 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, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Resolution No. 30.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for adoption</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:
Page 66, Calendar number 564, Senate Resolution No. 31, RESOLUTION PROPOSING APPROVAL OF A MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT JUDICIAL BRANCH AND THE UNION OF PROFESSIONAL JUDICIAL EMPLOYEES, AFT/AFT-CT, CONCERNING THE COUNSEL, LEGAL SERVICES JOB CLASSIFICATION.

THE CHAIR:

The distinguished Chair of the Appropriations Committee, Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Resolution and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The Resolution has been moved. Will you remark? Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Mr. President, this is an agreement between the Judicial Branch and the Judicial professional employees. This is a contract of seven employees. It has a Fiscal Year 19 cost of $20,374 dollars, $62,042 dollars, $119,601 dollars, $157,632 dollars in Fiscal year 22, and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution in order to provide wages for these workers and the dollar amounts from these wage increases will come from the Reserve for Salary Account. Thank you, Mr. President.
Thank you, Senator Osten. Will you remark further on the resolution? Will you remark further on the resolution? Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Good evening, good afternoon or good evening. Good evening, Mr. President, how are you?

THE CHAIR:

Evening, I think, yes, sir.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you. I rise for a few comments.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I rise just once again to reiterate the financial impact of seven employees on the State of Connecticut is $360,000 dollars over a period of three years. The increase of that contract represents a 20 percent increase, increases that I believe aren’t seen on Main Street, Connecticut, dollars that we're adding to our budget, dollars that we're adding to our liability, dollars we're adding to our pension liability, dollars we're adding to our fringe benefit liability of which we seek next week to meet next week in the Financial Advisory Committee to try
to switch money and rectify the shortfall that's coming as a result of these contracts. Job security, Mr. President, that could prohibit us from seeking to be more efficient as an operation and again, for the, I believe this is the fourth time that we're up here talking about double digit increases, benefits and increases that aren't seen on Main Street, Connecticut, benefits and increases that while they're to good people just don't come at a good time so, Mr. President, I urge rejection.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the resolution? Will you remark further? If not, the Clerk will call the roll on Senate Resolution 31.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution 31. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 31. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 31. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 31. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, would you please check the machine to make sure your votes are properly cast? If so, Mr. Clerk, will you call the tally.
Senate Resolution No. 31.

Total number voting 36
Necessary for adoption 19
Those voting Yea 19
Those voting Nay 17
Absent and not voting 0

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


Senator Osten.

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Mr. President, I move acceptance of this resolution and seek leave to summarize.

Please proceed, Senator.
SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Mr. President, this is a collective bargaining agreement. This resolution is a collective bargaining agreement between employees in the Plants Facility Engineer 1 classification, in the Connecticut Employees Union Independent NP2 bargaining unit. This agreement covers five fiscal years from July 1, 2017 through 2021. There are nine employees covered by this agreement. In Fiscal Year 19, a total of $21,097 dollars are associated with the cost for our current fiscal year. In Fiscal Year 20, $65,137 dollars are associated with the agreement. In Fiscal Year 21, $153,204 dollars are associated with the agreement. It's an annualized contract of $160,612 dollars and I urge my colleagues to support the men and women of this bargaining unit and the work that they do with wage increases. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, thank you, Senator Osten. I think if you just once again, make sure we have it on the record to move the resolution.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

I'm sorry, I'm just getting ahead of myself and I think this one will actually make it onto consent so just saying and I would move the resolution. Thank you very much, Mr. President. Keep me in line please.

THE CHAIR:

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Good evening, Mr. President. I rise for a few comments.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, sir. Again, for the fifth time this evening, I will be standing up in opposition to the contract again, not against the good people of the unit but of the time that is just not a good time to be adding nearly a 17 percent increase to these workers over the next few years. Part of the MOA, memorandum of understanding in this contract calls for a lump sum payment of $2000 thousand dollars per hour, job security which again means difficulty in terms of gaining efficiency in some of these departments and then, in FY 20, a 3.5 percent wage increase plus an annual increment or a top step increment which could be equivalent to 3.1 percent and then in FY 21, a 3.5 percent general wage increase with another annual increment or top step payment on top of the wages from the previous year. So the multiplication continues. Each and every year it gets more expensive. These employees overall will gain in three years an additional $26,000 dollars and change as a result of this contract.
So Mr. President, for the reasons that I talked about, the shortages that we're gonna address in the Financial Advisory Committee, the conversation about our ability to pay from former Secretary Barnes who spoke at a previous contract, certainly not this one, I don’t want to misrepresent, but a previous contract that we talked about earlier, but I still think his arguments are germane to the situation that we have at hand. I would just stand here and say the time is not right for this and that there are opportunities to go to work, there are opportunities for the state to move forward and these two just don’t blend together so we've been here. This is the fifth time this evening. I imagine we've got a couple more to go. I imagine that we're going to probably talk about those a little bit in the vein and perhaps end up passing them. I'm not sure that we would pass them on consent in spite of the good Senator's wishes. However, I do think that these things do need to be talked about because they do cost the State of Connecticut. Our taxpayers who fund these, our taxpayers who work hard on Main Street who I would submit, Mr. President, equally deserve double digit raises but unfortunately, are not able to sustain them given the economic conditions that we have, given the, given some of the policies that we're talking about this year that are going to be trickled down to Main Street, Connecticut that will only increase cost to do business and decrease available cash to be spent for residents here in the State of Connecticut and it's due in no small part to some of these contracts that we're seeing this evening that are just costing the taxpayer more. And again, just as a reiteration for the record, nearly $91 million dollars in new costs that we're going to be talking about; $91 million dollars that
I'm sure we could make the argument could be spent elsewhere. So thank you, Mr. President, for the opportunity to comment and I urge rejection of the resolution.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the resolution? Seeing none, Mr. Clerk, if you would please call the roll on Senate Resolution No. 32.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution 32. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 32. An immediate roll call in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 32. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 32. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, would you please check the machine to make sure your vote is properly cast and Mr. Clerk, if you would take the tally?

CLERK:

Senate Resolution No. 32.

Total number voting 36
Necessary for adoption 19
Those voting Yea 19
Those voting Nay 17
Absent and not voting 0

THE CHAIR:

The Resolution is adopted. [Gavel] Mr. Clerk, if you would call the next item.

CLERK:

Page 67, Calendar number 566, Senate Resolution No. 33, RESOLUTION PROPOSING APPROVAL OF A TENTATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT AND THE ADMINISTRATIVE AND RESIDUAL (P-5) BARGAINING UNIT. There is an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Mr. President, I move acceptance of the resolution and passage of said resolution and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much. This is an agreement between certain employees and various agencies in the administrative residual bargaining unit. It contains 64 employees covered by this agreement. It
has a cost estimate of $318,494 dollars in current fiscal year, in Fiscal Year 20, $471,922 dollars, in Fiscal Year 21, $981,610 dollars, annualized $1,046,052 dollars and I urge my colleagues to support this resolution. In addition, in reviewing the Financial Advisory Committee Agenda which is scheduled for June 6, while I certainly appreciate my colleague talking about the Financial Advisory Committee, I believe he left out certain things that explain what we're doing. Now the Financial Advisory Committee moves money from line items that have positive balances to line items that have negative balances and my colleague forgot to tell the circle that the Retiree Healthcare line item has a surplus because the Fiscal Year 19 budget was initially developing assuming a higher retiree population growth throughout the fiscal year than has been experienced. Additionally, the 2017 SEBAC agreement includes a higher retiree share for new retirees meaning that in our endeavor to look at what we're doing with state employees, we are looking at ways to lower the state share of the expense and that left a $16-million-dollar surplus in that line item to cover the deficiencies in the other line items. I point that out because that is true over each one of the agenda line items that are on our Financial Advisory Committee and I think that if you talk about one side of the ledger, you should talk about the other side of the ledger so the work that has been done through the State Employee Bargaining Agent Coalition and state employees there has been a significant decrease of state employee costs. In addition, we have talked a little bit about, we talk a little bit about the managerial pay plan and in talking with the Office of Fiscal Analysis I asked how many people are involved in the managerial pay plan now. Over the last few years
under the former governors, Governor Daniel Malloy, his administration, we saw a significant drop in the number of state employees that are in each department. That would include in the managerial pay plan and that right now today, there are 1484 managers in all of the Executive Branch and Legislative Branch funds. I think that's important to note, and Judicial, and I think that’s important to know because we have significantly slimmed down state government.

In addition to that, in the Appropriations Committee budget that passed the Appropriations Committee, unfortunately, on a party line vote, and I'm looking forward to my colleagues, in particular my colleague to the right, voting for the budget that comes out because it holds significantly true what we had in the bipartisan budget. And one of those things that we had in the bipartisan budget was a look at, was a look at the number of positions that we had and this year, we've been able to decrease the number of positions for state employees in the budget by about, by over 1000 positions and that has been done in order to show people that we are actually looking at ways to decrease state employee costs. Our state employees, right now the number of state employees are at the level of the 1960's so that shows a significant decrease in the number of state employees throughout state employment. That's certainly why our resident, our state troopers at around 900, I think it was 913 when the OFA analysis was done on the arbitrated award that we recently voted on. I want people to understand that we as a group working bipartisanly across the aisles, bicameraly between the House and the Senate have been looking at significant ways for us to decrease costs of state employees and I think that needs to
be said out loud. And I think that we also have to pay our employees. A decision has been made for us to have employees and we need to pay them. We have removed many of our services into the private sector and we have done that working together both again, bipartisanly and bicameraly and I think that the characterization that have happened on state employees today are a misnomer and are not showing people what good work these state employees do. The calls that I get now about state employees are, did you know I called the Department of Social Services and no one answered the phone in a timely fashion? That's because there's less people there, not because they don't want to talk to you. When they go to the Department of Motor Vehicles, and there's always a joke or two about the Department of Motor Vehicles, I think they're hard-working people that try to protect us each and every day and they're very busy. And they're very busy because there's less people there. They're about half of the number of employees over the last decade so as we look at this, I think we need to understand that and not mischaracterize these people as sort of scofflaws that are not doing good work and we shouldn't pay them for the work that they do. I think these are hardworking men and women who serve our state well. We have asked them to do more with less each and every year and they have stepped up to the plate to do that so now our managerial staff are down to 1484 and our line workers are now down to the level of the 1960's in state employment. I urge my colleagues to allow me to put this one contract on consent and work together to get this done and let's not play the, I don't wanna disrespect anybody's personal opinion on this, but I'm just gonna ask you to support the contract. Let's get this done. Let's work together and let's honor the people that
we ask to work for us. Thank you very much, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Will you remark? Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Good evening, Mr. President. Yes, I rise for a few remarks.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I first off would like to agree with the good Senator who indicated that the Senator to her right would be looking forward to vote for the contract and I think she forgot to say maybe two to her right, [laughter] but in all seriousness, Mr. President, again, I have no doubt that these employees work hard for the State of Connecticut. I have no doubt that we need to pay them. I have, as a member sitting around the circle here in small business, created jobs over the last three decades here in the State of Connecticut. We worked hard to get people on Main Street, to get themselves involved in the economic opportunities here in the State of Connecticut. Small business is the job creator of the economy in the entire United States of America. Specifically, we deal with Connecticut and small businesses, 80 percent of the jobs created are created by small business, not big
business. And the pressures that are being put on Main Street Connecticut by some of the policies that are coming out, some of the expenditures that are coming out of this assembly over the last period of time has put significant pressures on Main Street Connecticut. So I appreciate good employees and as I said during the first contract, the assets, the biggest asset that any small business has is its frontline employees and I'm sure that the people that work for the State of Connecticut provide a similar service. So that's not what this is about. This is about $27,687 dollars, which is the increase of 12 percent in this contract, that each employee would gain as a result of the next three years of working under this contract. And I would just simply argue that's not what people on Main Street Connecticut are getting; I'd probably argue they're not getting half of that and it's not because they're any better or worse of an employee for whomever they work for, it's just that they don't have this opportunity to sit around here and get voted on, nearly $91 million dollars in new costs to the State of Connecticut.

And while we may have less employees, certainly technology has offered us that opportunity, we should. While we have less employees, we should be looking at how we can create efficiency and effectiveness here in our government. We put pressure on our municipalities all the time. We put pressure each and every day on them and they are the ones who are efficient. They are the ones who work hard to try to keep their costs at a minimum and they are the ones that have had to find efficiencies certainly to do with personnel and I would argue that they're not seeing these types of double digit increases in government so while I appreciate the
good Senator's passion, I don't think I share her enthusiasm in voting for this contract and I would urge my colleagues to vote against this and if so, I would ask that when we vote, we vote by roll. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. A roll call vote will be ordered at the appropriate time. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on Senate Resolution 33? Seeing none, Mr. Clerk, if you would call the roll on Senate Resolution No. 33.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 33. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 33. An immediate roll call in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 33. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution 33. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution 33. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Resolution 33. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, would you please check the machine to make
sure your vote is properly cast and Mr. Clerk, if we will close the machine and take the tally?

CLERK:

Senate Resolution No. 33.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for adoption</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

The Resolution is adopted. [Gavel] Mr. Clerk, if you would call the next item.

CLERK:

Page 65, Calendar number 630, Senate Resolution No. 34, RESOLUTION PROPOSING APPROVAL OF A MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT OFFICE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD AND THE CONNECTICUT STATE EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION (CSEA-SEIU LOCAL 2001).

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report on the resolution and passage of the resolution and seek leave to summarize.
THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much. This is a memorandum of understanding, different than what we have been dealing with tonight. It is akin to the personal care attendant agreement that was passed in this body last year. It covers the period of July 1, 2017 through June 30, 2022 and applies to family childcare providers both licensed and unlicensed. It covers, the wages from this agreement will come out of the Care 4 Kids line item. There are 563 licensed and 640 unlicensed workers. In Fiscal Year 19 there is a dollar amount of $638,263 dollars, in Fiscal Year 20, $2,608,348 dollars, in Fiscal Year 21, $5,089,176 dollars, and in Fiscal Year 22, $8,037,824 dollars. This is out of the Care 4 Kids line item out of the Office of Early Childhood. This agreement has several components in it. There are 18,000 children that are provided childcare through family childcare providers. This is not referring to daycare facilities. This is, uh, the Care 4 Kids Program supports cost associated and in this all of these dollars are already appropriated and supported by both federal and state dollars. In total, the budget bill net appropriated $54.6 million dollars in FY 20 and $55.9 million dollars in FY 21. The federal share is anticipated, the total approximately $94.3 million dollars in FY 20 and FY 21 in the childcare development account. In addition, general funds in excess of $15 million dollars are expected to be carried forward into Fiscal Year 20. It is anticipated that sufficient funds will be available to support the costs
associated with the agreement from Fiscal Year 19 through 22 and I just need to correct for the record, as of April there are approximately 2914 members of the bargaining unit, 722 of whom are licensed and 2192 are unlicensed. There is a bonus incorporated into this contract. If a childcare provider gets national accreditation and if they have an associate's degree, there's an increase in pay and I urge my colleagues to support this agreement providing an increase for family childcare providers who take care of our children and much akin to the personal care attendants, allows us to make sure that children are placed in safe environments. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Will you remark further? Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good evening.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you. I rise for a question and a few comments on the proposal at hand.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.
SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, to the good Senator, the numbers that she read with regard to the amount of people in the bargaining unit called, I have it in front of me, 700 and something to, but they were licensed and unlicensed, 722 licensed and almost 200 unlicensed. Through you, Madam President, what is the difference between those two groups?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. It's 2192 are unlicensed and those are, those are childcare providers that are helping out with relatives in order to be subjected to the, so 2192 are unlicensed, those are taking care of relative's children in order to get those people back into the job market or go to college to increase their marketability. 722 are licensed providers and they take care of children with whom they are not related to and they require a license. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator for that answer. The licensed providers under this
contract get a little bit more than the unlicensed providers and that's because they work either freelance on their own or through an agency or organization. Would that be correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. They don’t work through an agency. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So if they don’t work through an agency, is it a small business that may have an opportunity to have a building or a room or something where people bring the children to like a daycare or something? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

This is not a daycare facility. This is family childcare providers. They take care of children within their home. They may segregate a section of
their home which is subjected to if they are licensed to unannounced reviews of the conditions within the home. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I think I just got confused but are the unlicensed, was that what you were just referring to or were you referring to the other group?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. The licensed childcare providers also take care of children within their homes up to 3. Their homes are subjected to review by staff from the Office of Early Childhood. Those that take care of children of relatives, could be a grandmother, could be a cousin, they're also taking care of children in their homes, but they're unlicensed. They can be subjected to review also but they're in a different category than the licensed and a daycare facility is different than that, having a separate structure, not someone's home and take care of, those are not considered in this particular contract. Through you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, Senator. So both licensed and unlicensed work in the homes and get paid the same way, they just get paid separate rates. I'm trying to understand the difference between the two groups and why the difference in rate. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. The different rates are as a result of a higher level of care. The Office of Early Childhood is actually encouraging more people to get involved in licensure as they believe that children should be taken care of by licensed providers; however, the unlicensed provide a network of people to care for people of whom they may be related to and allowing those to get care and allow their family members to get back into the workforce, to be taking additional training, to upgrade their skills through a variety of methodologies and gives us another pool of people to work with. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. So Office of Early Childhood provides the funding through their budget to pay for these, this bargaining unit. This bargaining unit is made up of family members of these children for whom they care and they, whether they're licensed or unlicensed, work sometimes out of their home or perhaps the parents of the people for whom they're caring for, maybe they go to their home and in that, in both cases, the licensed and unlicensed, those homes are inspected and in both cases, through you, Madam President, these are family members taking care of family members? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR Osten (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. They're not, only the unlicensed are related to the children, not the licensed workers. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. That was kind of where I was hoping we were gonna go and that seemed to be the difference but I didn’t, I didn’t get that. This contract also provides for home repair and that home repair would be for what purpose? Through you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President, and through you, the home repair would be to enhance the environment that the children are in. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So this bargaining unit is made up of grandparents, siblings, aunts, uncles that are, that are collective bargaining to take care of young children that they're related to, that they're trying to get to and the purpose of that through the Office of Early Childhood would be to make sure that their parents can get to work and otherwise, they would not. Would that be correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Through you, these, this memorandum of understanding different than the collective bargaining agreements that we
have had before us all night tonight and the arbitrated aware, is an agreement with the Office of Early Childhood under the Care 4 Kids Program to provide parents with an opportunity to get back into the work environment and allow them to be able to pay for or have the Care 4 Kids Program, a federal program, to allow them offset the cost of their child's care in a licensed or unlicensed provider and what that does, it's not just for work, it's also to allow someone to go a training program and get, and upgrade their skills. It allows someone to go to a college, a community college and allow them to move forward in life. It gives them a lot of opportunity and allows them stability and allows them to bring money home and if they were working at a local food establishment, they might not make enough money to work there and pay for daycare and this is allowing a safe environment for those children to be in and the parents to make some money to bring home and offset the cost of that childcare and gives them an ability to actually feel proud of where they are and what they're doing in life and make sure that their children are in safe environments. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. I appreciate that. My last question for the good Senator would be the Office of Early Childhood, I believe, was mentioned as the funding source. Is that funded through the Reserve for Salary Accounts or grants or the budget here in the State of
Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. As I said earlier this evening and I really appreciate working my colleague, the budget bill net appropriates $54.6 million dollars in Fiscal Year 20, $59.5 million dollars in Fiscal Year 21, under the Care 4 Kids, TANF, CCDF General Fund line item. This line item is in the Office of Early Childcare. It is not the Office of Early Childhood that is paying for that. There is a state portion and a federal portion. The federal portion is the climate change development fund and in addition, there are general funds in excess of $15 million dollars expected to be carried forward into Fiscal Year 20. It is anticipated that there are sufficient funds available to support the costs associated with this agreement from Fiscal Year 19 through Fiscal Year 20 in the appropriations that were made the Appropriations Committee budget that came out just about a month ago and it shows that line item. It's a combination of state and federal dollars. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator for that, showing an additional $16,373,611-dollar cost over the next few years of this contract and I just wanted to make sure on the record that was indeed in the agency budget. The good Senator did mention that it was in the Appropriations budget, but I haven't seen the next budget. We'll see where we come out with that, but I want to again thank you, Senator, for your answers. If I may just back up for a minute, Madam President. This is a federal program so there are multiple states throughout the country that handle this childcare in this way? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Yes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. Thank you for the opportunity to speak on this. Again, $16 million dollars, it would be nice if we saw what the offset was for the folks that are able to go to work and how that balances and whether that's a cost positive or a cost negative, but at this point, I thank you for the opportunity to speak and I urge rejection.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Will you remark further on the resolution that is before the Chamber? Good evening, Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I haven't talked about the contracts since you left, but since you’ve come back, let me refer my attention back to the contracts. [laughter]

THE CHAIR:

So delighted, Senator. [laughter]

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. You know, Madam President, as we go through these contracts, I keep hearing with every one that adds to the budget, that we have money for these contracts. I'm just wondering where that all is. I keep hearing we got plenty of money to do this and we got plenty of money to do that. I have to imagine that the budget that we're about to embark on maybe early next week probably won't have a tax increase at all, and no new revenue because we apparently have enough money to cover these contracts, and we certainly wouldn’t be adding to our budget if we needed more money so it seems to me, I'd be shocked if the budget that comes forward requires more revenue to balance since we're adding $100 million dollars, a little less than that, to our bottom line.
Madam President, we have now reached the $91-million-dollar level of new money to be added to the contract. We have now set a standard that in 2021, I'd say less than two years and the reason I say that is you have to start negotiations at least a year before, we have already set the precedent, we've already set the rail or the bar rather. Every contract is gonna mirror these contracts, 3.5 percent increase, step up when you sign, being paid while you're having lunch, changing policies, get rid of FOI for a number of these union issues so that employees' behavior now is not gonna be FOI able because apparently, that is all now collective bargaining. That has never been part of collective bargaining. Madam President, I still remain firm on the notion that if we are gonna do a budget in this Chamber that is not gonna have a CPI index for SAGA, it's not gonna have a CPI index for people on disability, it's not gonna have increase for CPI on social services, then I have to ask again, why do we continue down a path that puts the priority of peoples' health second? Puts the priority of those who need social help second? Why does it place those who are making good money, getting a strong pension, and the best healthcare in the country before those who can barely survive, literally, day to day? Madam President, as I mentioned as a precursor, we're talking about a cut of $9000 dollars to the blind, 1.5 to the disabled, $4 million dollars to TANF, $1 million dollars to SAGA. All this is coming at the expense of these contracts, make no mistake about it.

Madam President, I have shown this graft before that shows fringe going up at a greater rate than us putting money into social programs. Say that again. Our input and increase to social programs is dwarfed
by our fringe benefit increases over the same period of time. That speaks volumes for priority in this building, in this Chamber. Madam President, I haven't voted for any of these contracts and irrespective of Senator Osten's recent plea a few minutes ago, I probably will not support this contract as well and it's because we can't sit by and watch our not-for-profits go into disarray, bankruptcy, close up and close programs which is what they're doing. In fact, I believe ten group homes and day programs have closed in the last five years. Ten have closed in the last five years cause they can't afford it. That's not my Connecticut. That's not my vision. So, Madam President, I won't belabor this any longer than I already have. I'll just say I will not be supporting these contracts or this contract because we cannot substitute these contracts for the social welfare needs of our State of Connecticut. We cannot continue to raise the fixed costs and crowd out the social service costs. It's not right. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Will you remark further on the resolution that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further? Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the vote and the machine will be opened?

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 34. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Resolution No. 34. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution 34.
Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Resolution 34. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Resolution 34. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Resolution 34.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machines will be locked. Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally?

CLERK:

Senate Resolution No. 34.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for adoption</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease for a moment and I do want to announce the tally and the Resolution did become adopted. Thank you. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar page 9, Calendar 188, Senate Bill 960, go. On Calendar page 45, Calendar 551, Senate Bill 1130, go. On Calendar page 18, Calendar 320, Senate Bill 1062, go. On Calendar page 60, Calendar 151, Senate Bill 936, go. On Calendar page 63, Calendar 299, Senate Bill 957, go. On Calendar page 31, Calendar 440, Senate Bill 939, go. On Calendar page 21, Calendar 357, Senate Bill 1082, go. On Calendar page 15, Calendar 268, Senate Bill 869, go. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 9, Calendar 188, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 960, AN ACT CONCERNING THE PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY AUTHORITY'S REVIEW OF CLAIMS ARISING FROM CONTRACTS PREVIOUSLY APPROVED BY THE AUTHORITY, PERSONS INVOLVED IN THE TRANSPORTATION OF NATURAL GAS AND REQUIREMENTS FOR OPERATOR QUALIFICATION OF INDIVIDUALS PERFORMING COVERED TASKS ON A PIPELINE FACILITY, CALL BEFORE YOU DIG PROGRAM VIOLATIONS AND FINES AND THE PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY POLICIES ACT. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:

I think that wins the longest legislative title of the session. Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):
Good evening, Madam President. Pursuant to rule 15, I ask to be recused from the Chamber due to a potential conflict of interest and I would like to yield to Senator Kissel.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. The record will so note. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Good to see you this evening. Also pursuant to rule 15, I'd like to recuse myself to avoid any appearance of conflict of interest.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. The record will so note.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

I think there might be one more, but Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Lovely to see you up there tonight. 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. Sir, will you remark?

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 10278. I would ask that the Clerk please call the amendment?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO 10278, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the amendment, waive it's reading although I was gonna ask to have this large bill read, but I think I'll avoid that tonight, and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Please proceed to summarize, sir.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):
Thank you, Madam President. Before I begin, I just want to speak the Energy Committee this year cause I didn’t have a chance to say this earlier. Working with my co-chair, Representative Arconti, ranking member Senators Formica and Ferraro, I think we have worked together extremely well to come out with a bunch of bipartisan bills in the spirit of the Energy Committee, making them large and comprehensive so we have fewer bills, and this is one of those. This is a regulatory agency bill in several parts, there are five parts specifically. The first four parts relate to PURA, the Public Utilities Regulatory Agency and I'm going to go through them in much as detail as people want, to whatever extent I actually understand them.

The first part revolves around contract dispute. Apparently, there are certain situations where based on bids and requisitions of energy where there are minor changes to contracts, PURA is looking for an opportunity to resolve those disputes prior to going to superior court. This would allow that. The other section allows certain changes to their regulatory environment over natural gas and over large distributors and users of propane, not home propane or small propane, but most propane generators where they have large quantities.

The third part revolves around changing some of the call before you dig statutes. Currently, a lot of the generators sub out call before you dig services to third parties and in those cases, third parties tend to be liable, not the generators who call them out and this seeks to clarify that the generation company or the utility itself is responsible for those third-party providers that do call before you dig. The fourth part is changing and eliminating
the PURA regulations which were regulations that preceded all of the local programs, the in-state programs that we had that were enabled into the federal government. This is an attempt to eliminate that and clarify any confusion that our regulatory frame work is what oversees the sale of electrical requisitions. And the last part involves the Connecticut Green Bank, that part allows for the Connecticut Green Bank to work in conjunction with the US Department of Agriculture. They have a rural electrification program where they have funding for agencies just like the Green Bank so this changes some of the enabling statutes to that, to their bylaws so I think that's a short summary of it. I'm sure there are going to be some questions, but I'm waiting for anybody to ask them. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Needleman. Will you remark further on the bill before us? Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Good afternoon, good evening, Madam President. I rise for a few question and a comment for the proponent.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. First, I want to say that I couldn’t agree more with the good chairman of
the Energy Committee for his statement regarding the way that we all were able to work together and I credit him and chairman Arconti for their leadership in facilitating that great bipartisan conversation. As we all know, energy is not a partisan issue. It is an issue that affects each and every one of us. This is a technical bill in nature and does not elicit a lot of excitement but there are some questions that I have in regard to the PURA portion of the bill. One of the changes that PURA has been asking for and advocating for is the contract relook portion of this bill. So through you to Senator Needleman, Madam President, if a situation is ruled on and it comes back to PURA for a second look, does that in any way limit the opportunity to go to court should that be required? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President. No, it does not. It just gives, it's one attempt to resolve the dispute prior to going to court, but it in no way impinges on the complainant's right to go to court.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. I appreciate getting that on the record. Then in
section 10, line 343 of this bill, it talks about a new section that has to do with propane gas. Most of the rest of this deals with natural but propane, and it talks about on or before October 1, 2019, and every 1st of October thereafter, a person shall submit to the authority on a form prescribed information that the authority deems relevant about such person's propane distribution system that are subject so the distribution system that I know in my mind to be a propane distribution system is basically a truck. They would have to deliver propane so I know that in your opening statement you mentioned specific to larger you know propane distributors, but this doesn’t speak to size so through you, Madam President, to Senator Needleman, could you help me understand that a little better?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President. Having just spoken to the attorney for PURA a few moments ago, my understanding is this only has to do with large distribution facilities like big shopping center installations, not individual trucks that deliver propane, and it's a reporting requirement on a very small segment of the market, not homeowner distribution, small business distribution, just those large users and large distributors within the market.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica.
SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. It's just, and I appreciate that answer and I was hopeful that that was the answer that we were gonna get because the rest of the bill does talk about pipeline safety and I think to what you're referring is pipeline safety from large propane tanks situated in shopping centers that may serve multiple locations and PURA just wants to have the opportunity to look at that pipeline system there. Hopefully maybe next year we can talk a little bit about identifying the tank size that may be required for that so we can kind of make sure that it's separate from a small or large, or what is small or large but thank you for that answer. I don't know if you want to, you look like you want to add something to that but if not, we're good? We can go onto the next item. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

No.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Okay. All right. Great. Thank you very much for that, Senator Needleman and Thank you, Madam
President. At this time, I think this is some clarifications that PURA has been looking for, some clarifications that I think may be necessary and then with regard to the Green Bank, gives them an additional opportunity to provide what they need to provide for us so I urge support of this legislation. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of the amendment that is before the Chamber, please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I just rise briefly in support of the legislation and the reason I rise is not because of all the contents in the bill necessarily or the long title, but because
of the fact that as a former member of the committee myself and I know the Senator from the 1st district was also a long-time chair of the committee, that these are complicated issues and so I appreciate the work of Senator Needleman, Senator Formica, working together on these things in a bipartisan way. With Senator Needleman, being his first year taking on these complicated issues, he's really done a superb job with that and I know that they worked very, very well together in tackling some of these very difficult issues. When I first came in the legislature on the Energy Committee, I knew how to turn on and off a light and plug something in; that was about as much as I knew about energy policy and these are tough issues so I commend the chairs and the ranking members and the committee members for putting together a good bill along with others who have interest in to move our state forward. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff, thank you. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection, I'd ask that this be placed on a consent calendar. Never mind, we can't do that. There are two people out.

THE CHAIR:
Yes, our council are in agreement on that so with that, Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the vote and the machine will be opened?

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 960 as amended by Senate A. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 960 as amended by Senate A. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Bill 960 as amended by Senate A. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 960 as amended by Senate A. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 960 as amended by Senate A. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be locked. Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 960 as amended by Senate A.

<p>| | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for adoption</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:
The legislation is adopted. [Gavel] Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 45, Calendar number 551, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1130, AN ACT CONCERNING VARIOUS INITIATIVES AT THE UNIVERSITY OF CONNECTICUT. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Good evening, Madam President. It's good to see you. It's not that bad yet compared to the last few nights. Madam President, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

I will, Madam President, thank you. Madam President, over the last few years, this institution has passed several initiatives which seek to strengthen Connecticut's ability to compete in the new economy, the knowledge economy. We passed approximately three years ago Innovation and Entrepreneurship legislation. Senator Hartley and the Commerce Committee has led the effort regarding
continuing to grow bioscience in Connecticut and has been very successful in that regard. We passed earlier this year a bill on coding and computer science and we've also indicated our support to continue the Angel Investor tax credit. Those are just a few of the things that we've done here in Connecticut to support and build Connecticut's foothold in the world of innovation and entrepreneurship. Madam President, the knowledge economy, the technology economy, that's our future. Engineering, data analytics, machine learning, artificial intelligence, just a few of the areas that we hear about that have become part of our daily lexicon and in fact, right here in our Capital city that flowed from the innovation and entrepreneurship initiative that this body passed into law has come in insurance accelerator which is an initiative to take the ideas of startups, of people with ideas to support the insurance industry and build on those as the title of the organization implies, to accelerate those ideas into businesses that will support Hartford's and Connecticut's insurance industry. Prior to that, in fact Connecticut insurance companies right here in the city of Hartford would support accelerators, insurance accelerators in Silicon Valley in California would put executives on a plane to fly them out to Silicon Valley to hear pitches from startups in California. So imagine that. Here we are, insurance capital of the world, we still we think we are anyway and I believe we are, that our executives would have to fly to California to listen to pitches from these young companies and seeing if they could support those individual companies and the industry. Today we have an accelerator here in Hartford where it belongs so those executives don't have to go to those startups. Those startups come
to the executives. And in fact, just last week I had the honor to participate in unveiling the announcement to the Connecticut Children's Hospital Innovation Center which the president and the chief technology officer of Connecticut Children's, dynamic people coming from Colorado to Connecticut, leading the effort at that institution, and now they're setting up an innovation center, not only the employees, but doctors, nurses and others and technicians and clinicians at Connecticut Children's but to attract others from around the country, around the world to come to the Connecticut Children's facility to innovate for all, all for the betterment of children, children's diseases, birth defects. It is an amazing undertaking by Connecticut Children's. It will advance children's health. We're very proud that they're here.

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of LCO 10215. May he please call and I be permitted to summarize?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 10215, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara, please proceed to summarize.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):
Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The question is on adoption. Will you remark further?

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

I will. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, around the country wherever you see innovation and entrepreneurship flourishing, taking a foothold, turning economies around, you invariably see in the midst of that a research university. That is where activity is engendered. That is where activity is leading to the development of new companies and in fact, as I've said before, is a misnomer about small businesses are the job creators in this country. It's partially true. It's young companies that are the true job creators, who just happen to be small. It's young companies because as you understand the trajectory of a company's evolution, when they start they do the hiring, most hiring in the very beginning and then they plateau.

Connecticut has unfortunately some of the oldest companies chronologically in the northeast. Think about that for a moment. Some of the oldest companies when those companies are no longer hiring to the degree that they did at one time. We have the fewest startups as a percentage of our size in the northeast but around the country, whether it be in Boston, in New York, in San Francisco, in Denver, in Austin, Texas, in Nashville, Tennessee, in Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, there is one or more
research universities at the center of their revival.

The amendment before us seeks to support the University of Connecticut’s growing efforts with respect to innovation and entrepreneurship. This amendment and ultimately the bill was developed and written in collaboration with the University of Connecticut and they are fully supportive of the contents of this amendment. I'd like to thank President Susan Herbst, Gail Garber, Joanne Lombardo, Dave Stauber and Liz Keyes who all were an integral part of making this amendment come before us today. I'm also looking forward greatly to the incoming President Katsouleas who's a longtime advocate and participant in innovation and entrepreneurship himself and higher education.

Madam President, this amendment will support and encourage and the University of Connecticut will develop and maintain a program for faculty recruitment with an interest in innovation and entrepreneurship and in so doing, will promote economic development in key sectors in Connecticut. It will provide open source patents for those patents that may not be active today, but after ten years and after giving first right of refusal to the inventor to make those patents available to anyone who feels that they could utilize it to grow a company and hire here in Connecticut. The University will compare itself to leading universities around the country in innovation and entrepreneurship, developing a process to track that. It will develop an alumni mentor network, critical. Whenever you talk to universities around the country, those that have a strong alumni network to support innovation and entrepreneurship, this is
at center of their success and UConn will develop recommendations on how to strengthen their alumni network. They'll develop a central space on campus for students and faculty to go and identify with as to where entrepreneurs are, either are or would be entrepreneurs can learn from others and they will assist other universities. UConn will make recommendations on how it can assist other higher ed institutions in Connecticut to promote innovation and entrepreneurship. I think that is a critical part of growing this as part of our culture in this state.

Madam President, there are many more pieces to this amendment. The hour is late. I will limit my remarks at this point, but I hope the Chamber will support this amendment and ultimately the bill strongly to send the message and thank the University of Connecticut for embracing this and welcome our new president and advance and continuing to grow the presence of entrepreneurship on campus at the various campuses around the state and make UConn the leader of rebuilding our economy that I believe that institution needs to be and I hope it will assume that role in short order. Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of the amendment as presented the good chairman of the Finance Committee and I want to thank him for
working with the stakeholders that he outlined in his remarks. The original bill met with some resistance in the Finance Committee from our side of the aisle mainly because of a fiscal, I'd say fiscal heavyweight that was part of the bill and some dictatorial things which we didn't believe were necessary, but I think with Senator Fonfara working with all of the stakeholders in clearing it up, this is certainly something that we could support so I urge the Chamber's adoption of the amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the amendment? Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I just want to rise briefly in support of the bill as amended, uh, in support of the amendment as presented by Senator Fonfara and thank him for his work on this. Obviously, UConn is our flagship institution. It is an incredible investment for the State of Connecticut. The University of California at Berkley recently conducted a study in which they concluded every dollar that's invested in higher education, specifically public sector higher education results in $3 dollars to $4 dollars in return, somewhere between $3 dollars and $4 dollars in a return on that $1 dollar of investment so this is something that we are doing tonight I believe to strengthen our flagship university, not just at its main campus in Storrs but also, of course, the
Stamford campus which has an integral part of Fairfield's county economy and developing a 21st century work force.

I'm particularly thrilled, Madam President, that this amendment includes physical space on campus. UConn specifically will conduct a review of current and future spaces on its multiple campuses to serve as gathering places for student entrepreneurs. It's very important. It sends a signal what a university decides in its limited space to dedicate its rooms, its gathering spaces, where students are actually going to see and walk by when they're touring a campus, what professors and what campus visitors will notice as they make that visit to Storrs or Stamford or the many other UConn locations. So I thank Senator Fonfara and I urge my colleagues to support the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in strong support of the amendment and like the good chair of the Higher Education Committee, Senator Haskell, I would like to compliment our colleague, Senator Fonfara, for his good work on this legislation and the recognition that this bill and this amendment has of how critical the University of Connecticut is to the economic development in our state. UConn has been a tremendous partner in so many ways on economic development in our state. It's a critical resource.
It is what is giving us some of the most highly educated, best graduates here in the State of Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] Senator Flexer, let me just stop you. I'm glad that the Chamber has quieted down so that we can better hear the debate. Please proceed.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I believe that this legislation recognizes the role that UConn has in the economic future of our state. UConn has been a critical partner with so many companies in our state and obviously producing tremendous graduates in every area of study, and those graduates stay here in our state and they are starting new businesses. They are the innovators that are coming up and this legislation that's in front of us embraces that role and strengthens it and again, I'm so grateful to the leaders of the Finance Committee for working so diligently on this and I hope that my colleagues will support this legislation that will only bolster our great University. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Flexer. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the amendment before the Chamber? If not, let me try your minds. All those
in favor, please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, unless there is objection, I would ask that this bill be placed on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, ah, Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Nice try, Senator Fonfara. [laughter] Madam President, I do not have an issue with the underlying bill, but perhaps to make the underlying bill better, I would ask that the Clerk call LCO 10416.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:
LCO No. 10416, Senate Schedule B.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Madam President, I move the amendment and I request permission to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed to summarize, sir.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I have and many people have indicated that the salaries in UConn have grown considerably over the years and have really without any review by the legislative branch, these salaries continue to increase and that this does is very, very simple. It just says that when the salaries get over $200,000 dollars, that a notice before enacting that be sent to the Committee of Higher Ed so that the Higher Ed Committee can take notice of this and then proceed in any manner they wish to do it. Right now, it's not done that way before we give bulk money to UConn and the divide it up. In this way, with respect to the salaries, there's some notification to at least Higher Ed which is not really all that much a difficulty, to indicate that we've gone over $200,000 dollars and then Higher Ed can determine if they want to pull people in to get a handle of why it is that, what's going on because eventually, we are accountable to the State of Connecticut
constituency every time we fund UConn for the various things that they do. It's not that they need Higher Ed's approval, it's not that there's a public hearing on it. Whatever Higher Ed deems to do with it, it doesn't stop it from going in, it's just a matter of notice to the Higher Ed. Madam President, I don't think this is much of a push on the institution. I think it's clearly a transparent concept here and it keeps Higher Ed in the loop. Madam President, I look forward to adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Will you remark further on the amendment before the Chamber? Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise reluctantly to speak in opposition to the amendment offered by good friend, Senator Fasano. As well intentioned as I believe virtually all of his offerings are, the fact is that UConn like almost any business, even though it's an educational institution, is in a very competitive environment and attracting the best and brightest professors and faculty to the University requires that those salaries be commensurate with those that are in the range of a top 20 public university, which the University of Connecticut is and I've had conversations frankly with President Herbst in the past, with Gail Garber and others from the University regarding efforts to attract top flight professors to the University. It's very competitive. They're constantly stealing from each other because they don’t just come to teach. They
bring with them resources, their ability to attract research dollars and the team that they put together, this is very important in terms of not only research dollars which is critical to the mission of the University, but it also leads to attracting students to the University because when they know that those professors are here, they understand what work those professors are doing. It makes a difference in recruitment and enrollment of not only top flight faculty but students as well. That has made a big difference for the University in recent years and so for that, I would say, Madam President, I'd ask the Chamber to not accept this amendment, to allow the University to continue its mission to attract the best and brightest in faculty and in terms of students who come to our state and with respect to the underlying bill, to keep many of those folks here in the state, those students once they graduate. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Yes, Madam President. When the vote is taken, I'd ask that it be taken by roll.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. 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 bit of discussion and a question for the proponent of the amendment. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, please proceed, sir. Senator Fonfara, prepare yourself. Oh, I apologize. It is to the proponent of the amendment, Senator Fasano. Senator Fasano, prepare yourself. Please proceed, Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

All due respect to Senator Fonfara, I could have some questions for him as well but that'll come after. Thank you, Senator. In reading this amendment that you put forth, I think it to me, recognizes that you recognize the quality that Senator Fonfara talked about with regard to the educational system in the University of Connecticut. Through you, Madam President, this does not limit the dollars, but simply requests a report of those dollars? Through you, Madam President, would that be correct?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Senator Formica is correct. This does not limit or curtail any of the activity. Senator Fonfara makes an excellent point to have a competitive higher ed institution perhaps we have to reach those thresholds. It just says to
let us know when and if we do so that we can understand the reason for it and better understand it. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator for that answer and further down in lines 7 and 8, you talk about a report that would have to come back to the committee, the General Assembly having cognizance. The report would not go to the expenditure committee because of any concerns that may be to the level, but to the committee regarding higher education which would say to me that you're looking to quantify that the people that are coming in are serving an educational purpose at the University, not so much a dollar amount. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. That would be correct, Senator. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):
Thank you very much, Madam President. Thank you, Senator for your answers. I think that this is a reasonable addition to the bill and would allow for the opportunity just to give this Assembly a chance to take a look at what's happening one, at the cost of the personal services line with regard to the University of Connecticut who pretty much operate that personal services line through a block grant provided by the Committee on Appropriations and Finance and through the votes of this Assembly and so I think this is a reasonable amendment and would urge my colleagues' adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Will you remark on the amendment that is before Chamber? Will you remark on the amendment that is before Chamber? If not, a roll call vote has been requested. Mr. Clerk, please call the vote. The machine will be opened.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 10416. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 10416. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate, Senate Bill 1130, Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 10416. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate, Senate Bill 1130, Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 10416. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 10416. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.
THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be locked. Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1130, Senate Amendment B, LCO NO. 10416.

Total number voting 35
Necessary for adoption 18
Those voting Yea 12
Those voting Nay 23
Absent and not voting 1

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR FASANO (34th):

Thank you, Madam President. I have one more amendment before Senator Fonfara can make his motion which I would support. I would ask the Clerk to call LCO 10369.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 10369, Senate Schedule C.
Thank you, Madam President. Senator Fonfara is correct. We want to have top people there and although giving notice to higher ed made sense just in terms of notice, what this says is if, because we give bulk money to UConn, UConn determines how they wanna spend it. Madam President, if they gonna go up on the wages, we are responsible for the fringe, and I should say they are responsible for the fringe so they should know within the bulk money that they give them, just like everyone else, they should say here's our salaries plus our fringe. As I mention in here every time we do these union contracts, for which we did a whole bunch, fringe is about 96 percent of every dollar, 96 percent of every dollar. No business in the country has 96 percent of every dollar. That's the reason why we've been kind of harsh on the contracts and what this says is that in no event shall the state appropriate money for the general fund for the comptroller to pay the fringe. In other words, UConn, if you wanna pay these salaries and you wanna pay these increases, well
then UConn, you need to pay the fringe. And frankly, that's the way it should go. It should not come out of the general fund. If we want to get it out of the general fund, then let UConn out of the contract for SEBAC. What we're doing is we're saying UConn, you stay in the SEBAC agreement and we'll pick up the fringe and you make the salaries. So what we're doing is allowing UConn to use our credit card and we're the payer. That's not right, that's not fair. It's not fair to the constituency of the State of Connecticut so what this says is you do it the other way, and that would make UConn pay for the fringe. And there is a fiscal note on this I might add and usually we talk about fiscal notes, we talk about cost. This fiscal note is a saving of $53 million dollars annually so what we're talking about is a savings to the State of Connecticut from our general fund. Think of what we could with that money. We could choose charities. You could use that money for social services. You could use that money for education. You could use that money for municipalities. You could use that money for TANF. You could use that money for group homes. You could use that money for IDD folks. There's so many ways you could use that money and all we're saying to UConn pay the fringe that you promise in the contract and we should support this amendment. If you're not, then you support the notion that SEBAC should not apply to UConn cause you can't get it both ways cause we're paying that cost. Madam President, I look forward to adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber? Senator Fonfara.
SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Again, I rise in opposition to the amendment. Madam President, currently the State of Connecticut covers 100 percent of the salary and fringe of most other state agencies' employees, but with respect to higher education, the constituent units have to fully fund the salaries and fringe cost for most of the employees through student tuition fees, clinical research to patients and federal research dollars. UConn's state appropriation covers 57 percent of its employees leaving the university to have to pay the additional burden of 43 percent of salaries and fringes. If this amendment were adopted, I believe it would put about a $200-million-dollar cost onto students and their tuition which is already rising and difficult to meet as well as requiring the university to cut back severely on just about every aspect of operating that institution. I just think that this institution and the state in general understands the value of the University of Connecticut, not only to our economy but to so many families that send their children there, but in so many other ways that the university is a part of our fabric. I don't think that this amendment, as well intended as it might be, would be wise to adopt given the impact it would have on the university and on the State of Connecticut as a whole. Thank you, Madam President and when the vote is taken, I would ask that it be taken by roll call.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Roll call vote on the amendment has been requested. Will you remark
further on the amendment that is before the Chamber? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I just wanted to point out and I don’t think it will change Senator Fonfara's mind, but I think it's a $20-million-dollar cost to UConn but maybe that will have some influence on his vote. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber. Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, would you kindly call the vote and the machine will be opened.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment C, LCO No. 10369, Senate Bill 1130. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 1130, Senate Amendment C, LCO No. 10369. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Amendment C, LCO No. 10369. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment C, LCO No. 10369. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:
Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? Mr. Clerk, the machine has been closed. Would you please announce the tally?

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1130, Senate Amendment C, LCO NO. 10369.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for adoption</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Yes, Madam President, thank you and unless there is objection, I would ask that this bill be placed on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 18, Calendar numb Substitute for S.B. No. 1062, AN ACT AUTHORIZING MUNICIPAL CLIMATE CHANGE AND COASTAL RESILIENCY RESERVE FUNDS. There are amendments.
THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Good evening, Madam President. 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. The Clerk is in possession of a strike all amendment, LCO No. 7978. I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7978, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you. I move adoption of the amendment, waive its reading, and seek leave of the Chamber to summarize.
THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. With changes in sea level, storm patterns and weather, coastal communities have been working on resiliency plans. Certainly we all remember the effects of Hurricane Irene and Super Storm Sandy and the effects and the impacts that those storms have had on Connecticut communities. Certainly the damage around our coastline and shoreline communities was very significant and as a result, a lot of those coastal communities have been coming up with coastal resiliency plans. As towns seek to protect themselves financially, it really becomes vital that they have the security in place to respond in case of disaster. So this bill creates encouragement if you will for towns to establish a coastal resiliency reserve fund. It allows for investment flexibility of the fund and helps to address vulnerabilities, you know just another tool in the tool box if you will.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.
SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I won that flip with Senator Miner. Madam President, I think with respect to the underlying bill, I think there's a lot of logic to it in allowing a town to place certain monies and sort of self-insure, given the nature of Hurricane Irene, given the nature of Sandy, given the nature of the storm we had in October of last year. I think there's a lot of logic in that and I support the underlying bill. But in an effort perhaps, at least in my way of thinking, to make the bill a little bit better, I would ask to call an Amendment LCO 10434, Mr. Clerk.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 10434, Senate Schedule B.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.
Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, and why I say that the underlying bill before us talks about the resiliency fund and allowing towns to have it I think that is good. I had some other amendments that discuss whether or not that should be part of the bonding for grading purposes and I believe it should be part of the town finances so I won't be calling that one, but what this does is say I think we should put that money away, but that money should not be used to calculate the municipalities' ability to pay in collection with any collective bargaining labor agreement. In other words, we do allow a certain amount of reserve fund, not to be included as ability to pay. I think because this resiliency money is put away for a particular purpose, not to run government, but to self-ensure government against a storm of a degree of which would destroy the infrastructure, to allow it to be used for labor agreements would seem contrary to the process that we have and it would seem contrary to the real intent of this bill which as I suggest is well intended, and therefore I ask that it be excluded so that we can use it as constituents would want it to be used for, not for the ability to gain certain advantages in some contracts, but to be used for the purpose of restoring damage done to public facilities. So, Madam President, I put that forth to the circle. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber? Senator Cohen.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President and I thank my good colleague for his comments. Given that this is a new fund and we've certainly outlined the parameters by which this fund would be used within the bill, and should the governing body of a city or town choose to implement such a fund, I really believe at this point we shouldn't be micromanaging how the funds should be used or analyzed at this point, as we're discovering how these funds will really grow and change over time so with that, I would urge my colleagues to vote against this amendment.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in support of the amendment. I would ask the Chamber to consider the fact that it does look, it does appear to me that a lot of thought has gone into the underlying language. Section 1 actually lays out a very distinct process by which a town can make a decision to even develop the coastal climate change resiliency reserve fund. It's a mouthful. Madam President, it also goes into the process of how it makes a determination of how those funds can be invested. It can't be done by one person. It has to be agreed by the budget-making authority, the chief elected official, town treasurer I think is in here, so clearly there's been a lot of thought that has gone into the underlying language, but the last
section of the bill actually says that these dollars, at the very end, if the town decides to stop doing this, must be reserved for the purpose of retirement bonded indebtedness of such municipality and so I think what Senator Fasano's amendment is trying to point out, that in addition to those other important thoughts, we shouldn't be allowing a negotiation process and arbitration process to siphon some of the value of that fund for purpose of paying wages and benefits.

When this bill was before the committee, I had some concerns about the level of investment that's instructed in the bill. It appears to me that the more I read it, there are a number of precautions in here with regard to risk because it says shall, but it also say shall up to and so I would ask the Chamber to support the amendment, not because I think it attempts to try and divert any of the hard work and decisions that might be made by any town in developing this fund, but I think clearly this anticipates a significant amount of cash, taxpayer paid cash possibly bonding that would be accumulated in an effort to try and prepare a community for I think the issues that we heard during the hearing process and that the co-chair, Senator Cohen, points out tonight and so I, I've grown to accept what's in this bill and accept the intent for which it's been proposed. I would ask the Chamber to consider that this small amendment really does seek to preserve what I think the community is trying to do here and not run the risk of double counting the money. Thank you, Madam President.

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

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Madam President, I'd like to have a roll call vote on this amendment.

THE CHAIR:

A roll call vote will be ordered on the amendment. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President, for a second time on the amendment. I would just add that the reason why, if you were to take action to remove this from the purpose of being used for money available for labor agreements is a municipality cannot do that on their own so unless we put it into statute, visa vie this bill, you are not able as a town to make that decision. I would argue that's not micromanaging because micromanaging is for us to do something that a town could normally do. Unless we say by statute it is excluded, it is included irrespective of what a town feels and given the nature of the bill, which I think is spot on particularly for shoreline communities, that it's a novel idea for which I know a town in Senator's Cohen of representation are the ones who are pressing this forward, I think it's a great idea and I hope other towns follow, but I think to use it for the purpose of labor agreements is not accurate way of doing the funds, but more importantly, unless we intercede, we lose that opportunity. Thank you, Madam President.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the amendment? If not, Mr. Clerk, please call the vote and the machine will be opened.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 1062, Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 10434. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 10434. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 1062, Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 10434. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be locked. Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1062, Senate Amendment B, LCO NO. 10434.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>35</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for adoption</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] The amendment fails. Will you remark further on the bill that is before us. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

So close, Madam President. Madam President, I do rise to support the legislation that's before us. It does appear to me that this would be available to any community in the State of Connecticut. While the title clearly says coastal resiliency, I would argue that it also says climate change and reserve fund and it seems to me that there are communities throughout the state that may have for a long period of time identified areas that could be buffer zones, could be areas that maybe hold water for a certain period of time after very large rain events and it seems to me again, unless someone can correct me, things like land acquisition are clearly within the definition of this legislation and so for communities that may wanna use this as an opportunity to move money that has already been raised as I understand it, not specifically budgeted in a line item, then it seems to me that this could be another capital project, capital reserve fund that might accomplish those goals of trying to minimize damage perhaps both public and private by acquiring real estate, making capital improvements, that sort of thing. So I do rise in support of the bill. I thank the gentle lady for bringing it to us. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I want to thank my good ranking member for his comments in support of the bill. I also just want to mention I certainly have summarized the bill through the amendment that was brought forth, but I do wanna comment on something that Senator Fasano had mentioned in that a community within the 12th district was really the leader that brought about this legislation and that is the community of Branford with first selectman Jamie Cosgrove at the helm. It was because of their good planning and their own coastal resiliency efforts that the thought of this reserve fund came about and their RTN there in Branford did in fact vote to establish this fund. This legislation will give them some investment flexibility and hopefully encourage others not only on the coastline but as the good Senator mentioned, across the State of Connecticut become a little bit more prepared when it comes to climate change and resilience from storm surges and the like. So I commend Branford’s efforts and hope that others will take that same path forward across the State of Connecticut so I urge my colleagues in the circle to vote in favor of this legislation tonight.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):
Thank you, Madam President. Some questions for the proponent of the bill, please?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir. Senator Cohen, prepare yourself.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you very much. For legislative intent, I just wanted to be sure that this language was permissive. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President, yes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. And I'm reading that obviously it's with direction of the chief executive, but would it also require approval by the governing legislative body of the respective town? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President, yes, it would be. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President, yes, it would be. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. Now, the issuance of bond and reserve fund to be allocated in there, is there any direction of a preference of which way to go for each of these respective towns to utilize these funds to put into this resiliency and climate change fund? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President, if we are talking about investments in this fund as far as the percentage, if I understand my good colleague correctly, through this legislation up to 50 percent of the reserve can be invested in equities so it raises the cap slightly. There are safeguards in place, reporting mechanisms to ensure that the risk is well accounted for and the return is in fact there. I do know that a recent study revealed that, and I will just read from the Vanguard Group here, revealed that a 50/50 stock bond allocation resulted in an 8.4 percent average annual return as opposed to the 30 percent stock/70 percent bond allocation which resulted in an annual average return of 7.3 percent so it is a bit more aggressive, but obviously the annual return payoff is there and again, I would just reiterate that certainly the safeguards are in place and reporting mechanisms so that should the equity investments be failing at any point in time, they can reallocate those funds accordingly. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. I want to thank the proponent for the explanation and it does raise an additional question for me in regard to obviously it's permissive to allow the authorizing legislative bodies to make that funding determination, but it is a risk investment in any equities or even bond. What would
ever happen if there was a significant loss in this investment? Is the municipal required to meet a certain threshold level or do we allow it to be sitting at the dollar amount in case there is a catastrophic loss? Through you. Does it need to be made whole? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President and through you, while there's no specific dollar amount placed on this reserve fund so that would be up to the governing body of how much they wanted to place as a minimum, but certainly there is a cap on the investment and equities at 50 percent through this legislation. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President, but the question specifically is, if the fund and the investment suffered a catastrophic loss, would we leave it as is or is there a minimum threshold to meet to ensure the fund is viable? Through you, Madam President. Do we leave it alone?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.
SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, again, there is no specific threshold that's called out in the bill, but because there is a 50/50 presumably, there wouldn’t be a complete crash and so that the stock allocation, rather the bond allocation would still be in there at 50 percent which tend to be less risky and more stable.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So it would be safe to say there is no minimum of dollar volume for this fund regardless of whatever the return may be? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and through you, yes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):
Thank you. I want to thank the good Senator for this proposal and I do represent a coastal community and this is an innovative idea to allow us to be able to implement programs that will take care of our community and be less dependent on some of the FEMA funds as well as federal funding that may be short in coming and delayed in coming so I applaud this initiative and I urge support. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir Hwang. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? If not, Mr. Clerk, would you kindly call the vote and the machine will be opened?

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 1062 as amended by Senate A. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 1062 as amended by Senate A. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Bill 1062 as amended by Senate A.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be locked and Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1062 as amended by Senate A.
Total number voting 35
Necessary for adoption 18
Those voting Yea 35
Those voting Nay 0
Absent and not voting 1

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Page 60, Calendar number 151, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 936, AN ACT IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE OFFICE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Good evening, Madam President. It's getting very late in the evening. I'll be brief. This is our aircraft carrier bill for early childhood. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):
Yes, Madam President. The Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 9948. I would ask that the Clerk please call amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9948, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCORY (2ND):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, this amendment makes the following changes this bill: One, in sections 2 and 3 which under the bill allows foster children to have a 45-day grace period to comply with vaccines and the physical exam requirements to attend a daycare. The amendment adds to the definition of a foster child, a child which is placed by DCF with a relative or a caregiver. Part two amends section 4 of the bill which under the bill lists specific individuals must undergo comprehensive background check to provide childcare services. This amendment excludes from the requirement Care 4 Kids, provides who exclusively provides childcare to relatives that are not licensed by OEC. Section 3, I mean part 3, section 501 requires any applicants for position as head teacher or education consultant in a licensed childcare center or group childcare home to meet requirements and state regulations. This basically
aligns with current practices and keeps us in compliance and allows the OAC Commissioner to suspend or revoke approval for failure to follow state regulations. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. The question is on adoption of the amendment. Will you remark further on the amendment that's before the Chamber? Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in support of the amendment. I do have just a couple of statements to make and then a question for the good Chair. The amendment does in fact make some good improvements to protecting the children that will be interacting with our children and I think this is a good, a good piece of legislation to be brought before us to address concerns that had come out of, come out of the Office of Early Childhood. Madam President, through you to the good Chair, on line 76 of the amendment, there is reference to change in the number of months that it takes to qualify to be 3 years old and I'm just hoping that the good Chair might be able to explain that just for the purpose of legislative intent. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):
Oh, absolutely, Madam President. Madam President, section 502 allows any licensed childcare center or group childcare home to enroll a child who is up to four months younger than 3 years old, i.e. a child that's 32 months per support or suggestion by the parent or guardian and in agreement with the program director. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President, and I thank the Senator for his answer. So just for clarification, we're allowing a child who is not quite 3 years old yet to be considered a 3-year-old for the purpose of being enrolled in programs for a 3-year-old? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Yes, Through you, Madam President. Absolutely.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you very much, Madam President. that's all the questions I have. I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Berthel. 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. All in favor of the amendment's adoption, please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Absolutely. Well just a couple more things. Let's talk about what's in the underlying bill. It allows OEC to fine childcare centers and group childcare homes up to $5000 dollars for not giving 30-day notice prior to closing. It shortens the eligibility of the competitive school ratings program for grants from every five years to every three years. It removes the requirement that OEC conduct a true analysis of certain bachelor degree programs of early childhood education. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator McCrory.
SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Madam President, if there is no objection, I would ask that this bill be placed on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 63, Calendar number 299, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 967, AN ACT CONCERNING RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTION SERVICES REGARDING EMERGENCY MEDICATION. There is an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

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?

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Currently, there is no clear reference in the Connecticut General Statutes
related to the issue of administration of emergency psychiatric medications to criminal defendants committed to the facility of the Department of Mental health and Addicted Services. This bill would address this oversight by codifying existing practice of the administration of emergency medications when a patient engages in behavior that places himself or herself or others in immediate risk of harm which would constitute the psychiatric emergency.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Will you remark further on the bill that is before the Chamber? Good evening, Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I rise in support of this bill. We heard directly from the Department of Public Health and DMHAS how important this bill is for both the people within our care and for the workers who are caring for the people that are in this particular position. Most of the time, these patients are being brought to a facility to have a psychiatric evaluation and at times, they become agitated and they a risk to themselves and to the people who are caring for them. If anything is necessary to be provided to the patient without consent, it is short-term, short-acting, less than four hours, but they go through a whole process of trying to deescalate the patient. They have specific techniques that they use. They try to get consent. Some of these patients, again, are in an evaluation stage for competency to stand trial so there's always an issue as to whether you can
actually really provide consent. This is used very rarely, but it is something that will add an added measure of safety for both the patient or the person in care and the person who is responsible for that care.

This is used only after all other efforts are exhausted. This is not something that is done commonplace and it has been something that has come to us. We've talked about this in the past, but it is something that would really help situations that can become quite frankly violent and have very unfortunate outcomes so I support this legislation fully. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Madam President, if there is no objection, I would ask that the bill be placed on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 31, Calendar number 440, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 939, AN ACT CONCERNING PSYCHIATRIC COMMITMENT EVALUATIONS.

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:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This is a bill that came to the Judiciary Committee trying to deal with what is put forward as a shortage of psychiatrists in our state. The psychiatrists are in shortage because there are not enough who are willing to accept appointments to evaluate patients who are committed to hospitals so currently under the law, the evaluation necessary to make the commitments we're talking about require two evaluations from physicians. What this bill would do is reduce it in number to one and that would allow for these commitments to be made without making any significant change in the ability of the patient should they have an issue with the commitment to also avail themselves of a process that would allow them to challenge that commitment. It's a good bill and I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further on the bill before us? Good evening, Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Again, once again, great to see you albeit that it's 25 past 10:00 and I thought we would be home by now but I stand in support of the bill. I had some concerns regarding it when it was before us in Committee. I spoke to some folks from DMHAS, also had a chance this afternoon to have a very good conversation with Paul Kinerim, the chief probate court administrator. There is a cost associated with the second physician. It's also been explained to me that there needs to be some arm's length regarding this so it can't be someone associated within the network and as the networks grow larger, it's harder to find physicians that are not in immediate association to make this objective evaluation so with the constraints that are brought to bear in trying to get two, and it was also my understanding that it was only one person that has to be a psychologist, that the other one could be a general practitioner. I've heard that that second physician really doesn't really aid in the analysis and is somewhat superfluous, probably was made original part of the law sort of as a belt and suspenders kind of notion, but the concerns that I had originally have been assuaged and I would urge my colleagues to support this bill and move it along. Thank you very much, Madam President. At this time, I'd like to yield to Senator Somers.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Somers, do you accept the yield?

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes, thank you, I accept the yield. I would like to speak in favor of this bill. I know that there were some questions concerning why are we going from two evaluations to one and I just would like to reiterate what Senator Kissel and Senator Winfield had said which was originally we had an evaluation done by a psychiatrist and another attending physician, but that attending physician did not have the background in doing the psychiatric evaluation. Therefore, it is not only cost saving but it's more empowering for a probate court and as was so eloquently stated, our networks here in Connecticut are becoming larger and larger so find a psychiatrist for which we are very, have a large shortage of anyhow, it's becoming increasingly more difficult so having one person be able to evaluate a patient, who is clinically trained and takes this job very seriously, I would like to make sure that everyone in the circle understands that when someone does a psychiatric evaluation on a patient like this, it is you know to the tee, that take this very seriously. Making a commitment is something that is not done frequently and is done with the utmost care and concern when that decision is made. It provides an opportunity going forward for that patient to have a second evaluation at a later time by someone outside of the network and perhaps a different psychiatrist going forward so I fully support this legislation. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Somers. Will you remark further on the bill that is before us? Will you remark further? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, madam President and I have just a few comments with regard to this bill. My real concern is focusing on the individual who is being involuntarily committed. I can understand how we endeavor to streamline processes in the endless pursuit to save money and there is a positive fiscal note here where we're gonna save $260,000 dollars with this initiative. I also understand why the medical profession and hospitals may also look at this as beneficial because there might not be psychiatrists or physicians who are available to undertake this process, but that's not what an involuntary commitment is about.

An involuntary commitment is about allowing an individual, in most cases having either a mental or addictive issue, to be involuntarily committed to such care against their will. So this is a liberty issue. A liberty issue which under our frame of government must be protected at all costs because our rights cannot be abridged unless due process is afforded the individual. This bill has due process, or let me restate that. Current law has due process because you don't need just one physician or psychiatrist, but you need two and what we're gonna do is change that from two to one so there's an erosion of the due process that is afforded to individuals and I think that's very risky in a situation where a person is being involuntarily committed.
There's also a segment of this where we're going to then indemnify where we're not going to hold the psychiatrist liable if the decision was wrongfully done, the commitment so I see a process being put in place for all good reasons and I can understand how individuals would look at this bill and say that it's important to save the $260,000 dollars or there might be situations where we can't find someone, but to me, before government takes somebody's liberty away, government needs to do a little extra homework to endeavor a little harder to make sure that they dot all their I's, cross all their T's and if that costs a little extra money to preserve and protect an individual's rights and liberties then so be it. Our government shouldn't use economic efficiency to abridge our rights and while good intentioned, I don't think this bill adequately protects those due process rights both in the area of limiting the amount of physicians, you're not gonna have a concurrence between two, we're gonna streamline it to one, and the second part is with regards to the liability, absolving that liability in the event that one doctor doesn't do their due diligence and does abridge due process, you're not going to allow the person who's rights were taken away any recourse and I just think that that's a significant and substantial departure from the due process that is now afforded to individuals in an involuntary commitment and for that reason, Madam President, I would urge my colleagues to join me in voting down this bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I would just like to clarify a few points here. So if a client comes in and is evaluated by a psychiatrist, they have an attorney present with them throughout the process. If the client feels that the outcome is not appropriate, they have an ability to appeal it to the superior court and I think it's important to recognize that a psychiatrist who is doing this type of evaluation, as I said previously, they take this very seriously and they are qualified. Right now the current system is you have a psychiatrist, but you don’t necessarily have a qualified M.D. to back up so they're not doing a clinical evaluation so I think that's very different. Really in reality what we're having now is just one psychiatrist doing a clinical evaluation and they the ability to have an attorney present with them at all times. A decision can be appealed to the superior court should the attorney feel that the client was not provided adequate liberty, and the indemnity clause is actually deleted in the amendment, in the amended version so that has been taken out so I just wanted to make sure that that was clear. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):
Madam President, for the second time, with regard to appeals to superior court, it's not like the superior court will resolve that issue in a day or two. You're gonna have to file that if you've lost your liberty interest because the probate court made that determination and then you go to superior court and the court upholds that and you have further appellate rights. It's not uncommon that this could happen and last years before the issue is resolved, all the while the issue of liberty has been denied the individual through due process, through time because if they’ve been committed to the facility, that's where they are and so while these rights may be available, the liberty interest has already been taken away so that has to happen at the outset, it has to happen at the first hearing, and that's why I think you need the two medical providers to be present to make sure that the reports are proper and accurate. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Will you remark further on the bill that is before us? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you would call the vote. the machine will be opened.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 939. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 939. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 939. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote
has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 939. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 939. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 939.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Senate Bill 939.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for adoption</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Page 21, Calendar number 357, Senate Bill No. 1082, AN ACT CONCERNING THE CONSOLIDATION OF PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING POINTS. There are amendments.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Good evening, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:
Good evening, Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill and waive its reading.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam Chairwoman. Last night I made a comment to Senator Witkos and Senator Fonfara that I was pleased with the bill they put together which is a 21st century. The bill I'm about to present is probably the 16th or 17th century and that's what is and hopefully tonight will be the beginning of the process of changing that history of Connecticut. This is the PSAP bill, public safety answering points. Connecticut has about 100 still. Houston, Texas has one for the Houston region. Southern California has two for the California region. Some rural states have one for the state. We have towns that have several, 8, 10, 12. That means that's 12 dispatchers depending on how they fund it and so on.

The program is funded well. When you make a phone all, a penny or two of that goes into the fund and that's how the PSAP's are funded which is a good idea, but it's gotten out of whack and we have a very unusual situation in the Waterbury area. I'd like to defer to my colleague, Senator Hartley, to
briefly describe the situation in Waterbury. Senator, through you, please.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley, do you accept the yield?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes, good evening, Madam President and indeed I do and thank you to Senator Cassano. If it's appropriate, I would like to, Madam President, ask the Clerk who is in possession of an amendment that is LCO 10368, if he might call it and I be granted leave to summarize, madam.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 10368, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley, please proceed to summarize.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):
Yes, indeed. I first of all want to start off by thanking Senator Cassano for the yield, but more importantly thanking and recognizing his leadership which brought us to this point tonight and if it were not for his patience and persistence, quite frankly, we would not be at this point and as he may have mentioned, it is quite frankly a critical point with regard to the underlying amendment. So it was only a couple of days ago colleagues that we had some very compelling testimony on the floor regarding our first responders and recognizing the imminent dangers that they perform for us every day and so this particular proposal that's before us speaks to the conduit and how we reach those first responders and that is through, as Senator Cassano mentioned, our PSAP's, our public service answering points of which Connecticut has 105 and there are six that are regional. The regional model is something that's been recognized in its value in achieving efficiencies and consolidation and so the formula that deals with supplementing those regionals actually historically has been weighted by virtue of the number of towns and to Senator Cassano's point, we now have before us a model which now includes one of the largest cities in the State of Connecticut that does happen to be Waterbury that has joined in a consolidated effort with the northwestern regional PSAP bringing in over 100,000 residents into that regional PSAP district. The results of the formula which never really recognized this kind of a construct is that this particular PSAP is now in some grave financial situation and so the underlying amendment seeks to recognize that and to within a very time certain identify and deal with that. So, Madam President, simply what it does is to identify a very narrow PSAP that is a regional
one that has a population over 100,000 and to identify a change in the waiting which would recognize the population and the number of calls. However, it is very prescriptive recognizing the fact that this should not in any way affect the funding of any of the other PSAP's and so there is hold harmless language in there and it also talks about a date certain, that this change in the formula exists until May 1, 2020 or at such time that regulations are promulgated, whichever is sooner and that, Madam President, is the proposal that is before us. I wholeheartedly support it and once again, am grateful for Senator Cassano's leadership on this and with your indulgence, Madam President, I would request to yield to Senator Berthel.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hartley. Senator Berthel, will you remark?

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Yes, Madam President, I accept the yield. Thank you, Senator Hartley. Madam President, I rise in support of the amendment. I would also like to express my gratitude to Senator Cassano for the work that went in to putting this together. I think that what we're doing here tonight is the beginning of some very important evaluation and the opportunity to reexamine the manner in which as we continue to consolidate our services for the answering of 911 calls throughout Connecticut, that this will be the beginning of a very important discussion. It is addressing a fix as Senator Hartley has spoken to, but I think it does open dialogue up for a
communication throughout Connecticut to continue to improve what we're doing with respect to a very important part of the public safety, safety net because this is where the action actually begins so to speak. So again, I think Senator Cassano for your help and your support with this and I urge adoption. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the amendment that is now before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the amendment that is now before the Chamber? If not, oh, Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. To the Senator, through you, Madam President, I want to make sure that all other PSAP's in the state are secure in their funding including the small towns, to Senator Hartley, through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and thank you for your question, Senator Champagne. Yes, indeed, because I do want it to be recorded on the record. This in no way jeopardizes any of the funding for the regionals or the PSAP's right now. We have as you may be aware of had discussions with DSET and they have attested to that and there is further, Senator, language specifically indicating a hold harmless
that no PSAP should be decreased with regard to their calculated formula. Thank you. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hartley. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I just wanted to, I heard you say that originally and we're having a lot of PSAP's are concerned about losing money throughout the districts, especially the small towns. When this came to us in Planning and Development, I did like the point that you know instead of forcing this to regionalize, this gives incentives to regionalize so I am for the bill and even though I'm still nervous about the amendment, as long as the other PSAP's funds are not going to be touched, then I will support it. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Champagne. Will you remark further on the amendment that is now before the Chamber? Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Thank you, Madam President. Just a couple points here. As a first selectman, I was the first non-fire chief, ambulance chief that was ever allowed on the regional PSAP down in our area called Valley Shore, an extremely well run, fiscally prudently managed PSAP and we have been fighting the funding issue for the last ten years. The funding formula,
without going into much detail to bore my colleagues to death, included the number of towns, population, and the number of calls. There was a study done in 2014 that made very specific recommendations basically saying that the number of towns was not a relevant factor and the conclusion that was drawn was we should be basing this on population and number of calls with the idea of holding harmless some of the PSAP's that had a lot of towns that had very small populations. That bounced back and forth between DSET and OPM and DSET and OPM. The formula change never got enacted and in the interim period, a city merged into a small regional which really kind of blew up the holding funding formula. I support this amendment because I understand that northwest is in trouble and they need a solution today for a problem that’s been created as the result of funding formula that no longer works for the PSAP's as they are organized so I rise in support but I also want to encourage my colleagues and the state and DSET to come up with a final fix for this formula that makes sure everybody's treated fairly. The result of our being underfunded for as many years as we were unfunded was a lack of capital because the state has an incentive grant that they give the PSAP's, there's an additional 12 percent grant that the PSAP can match for capital improvements. So the more money the state gives you, the more money you give you for capital. Over 35 years of being underfunded, we were shortchanged on capital by a significant amount. That needs to be fixed because to maintain a PSAP that serves ten towns, we have to continually invest in our infrastructure. We have no backup staff, we have infrastructure that's aging and thanks to the good graces of this body and the legislature and the Governor, we received bond money to improve the
infrastructure, but if the formula's not fixed ten years from now, we're gonna be back right in the same position so I encourage my colleagues to make sure. Senator Cassano, thank you for the hard work, but we need to make sure that this gets fixed once and for all. We are the perfect example of towns working collaboratively together on a voluntary basis and we should all be rewarded the same way to make sure that we provide the emergency service necessary. We don't have police departments, we have resident troopers so as such, these are PSAP's for not police, they're fire and EMS and they provide vital service. They don't work promptly; people don't get there on time and people die so I encourage my colleagues to make sure that we get this fixed once and for all. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Will you remark further on the amendment that is now before the Chamber? Senator Anwar.

SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President. I stand in support of the amendment. I just want, and I've served as a mayor, and this is a step in the right direction to our efforts to have shared services within towns, between towns. Again, it's no secret we are essentially not sharing enough that we can. This is non-educational sharing that I'm talking about. There's truly opportunity within communities to be able to share some of the services and reduce their costs without compromising the quality. This has been shown, other states have done this and the data is pretty sound with respect to saving money and
also not compromising the quality so with that, the only word of caution is that if we are going to provide some of these incentives, we have to continue to remain committed as a state to be part of that, literally the critical nerve centers that are going to be part of saving lives. So if we move in this direction, the state cannot come back in a few years and say we don’t have the money and let's cut the resources from this aspect so we have to make sure that we, and I want to put this on the record by stating that we have to remain committed to this effort. It is pretty clear that we will save money in the towns and the municipalities will benefit from this so bills like this which have a track record in other parts of the country, do save money by shared services and are something that we should start to talk about more within the circle and so I support this amendment and hopefully the bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I just rise for a comment or two. As it relates to being a first selectman of the town of East Lyme and a resident trooper program and the importance of what we tried to do for a number of years regionalizing our dispatch with a number of surrounding towns and we found that some of the opportunities that held us back I don’t see addressed in this bill and I hope that Senator Needleman has got us on the right track and that we really need to come up with a solution
so I look to Senator Cassano and the leaders of the Public Safety and Planning and Development Committee to come up with something that really addresses those situations that stop these things from happening and in a lot of ways, that has to do with labor contracts and there has to be a way where they come to the table and each town can talk about the best way to move forward in combining labor contracts, whether it’s the best of the best and put it forward and move it, move it down the road. I think that would be helpful. The rest of this stuff that may be specific to a certain PSAP, but regionalization is not gonna occur in Connecticut until we face that reality and we have to come forward and deal with it. It's an easy fix. Nobody loses, but it just has been stopping and that's what stymied the efforts that I led during the seven years I was first selectman. We had everything else lined up, but we couldn’t get that one over the line and so Senator Needleman talks about Valley, there are a number of opportunities, we should’ve regionalized 24 towns in southeastern Connecticut and it should’ve been the low-hanging fruit so I will support this amendment which will become the bill, but I really think that if we're gonna solve this problem, one, we can't mandate what small towns do but we have to open doors to allow opportunities so that we can create solutions that will make it work. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):
Thank you, Madam President and I thank each of the Senators for their comments, particularly Senator Formica for your comments which lead to my final comments. We have recognized that there is a lot of work to do. As I said earlier, we do have a mess and so we put in a cutoff date of May 1 and we did that for a reason. I'm asking through our committee which has cognizance, the committee will after this session is over begin a process of reviewing this entire situation. There are national leaders that are good at organizing some of these PSAP's. There are many right in our state that know how to do this and will be glad to do this. There are obstacles to overcome. Every fire station, every fire department, police department, volunteer department wants to have "their own." We can't afford to fund that and we need to look at those kind of changes and so planning and development will take on the charge of trying to find a feasible economically sensible doable PSAP system for the State of Connecticut and so that's a goal and we will start shortly and move forward in this area because it must be done. I can tell you I never thought it could happen in a place like Manchester, Connecticut. I have a -- in Manchester we have a paid fire department. We also have an Ace Utilities Fire Department. We have an ambulance system with its own system. We have the police department. I forgot the fifth one but they are all now at Manchester Police Station. One dispatch that works well. It worked out both with union and non-union and so it can work and we've seen across the country where it does work so I would urge support of the amendment. If the amendment passes, then, Madam Chair, that would be the bill so I would urge passage of the amendment.
THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber? 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. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 15, Calendar number 268, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 869, AN ACT CONCERNING RECOMMENDATIONS BY THE CONNECTICUT AIRPORT AUTHORITY REGARDING NONBUDGETED EXPENDITURES, THE CONNECTICUT AIRPORT AND AVIATION ACCOUNT AND THE SECURITY EXEMPTION UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:
Good evening, Senator Leone.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):

Good evening, Madam President. It's good to be here and a pleasure to see you tonight. Thank you. 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, sir?

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. What we have before us here today is the Connecticut Airport Authority Agency's requests for changes for this year. They are a few things that we talked about in the Transportation Committee and as a result, we've made a few changes ourselves and I do have an amendment so Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of LCO amendment 10231. I would ask that he call the amendment, please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 10231, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Leone.
SENATOR LEONE (27TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the amendment and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):

Thank you, Madam President. What we have here, this is a strike all amendment which will then become the bill. It has three sections. Again, this is the agency's request. Section 1 is to make a change for making authorizations by the executive director for non-budgeted expenditures from a change of $500,000 dollars to $1 million dollars and that would be if such airport or equipment of the airport is damaged as the result of a natural disaster or incurs a substantial casualty loss. So it's really for an emergency situation that could happen at a moment's notice and as many people know, running an airport where a calamity could happen, the cost could be quite significant and that is the reason for that request.

Section 2 of the amendment makes a change from any expenditures from the Connecticut Airport and Aviation account, that monies in the account should be expended by the executive director of the Connecticut Airport Authority instead of the Commissioner of Transportation for the purpose of airport and aviation related sections. And then finally, section 3 has a change to a section in regard to FOI. Currently, respondents to any
requests for proposals or bid solicitation are issued by a public agency, but at the same time, we wanted to make sure that responses by a public agency to any request for proposal or bid solicitation issued by a private entity also be included and that means, Madam President, is if the agency, CAA, were to respond to a bid with a private entity, that they wouldn’t want to disclose information that could put them at a competitive disadvantage until such time the negotiation is complete and based on that, that was something that the committee felt we were comfortable with and those are the three main sections of the bill that again lays out the reason for these changes and the amendment would then become the bill so I would urge support. And I also want to thank the members of the Transportation Committee and my ranking member, Senator Martin, for assisting along with the co-chairs and ranking down in the House. This has been a good team effort and I just want to say thank you to them. With that, I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Through you, Senator Leone. Will you remark further? Good evening, Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Good evening, Madam President. I just rise to support the amendment and the underlying bill. I had a good conversation with the Connecticut Airport Authority representative and these changes are good for everyone so thank you.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Martin. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber? 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. Will you remark further on the bill that is before us as amended? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I do appreciate and concur with the bill that's before us but I would ask the Clerk to call LCO 7731.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7331, Senate Schedule B.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):
Madam President, I would move the amendment and request permission to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Madam President, basically all this does is talk about that the director who may serve under Connecticut general statutes 15120bb cannot be one who is serving on the Chamber of Commerce at the same time. There is sort of in our view a conflict of crisis to serve on the CAA and serve as a Chamber of Commerce individual. Certainly there's a lot of people that want to serve on this board and holding that double duty one could argue could end up being a conflict. Madam President, I think there's currently perhaps with this amendment if it passes is an issue that has been raised. It is a concern and what this amendment would to assure that from this point forward that would never be the case again with respect to the CAA. It is an issue that I think makes sense given the fact that in transportation and business, you really don't want somebody having two hats at the same time and arguably not looking at things as objectively as they should. So, Madam President, this would be going forward, not going past, and I think this would make a stronger more effective board and I hopefully can see this get passed.

THE CHAIR:
Thank you, Senator Fasano. Will you remark further on the amendment before the Chamber? Senator Leone. Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Sorry, Madam President, very quick question for Senator Fasano.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

When you say the Chamber of Commerce, are we talking about the Chamber within the region of the airport or a statewide chamber or can you be a member of the local Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It would be for the local Chambers.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Will you remark further? Senate Leone.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):
Thank you, Madam President and I want to thank Senator Fasano for his questions or the amendment and the point of view, but at this time, Madam President, I would ask that we do not support this amendment from the standpoint that currently, anyone who is serving on the board, current law states that any directors that may engage in private employment or in a profession or business subject to any applicable laws, rules or regulations of the state or federal government regarding official ethics or conflict of interest already exist so if there is any kind of conflict, if someone is acting in bad faith, I believe current legislation covers that situation. If there's anything more than that, then I'm sure it would come to light either through that process or when the state auditors do their annual audit of the agency and then that also would come to light.

I guess a second comment would be that maybe serving on the Chamber of Commerce where some may think it's a conflict, at the same time, it's also something that could help the Chamber because airports are very critical to the business success and the economic vitality of the state, and so that goes hand-in-hand with promoting what the Chambers are all about, providing business and economic opportunity so as long as it's done in an ethical and lawful way, I believe there does exist symbiotic relationship that could be a positive one and so it's for those reasons that I would, I would ask for not passing of the proposed amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Leone. Will you remark further? Senator Fasano.
SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Many of my amendments are met with some gratitude and then a but not liking them at the end so I'm getting used to the pattern, but with that in mind, I would ask for roll call vote when it is ordered. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. A roll call has been requested and that will occur. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, 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 Amendment B, LCO No. 7731. Senate Bill 869, Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 7731. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 7731, Senate Bill 869. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 869, Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 7731. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? Would the Clerk please announce the tally and I would encourage the Senators to please stay close to the Chamber because we will have a vote on
this legislation and then on the Consent Calendar.
Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 869, Senate Amendment B, LCO No. 7731.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Total number voting</th>
<th>36</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for adoption</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:


SENATOR LEONE (27TH):

Thank you, Madam President. As such, now that this is the bill, I would ask with no further objections 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, if the Clerk can now call the items on our first Consent Calendar followed by a vote, please?

THE CHAIR:
Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Consent Calendar No. 1: Page 15, Calendar No. 268, Senate Bill 869, page 21, Calendar 357, Senate Bill 1082, page 45, Calendar 551, Senate Bill 1130, page 60, Calendar 151, Senate Bill 936, and page 63, Calendar 299, Senate Bill 967. 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 on Consent Calendar No. 1. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar No. 1.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be locked. Mr. Clerk, kindly announce the tally, please.

CLERK:

Consent Calendar No. 1.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Total number voting</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Necessary for adoption</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Yea</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Those voting Nay</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Absent and not voting</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] The Consent Calendar is adopted. The Senate will stand at ease for a moment before we have points of personal privilege. Senator Duff.
SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, that concludes our business for today. There will be an immediate Senate Democratic caucus following adjournment in our caucus room. We would ask all members to please very quickly come to the caucus room. Also we will not be meeting tomorrow for session and we will be meeting at 10 o'clock for a Senate Democratic caucus on Monday and 11:30 session on Monday as well. We wish everybody a good weekend. I'd like to yield to Senator Witkos.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Senate Republicans will have an immediate caucus upon adjournment and for journal notation, Senator Logan missed votes today due to legislative business back in the district.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Once again, just reiterating, an immediate Senate Democratic caucus in the caucus room and with that, Madam President, I move that we adjourn subject to the Call of the Chair.

THE CHAIR:
We are adjourned. Go forth and govern.

On motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 11:18 o'clock p.m. adjourned subject to the Call of the Chair.