CHAIRPERSON: Representative Joe Verrengia

SENATORS: Osten, Hwang Champagne, Winfield

REPRESENTATIVES: Paolillo, Sredzinski, Allie-Brennan, Barry, Dauphinais, Ferrero, Fishbein, Fusco, Genga, Hall, Hayes, Morin, Serra, Smith, Simmons, Vail

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Welcome to Thursday, March 5th's Public Safety and Security Meeting. We have a pretty long sign-up list. We are gonna go back and forth. We are gonna reserve the first hour for public officials, legislators and agency heads followed by back and forth from the public. We are going to limit the comments to three minutes. Anyone who goes over the minutes will hear the alarm from our Clerks and before I go any further, there will be an announcement, quick announcement from our Clerk.

CLERK: In the interest of safety I would ask that you to note the location of and access to the exits of this hearing room. The two doors through which you entered the room are the emergency exits and are marked with exit signs. In the event of please walk quickly to the nearest exit. After exiting the room go straight and exit the building by the main entrance or follow the exit signs to one of the other exits. Please quickly exit the building and follow any instructions from the Capital Police. Do

not delay and do not return unless and until you are advised that it is safe to do so. In the event of a lockdown announcement please remain in the Hearing Room, stay away from the exit doors and seek concealment behind desks and chairs until an "All Clear" announcement is heard.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Thank you for that announcement. So go right to the list, first up is Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH): Good Afternoon Senator it is good to see you. I miss our time on the Judiciary Committee together. Chairman Bradley, Chairman Verrengia, Rankling Members Hwang and Sredzinski. I am State Senator John Kissel serving the fabulous people of Enfield, Somers, Suffield, Windsor, Windsor Locks, East Granby, and Granby. I am here on behalf of, first a thank you for raising House Bill 5319 AN ACT EXEMPTING VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANIES AND DEPARTMENTS AND VOLUNTEER AMBULANCE SERVICES AND COMPANIES FROM THE FEE FOR A CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS CHECK.

And a couple of housekeeping points before I turn it over to Chief Provencher. First of all, Chairman Verrengia it is my understanding you are not going to seek reelection next year and I just want to let you know that it has always been a distinct pleasure serving with you here in the legislature and I wish you all the very best in the future.

Second just by way of background, I represent seven town in North Central Connecticut the largest of which is Enfield and Enfield is unique in that it has five different fire districts. I am here with Chief Earl Provencher, he is the Fire Chief of the North Thompsonville Fire District and I am going to

turn it over to him because he raised the issue to me regarding the cost associated with criminal history background checks especially for departments such as his which are primarily staffed by volunteers. Chief.

CHIEF PROVENCHER: Good Afternoon.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Excuse me, Chief if you could just hit the button for the mic. Thank you.

CHIEF PROVENCHER: Good afternoon Co-Chairs, Co-Vice Chairs and members of the Public Safety and Security Committee. My name is Earl Provencher and I am the Fire Chief of the North Thompsonville Fire Department in Enfield. I am here today to ask your support of House Bill 5319 AN ACT EXEMPTING VOLUNTEER FIRE COMPANIES AND DEPARTMENTS AND VOLUNTEER AMBULANCE SERVICES AND COMPANIES FROM THE FEE FOR A CRIMINAL HISTORY RECORDS CHECK.

I ask you to imagine this, you leave for work either a full-time job or here at the LOB. An hour or so later you receive a phone call from your neighbor frantically yelling "You have to come home right away your house is on fire". And so starts the beginning of one of the worst days of your life. As you get home you see your home surrounded by the fire apparatus and the firefighters. It doesn't appear that bad, so you go up to an individual, usually a white coat, very similar to me and you learn is the Incident Commander. You identify yourself and ask the Incident Commander what happened and he says it looks like someone left food on the stove and left the stove on and the cabinets and stove were on fire. You see a bunch of firefighters in the house and you ask to go inside to see. The Incident Commander says, "I'm sorry

right now you must stay out for your safety as the carbon monoxide levels are too high", so you comply, but nonetheless you are thinking, I left amongst other things seven hundred dollars on the counter this morning which is supposed to go to my son at college this weekend. I just hope it is alright.

After about twenty minutes the Incident Commander comes up to you and says the house is clear now we have checked it with meters, I will be glad to show you exactly what happened. As you enter the house you are devastated by the fire and smoke damage destroying the stove, cabinets and the area around them. Then you think of the seven hundred dollars on the counter so you look over and there it is just where you left it.

Now I just ask you to rewind to the point where the Incident Commander tells you, "I'll bring you inside" and you go into the house with the same results, the only difference is when you look on the counter the seven hundred dollars is gone. You mention it to the Incident Commander and ask if they could have moved the money. The Incident Commander says, no and "are you sure you left it there"? You tell me you're positive if you left it there. At this point the Incident Commander brings a police officer in and the story is told once again. So now you're thinking what kind of people are on this fire department. They must be thieves. As the police investigation continues the names of all the people who are taken and as also routine the police officer runs criminal history check on these individuals. Surprisingly two members of the fire department are convicted felons, believe it or not for burglary and breaking and entering. When the police office tells the fire chief this it is a surprise to him and the

chief says that he usually tries to get a background check on new fire fighters but these gentlemen looked so clean-cut. And really he didn't have the time, you didn't want to pay to get the background checks done as the budget is so tight. So they slipped on the preemployment background check and the police officer ends up with an arrest and the fire department ends up with a wealth of bad press. So this is fictious and I'll cut to the chase. I hear my alarm.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Just to let you know it's not a fire alarm [Laughter]. The alarm though, that's correct.

CHIEF PROVENCHER: But I always got criminal background checks done through the Department of Public Safety and a couple of years ago when they enacted new laws that brought fees in, I had a call, a phone call from a staff member who asked if we were part of the town, a municipality and I said yeah, we are a municipal agency within the town and said we are a fire district, he basically said we would have to start paying the fee. So, the towns around me get those checks basically for free because they are town under the town government. So in order to not pay the fees I'm asking you here, asking your support in moving House Bill 5319 forward to not only level the playing field for all fire departments but also help make sure the situation that I described prior are much less likely to become a reality. Thank you for your time and consideration and everything you do for this State.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Thank you.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH): And if I could just chime in, I failed to ask the support of the esteemed, all the members of Public Safety and Security Committee and I also want to acknowledge Representative Hall who also represents about half of the Town of Enfield and so thank you all very, very much.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Thank you. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you for the indulgence on the time, I know you had shared that earlier. But that being said, thank you Senator Kissel for raising this Bill along with other colleagues and I think the most critical part, if you could clarify for me, in reading the testimony it seems to be some discrepancy in regards to the requirement of the fee or the waiver of the fee. Could you give any explanation as to why there is a discrepancy and why we are charging additional fees for our volunteer fire departments when they are out there doing the work on behalf of the community on a volunteer basis?

CHIEF PROVENCHER: I appreciate that question, Senator. I actually think it is misinterpretation of that Statue when it was brought in. I don't believe that anybody put that in place so that certain fire departments got charged and certain other one didn't. So I believe that was the misunderstanding but it is an interpretation down at the Department of Public Safety and I was basically was hit with, the "ya don't get 'em for free anymore" and it just, so again I don't know why some would and some wouldn't but it doesn't make sense.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH): And Senator I would be happy to do some more research on that. It might be because in Enfield the fire districts are also

specific taxing districts in and of themselves so it is not as if they directly get funding from the municipality so it could be that kind of legalistic glitch that has caused this distinction. It is not a distinction because one department has primarily volunteers and another doesn't. This seems to be across the board for fire districts that are taxing districts in and of themselves.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): Thank you, Senator Kissel and Chief, I think the town is very lucky to have the likes of Senator Kissel as the Ranking Member of the Judiciary to be able to assess and do some research and get you some answers but I also know that you've got great activists in Representative Hall so I will defer the rest of my time and thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for all your work here and all your men and women as well.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Representative Hall.

REP. HALL (7TH): So welcome, Senator Kissel and Chief Provencher. I just want to do a quick commentary. Earl as I most fondly know him is one of the most well-respected fire chiefs in our town. We really look to him for great leadership and he is truly like a pillar in our community. So first I want to thank you for everything you do for Enfield and welcome.

So this Bill actually got out of Committee last year and was voted out of the House unanimously at the end of Session so I am hoping we again vote it out of this Committee again and pass it out of the House. So and of course half is up to the Senate to move it forward. We understand urgency here, the fact that you used to be able to do it before and now all of a sudden you can't I think really, you

know, stands behind the Bill itself. So, I just have one quick question. The background check, the check itself, is it a national background check or is it the State's background check that you used to get?

CHIEF PROVENCHER: I cannot tell you if it was national. I know it was through the State Department of Public Safety, Bureau of Identification. So I am not sure exactly what it was. I know it was the whole State of Connecticut whether it went further or not, I can't tell you. I never got anybody back that was wanted in California.

REP. HALL (7TH): So welcome and thanks for coming and advocating for this. I know it does affect other departments across the state because one of our other State Reps put this forward with myself in the House so it definitely does affect other fire departments in the State. So hopefully we can pass this out and move it forward and thank you for being here today.

CHIEF PROVENCHER: Thank you for your kind words.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you Chief, Senator for being here. This Bill has been before us numerous years and never seem to quite get it over the finish line. I am hoping that 2020 is the year to do that. Representative Carpino also submitted this Bill request amongst himself, Representative Hall and others so I feel that this is a good opportunity. I have the fortunate to represent two towns Monroe and Newtown that have between them I think six or seven fire companies,

volunteer, all volunteer and so I appreciate and realize the sacrifice, the time, the training that goes into this. What is your budget like as a Chief and do feel as if you have enough extra money to be able to spend on things like background checks?

CHIEF PROVENCHER: Well that is kind of a loaded question, but with due respect is so, if you budget and you have to pay for this. If you have "x" amount of new members that want to get on in a year and you have to pay for this, it obviously leaves either training, equipment, we have to pay our fixed costs just like anybody else does, so it is a matter of juggling things around, that is really what it comes down to.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): And that is exactly what I knew the answer was going to be is because we know that if you spend money on the background checks you can't be doing more training. You can't be buying more gear, you can't be keeping your men and women safe. You can't be fixing your trucks, so with this we are hoping that there is a relief there and it allows you to spend that money in other necessary areas. For all this time and hours you put in, not just responding to calls, but all the stuff behind the scenes, the administration, the training so thank you for all you do, I appreciate it and I thank you for being here. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Thank you. Representative Hayes.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Senator and Chief for both being here to testify. I know how important time is. Chief do you have any idea of the exact amount they're charging you per candidate?

CHIEF PROVENCHER: Thank you, Representative. When I started, when this first came down I thought it was $60.00 dollars and I believe it is $75.00 now. That was about three years, I'm not sure if that's what it did, but I believe that is what it is initially. One of the problems with that is once you find out that somebody has a record, that's all they tell you. If you want the additional information you have to send more money to find out what they are wanted for, or what their conviction was for.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay, thank you and I can't imagine you're gonna ask people that are applying to be volunteers to have this money come out of their pockets, so it's gonna come out of the department budget, right?

CHIEF PROVENCHER: That's correct.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Thank you.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Thank you. Any other questions? Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Chief and thank you, Senator Kissel for being here. I grew up in Enfield and I probably was served growing up those years by every fire department in Enfield because we moved around quite a bit. My mother was a resident in the area of North Thompsonville when she passed away. So my understanding going back to when I paid car taxes in the Town of Enfield and my taxes. So you raise, your budget is through a property tax or a special tax for residents of the district, correct?

CHIEF PROVENCHER: That is correct.

REP. SMITH (108TH): So if you have to absorb this or continue to absorb this, you have to budget for it which in effect raises property tax for the residence of your district?

CHIEF PROVENCHER: That is also correct.

REP. SMITH (108TH): Whereas if I understand correctly other municipalities with municipal fire departments they get that service for free and there is no burden on the taxpayers?

CHIEF PROVENCHER: Not to my knowledge, yes. They do not have to pay anything for it. Like I said I believe that it was a misinterpretation and part of this is also to clarify because I do, there's 160 towns in Connecticut and there is 320 something fire departments, so we talked to different people, there are more fire districts but I still talk to some people that get it through their local police department which I believe is probably technically not legal. Some people still get it down here through the State because I don't know if there is an identifier or what that comes through. So there is a lot of different ways to do it and some people still get it and some people don't.

REP. SMITH (108TH): So there are some backdoors that open in some areas and some towns and not in others is what you're saying.

CHIEF PROVENCHER: I appreciate, I would rather go through the front door.

REP. SMITH (108TH): I agree with you. Thank you very much and thank you for your service.

CHIEF PROVENCHER: Thank you, sir.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Thank you. Any other questions? Representative Genga.

REP. GENGA (10TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you Senator and Chief for your testimony. What kind of funds are we talking about, you recall your annual costs for this the last four years?

CHIEF PROVENCHER: I didn't do any research Representative on that but I would guess it is $1,000 dollars. Again I tried different avenues because I didn't want to get to the point where we had background checks coming through and then we had to find out what it was for, because there may be somethings that are forgiven on there and length of time and some other stuff. But I just, I was disappointed so I didn't go through with doing it that way.

REP. GENGA (10TH): So roughly $1,000 dollars we say would be a fair common sense number?

CHIEF PROVENCHER: I would say so, my estimate.

REP. GENGA (10TH): The other part of the question is when you have somebody who has some kind of problem with a background check and you have to pay additionally, you know off hand what that cost is?

CHIEF PROVENCHER: I thought it was $100 and something dollars or $100 dollars on top of what you already paid but I'm not exact on the figures. So I think it is in that legislation actually.

REP. GENGA (10TH): Thank you.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Thank you. Are there any other questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony. Have a good day. Up next is Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH): Hello Chair Verrengia, how are ya? Chair Paolillo and Ranking Members Hwang and Sredzinski and all the distinguished Members of the Committee. It is a pleasure to be here today. I am State Senator George Logan. I am here in support of Senate Bill Number 236, AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO DIAPER CHANGING STATIONS IN PUBLIC AND COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS. I am looking to amend the State Building Code to require diaper changing tables accessible to women and men in all newly constructed or substantially renovate public or commercial buildings that include at least one restroom that is open to the public.

I have with me here today, I have Chris, Charlotte Rose, and also in the audience is her other parent there Josh, hey Josh, [Laugher] and you know, they brought an issue to me, to my attention that was one that I though required immediate attention. And this is their story and I am gonna have now cede the reset of my time over to Chris.

CHRIS ACOSTA: Hello, Mr. Chairman and distinguished members of the Public Safety and Security Committee, I am Christino Acosta, and I live in Hamden and I am here with my beautiful daughter Charlotte Rose and we are here to testify in support of Senate Bill No. 236 AN ACT CONCERNING ACCESS TO DIAPER CHANGING STATIONS IN PUBLIC AND COMMERCIAL BUILDINGS.

Doing this would improve the quality of life for all families in the State of Connecticut. There are more Fathers today sharing parenting roles as well as being stay at home fathers than ever before. There are also more Gay male families with children than ever before. There are more stay at home fathers, I am all of the above. I am a gay male,

stay at home father who is married with a little girl. [Charlotte gives her name - Laughter]. That's right.

I don't have a wife that can take her into the ladies' room to change her so my only option is a, you know, male bathroom. Since my daughter was born, I have run into the issue where there are almost never changing table in men's bathroom and that only leads me to have to lay her on these disgusting and germ ridden floors, no child should have to be laid on a bathroom floor. I would bring, at first I would bring like swaddling blankets and things like that to lay on the floor and lay her on top of it, but you can only use that once and if you are running a bunch of errands, you know, after that the blanket is now disgusting and germ ridden and you have to throw it away or sanitize it at home and it gets to be an issue. There were many times I would be in restrooms and, you know, other guys would be coming in or leaving and say, dude, "I feel your pain", I understand. I had to deal with the same thing or I would always have to pass my kid to my wife so she could try to find one. You know, there is not always a family restroom around.

So my issue here it was so frustrating and I decided to be the Dad that goes in and does something about it, [Charlotte sneezes] Bless you and tries to make a change both for Charlotte as well as for all other children and dada in the State of Connecticut.

So doing so would be a very, very cheap. Approving this Bill would be inexpensive for companies to do, on Amazon professional ones are from $150 to $300 dollars depending on your choices so it is really inexpensive to do this.

It is my wish to have this Bill named the CharlotteRose because I have put so much time in it, and energy and passion into it. The most important thing to me is having the bill passed. So I thank you for the opportunity to provide this testimony in support of Senate Bill 236. I urge you to consider this modest request on behalf of all the children and Fathers in Connecticut. Thank you.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Thank you for your testimony. Are there any questions? Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you, Senator Logan. Thank you, Mr. Acosta. This is something that did pass out of the Committee last year, so I am hoping we can do the same thing this year. Thank you, Charlotte for testifying, you did a great job [Laughter]. You even identified yourself on the record which sometimes people that have been here for years forget to do [Laughter] so great job. Thank you for bringing this up, I think it is important and as society changes government has to change with it, and I think it is very important. Thank you for taking the time to come up and do that. Thank you, Senator.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Representative Fusco.

REP. FUSCO (81ST): Thank you, Senator. Thank you for testifying. So just a quick question. Is there, can you see further concerns about privacy, in other words would you like to see this, you know, table inside of like a larger stall like for the handicapped or out in the open?

CHRIS ACOSTA: Ideally it would in a handicapped bathroom stall, but more importantly if there wasn’t

a handicapped stall for some reason in that restroom then just having one in there in general would be great because I can always cover her with, you know, her shirt or her pants or whatever have you and changing go by pretty quickly when doing this a bunch of times, right. So really it only takes a second and I always kind of block her for those kind of things anyway as the protective dad that I am.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Okay, any other questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony. Senator Maroney. [All saying bye to Charlotte]. Senator that is tough act to follow [Laughter].

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH): I know, they say you should never follow puppies or babies and thankfully I am not actually testifying, I am going to yield my time to my constituent so he will have to follow the baby. So Representative Verrengia, Representative Paolillo and distinguished Members of the Public Safety and Security Committee, my name is James Maroney and I am here with my constituent Abe Baggili to testify on Senate Bill 235 AN ACT ESTABLISHING A CYBERSECURITY TASK FORCE and with your permission I will yield my time.

IBRAHIM BAGGILLI: Thank you, Senator. My name is Abe Baggilli or Ibrahim Baggilli, I am the Elder Endowed Chair at the University of New Haven Cybersecurity. Members of the Public Safety & Security Committee, I am in support for THE ACT ESTABLISHING A CYBERSECURITY TASK FORCE.

As a cybersecurity researcher, scientist, professor, educator and father, I am in full support of this. The State of Connecticut faces the challenges as you might know, but if you don’t here are some things that maybe people should hear about.

In 2019, Starling Physicians, based out of Rocky Hill, was attacked through phishing. The investigation determined that leaked e-mails contained certain patients' names, addresses, dates of birth, passport numbers, Social Security Numbers, medical information and health insurance or billing information. Attackers in the state have not only focused on small companies, they have also targeted larger corporations. For example, EMCOR, a $9 Billion dollar corporation in Norwalk, suffered a ransomware attack which was reported this past month.

School systems are continuously being attacked in Connecticut. Examples of districts that were affected by ransomware that have been disclosed publicly include the Wolcott Public School System, the New Haven Public School System, and the Middletown Schools. There have also been challenges with towns being attacked in recent years such as the ransomware attack on the towns of Hamden, Watertown, and Plymouth.

Most recently, 326,000 patient records were impacted in a UConn Health phishing attack. Perhaps another important statistic may be of interest to you is from the 2019 Internet Crime Report reported that in 2019 that there was 4,412 cybercrime complaints to the FBI with losses totaling about #24 million dollars. This is only for the State of Connecticut.

So cybersecurity has a big talent problem if you don't know this. Cybersecurity Ventures predicts that there will be 3.5 million cybersecurity openings that need to be filled globally by 2021. In fact, the CyberSeek, which is cybersecurity job demand and supply heat map you can see that

Connecticut has about 3,626 cybersecurity openings but the geographic concentration of cybersecurity workers is below the nation's average.

Cybersecurity talent development needs to be at the cornerstone of this task force. When I came to Connecticut in 2013, I was surprised at the lack of cybersecurity talent in the state, and I was tasked with building a world-class program. Right now, the University of New Haven is one of only 21 Universities in the U.S. designated by the National Security Agency as a Center of Academic Excellence in Cyber Operations and only two in the northeast, but we are the only one in Connecticut. We have a $4 million dollar scholarship for the SFS Program, Scholarship for Service for students to where we pay for their whole degree on the basis that they're gonna work for the Federal Government or the local state and Tribal Governments as well.

We also have the GenCyber Agent Academy where we've taken kids from 9th to 12th grade to educate them and push them forward. All of these things that we've done, you know, our students have found vulnerability that affect over 1.5 billion people worldwide, and I can go on, and on, and on.

But the important thing that I really want to bring to your attention here is only one student out of lab since 2013 is working for a company in Connecticut. One, right. So what do we do? We're helping. We're helping by currently we have support with the MITRE Corporation, where we are trying to safeguard our elections in the State. We have a grant that we try to get from the Department of Defense for doing training for the National Guard in the State and so on and so forth.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Sir, if you can just wrap up, please.

IBRAHIM BAGGILLI: So if you don't know this, this past year I got my U.S. Citizenship again, in the State of Connecticut, my two daughters were born in the State of Connecticut, I love this State. And what I am trying to tell you here is there is a lot of challenges that maybe people don't fully comprehend the scope of the challenges that we're facing. The defense industry in Connecticut has been very strong but the cyber defense industry has been weak. We need to fix that and together we can make this happen and this Task Force is a push in the right direction. The University of New Haven and myself are very dedicated to that cause and happy to work with all of you. Thank you very much.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Thank you, sir. Are there any questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony. Senator Miner. I don't see him. Representative DiMassa. Representative, welcome back to the Public Safety Committee, we miss you.

REP. DIMASSA (116TH): Thank you, trust me, I miss this Committee. Thank you, Mr. Chairman, thank you members of the Committee for hearing my testimony. I am proud to represent the 116th New Haven, West Haven today in regard to two Bill on your docket 5316 regarding ATVs and 5317 regarding a cooperative purchase agreement for Narcan throughout the State.

On ATV, on 5316 I believe this Bill is very important to our municipalities to give them the option through ordinance to set some parameters for these vehicles. We have had a number of safety incidents throughout the State. Our law enforcement has had some difficulty whether it is with seizure

of these vehicles or regulating the time of day, so this would give them the option to do that through their local town elective body.

As far as 5317, this is a tremendously good Bill that is going to provide municipalities across the State who otherwise would have trouble purchasing Narcan to work with DAS and DESP to cooperatively purchase those together. And I would be remiss if I didn't point out the hard work of Vice Chairman Paolillo on this effort. It is a tremendously good Bill and I know he has worked very hard with you all on that. So I would encourage the support on both Bills. And I just want to thank our New Haven colleagues for showing up today. We are in full force and will have some expert testimony that I certainly cannot provide but they will provide on these Bills. And Chairman Verrengia just to you, to echo the comments of Senator Kissel I want to thank you for your tremendous service to the State of Connecticut, not only through Law Enforcement but through service the legislature. You will be missed. So thank you and I can take questions.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Thank you, Representative. Any questions? Representative Paolillo.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Representative, thank you for being here and obviously we do miss you on this Committee. If you can talk a little bit about your interaction with law enforcement around the first issue that you raised, around ATVs and some of the issues that you are seeing?

REP. DIMASSA (116TH): Absolutely. Some of the issues, first of all it is very difficult for law enforcement especially when you have a minor who is operating one of these vehicles either at late

hours, or early in the morning, during rush hour traffic, you know, they're in the streets, they are causing public disturbances and one of the difficult pieces of this was being able to regulate the use, the hours of operation, some of the parameters but also the flow of traffic and the fines. So this Bill will beef up that ability and it's not just about, you know, it's not just about penalties here it is about the safety of the operator just as much the safety of the community.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Representative. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Any other questions? Representative thank you for being here. Next up we have Noel Petra from DAS. Good Afternoon.

JOE CASSIDY: Good Afternoon. My name is Joe Cassidy, I am the State Building Inspector and I am pinch-hitting for Deputy Commissioner Petra this afternoon, he's unfortunately got detained and can't be here with us today. So bear with me as I struggle through this. So, first of all we would like to thank the Committee for raising our Bill.

The proposal is intended to provide alternative resources for code compliance to facilitate development and economic growth. It will allow towns and the State to leverage limited resources to ensure public safety through a pool of firms vetted and overseen by the State. It will provide a pool of resources to support development during peak economic periods.

In order to assure the safety and well-being of the public, it is essential to have experienced, knowledgeable, trained, licensed and certified

individuals who are able to timely verify that the plans for the construction work are completed in accordance with the codes and safe. Delays in inspections could create a public safety hazards because code violations are not identified quickly enough. Additionally, delays create a bottleneck in the review and inspection processes, which creates delays in construction activities and the resulting effects on economic development benefits.

In general, the difficulty is caused by two factors: The construction/development world is highly dynamic, with large fluctuations, whereas staffing in the State and municipalities are basically static. The State and municipalities cannot adjust their staffing levels as quickly as the construction/development market moves and require supplemental expertise during these

We developed Senate Bill 269 to address this problem. The Bill would authorize DAS to strategically deploy the existing state resources to create two separate, but related, programs – one for building inspectors and one for elevator and escalator inspections to be able to conduct plan review and inspection services for construction and renovation of buildings; establish administrative guidelines and procedures for inspections and reviews and audit the work product of inspection firms and inspectors to ensure that the reviews and inspections meet our rigorous standards.

Through these two programs, the State will be able to develop an alternate source of inspectors and firms that possess the required qualifications, knowledge and experience. In turn, will give building owners and developers the choice, simply an

option of utilizing the existing process or contracting with these certified entities to perform reviews or inspections, with audit and oversight from the State or municipality.

Finally I would like to address some misconceptions surrounding this proposal. First, the proposed programs WOULD NOT impact public safety. The licensure and certification requirements of third party inspectors would be identical to those held by inspectors employed by the State or a municipality. Together with a rigorous audit and oversight program, there would be no difference in the quality or integrity of independent inspections, or the safety of the general public.

Second, this proposal WOULD NOT cause a revenue loss to the State or towns. It does not change the existing fee structures for permits, reviews or inspections. To the contrary, we believe it may result in revenue increase to the extent it creates a reason for more people to seek to be licensed.

Third, the proposed programs WOULD NOT, in any manner, dilute the statutory authority of local building officials to approve inspections or issue permits.

Finally, the purpose of this proposal is to provide an additional source of qualified licensed and certified inspection firms available to developers and building owners. It would not replace, privatize or otherwise outsource inspection services conducted by DAS or municipal inspectors.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): If I can just ask you to summarize.

JOE CASSIDY: Okay, that's pretty much the end, Representative. I'll stop right there.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, that was easy, easier than I thought. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Good Afternoon, never know what time it is. Just a couple of questions, I think. So you are saying that the certifications would be the same, I've only glanced at the Bill, is that laid out in the Bill or is that just how we will operate?

JOE CASSIDY: That is how we would operate. The Bill is actually a proposal to request permission to develop the program. But yes, the staffing would, they would be certified the same way local building officials and inspectors are now.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH): So if there is a concern about that, I'm just inquiring, if there is a concern about that, would you have objections clarifying that in the language?

JOE CASSIDY: No, that's fine.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH): Okay and I know there's been some concern about potential difference and cost of the people doing the work. Could you address that?

JOE CASSIDY: Potential differences? I'm not exactly.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH): The cost for having the independent individuals do the labor that we're talking about?

JOE CASSIDY: Oh, okay the developer would be bearing the cost for those services, you know, as a

business cost is developing a program. It becomes a cost benefit for them whether or not to use the program.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH): And just a question because it comes up in a lot of the things we do, so currently. Well I guess two questions. One what is the issue with getting people to do the work currently, why can't we get enough people to do the work?

JOE CASSIDY: Well as you know most every municipality has, you know, budget, everybody's got budget constraints and, you know, from time-to-time when you get peak economic booms, you know, you exceed the capacity of the Building Department, so you start to get delays in inspections and so forth. This is a way of alleviating those peak period delays.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH): Okay, I'll leave it there. Thank you.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Thank you, Senator. Any other questions? Can you just go into a municipality for instance without naming a municipality and talk about a delay for instance that you are seeing right now. What would be the backlog since, you know, for instance in the City I represent, New Haven, various projects that are underway and continue to be underway, long-term, what would be an average backlog that you're referring to?

JOE CASSIDY: Generally where you see the larger cities where they have the larger backlogs, you can see anything from two to four, to six weeks depending, I know, in larger cities when the solar

PV people come in and then they really carpet, bomb an entire area, you'll see a spike in, you know, electrical work and a lot of delays as they go in and put in, you know, a couple of hundred systems in in the course of a couple of months. So those are the types of delays that I think we see.

REP. PERILLO (113TH): Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Thank you. Also, especially with some of the smaller towns when you have even a large project come in that can take up quite a bit of time and I think that these independent inspectors do give a hand when that is necessary, especially, you know, when you're putting in large apartment complexes, condo complexes even large business is that true?

JOE CASSIDY: Yes, certainly. I mean that's another, one of the problems we found that this is aimed at, yes you are correct.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Senator. Any other questions? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH): Sorry about that, I probably should have asked the question before. So the individuals currently doing this work, are they organized into unions or not and how would this affect them if they are?

JOE CASSIDY: I think it depends that's town by town whether or not.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH): But some of them would be?

JOE CASSIDY: Some inspectors are in unions and some are not. Yeah, it depends.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH): And any idea how this proposal might affect that?

JOE CASSIDY: Not really, no.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH): Okay, thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Mr. Chairman, you have a question?

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Yes, with respect to the elevator inspections, it is my understanding that the genesis of the Bill is because they're short. Right, short elevator inspectors?

JOE CASSIDY: We do have a backlog of period inspections, yet.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): An how much of a backlog do you have?

JOE CASSIDY: At last I looked it was somewhere in the neighborhood of about 3,000 objects.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Three thousand. And there was a change fairly recently as far as when the inspections were to take place, correct me if I'm right. I think there was a point that it was every 12 months that the elevators might have had to be inspected and then it was moved up to 18 months.

JOE CASSIDY: Eighteen months, probably about 11 or 12, just before I became involved with the department, yeah.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): So this Bill, part of this Bill would essentially allow for outside inspectors, you have a group or a list that contractors can use for outside inspectors?

JOE CASSIDY: Right.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): So why wouldn't the department just hire more inspectors?

JOE CASSIDY: That is one of the things that we are trying to do as well. We are competing with, you know, the marketplace and the pay scales are a little different.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): So it was my understanding in the conversation that there was a degree of difficulty in getting inspectors online. So how was it that another company can get a pool of inspectors if you will, and the State can't.

JOE CASSIDY: They may be able to hire part-time or, you know, per diem or, you know, a contract basis rather than hiring them as fulltime employees, so they'd have a lot more flexibility in the way that they hire employees.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): So taking the finances out of it, let's just look at the work that they do. So right now someone from the State goes in and inspects these elevators. If there is new construction, say I'm building a hotel, and my partner Representative Paolillo owns an inspection company, him and I kinda work it out, right, because I'm the inspector, private inspector and he needs to get this thing up and running so there is always that possibility, right, that if I want to continue to do business with this developer, I don't want to say just to be his friend, but so I continue to get other business then, may kinda look the other way if you will or compromise if you will, kind of leaves that door open. And I am not suggesting that happens because on the flipside I am confident in the State inspectors that they don't mess around. They're gonna come in and if this developer doesn't

have his stuff together, they are gonna red tape it or whatever they do and shut it down. So and I think that's really important from a public safety perspective so would it be, and I know nothing about this industry, and this was actually the first I heard of it this year and I was kinda taken back that, you know, we're 3,000 or 5,000 inspections behind, that is a major problem. I think twice now when I go in an elevator, you know, But that is, what I'm saying is that is not an unreasonable scenario.

JOE CASSIDY: Right and that's part of the strength of the audit in followup program that we would place to manage these outside firms to make sure that that quality stays there so we would be able to, you know, disqualify a firm that, you know, had one of those handshake relationship with the developer and was doing shoddy inspection work.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): But the question comes to mind is how can you audit if you don't even have the inspectors to go out and inspect it, like do you know what I'm saying? So I'll leave it at that. I think, you know, from where I sit that is an issue but we will continue the dialogue as we go forward.

JOE CASSIDY: Okay.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): Thank you very much. So I just want to make sure I am understanding this. You want to take the work of a public employee and put in the private industry?

JOE CASSIDY: No, we are not talking about taking anybody's work, we are just trying to offer an alternative for the developer if.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): Which would take the work away from a public employee and put it in a private employee because otherwise they would be, that job would be covered by a public employee. Is that not true?

JOE CASSIDY: True.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): All right, so you are taking work away from people that's true, that's just true, how many inspectors do you have right now?

JOE CASSIDY: We have, are we talking about building or elevators or?

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): Yep, both.

JOE CASSIDY: Both. We have nine building inspectors now we have six elevator inspectors at this time.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): And how many did you have ten years ago?

JOE CASSIDY: Ten years ago I think we had 11 elevator inspectors and.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): Double the amount you have now.

JOE CASSIDY: Roughly, yes.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): When is the last time you hired a building, and elevator inspector?

JOE CASSIDY: Three years ago.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): Say it again.

JOE CASSIDY: Three years ago.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): Three years ago.

JOE CASSIDY: That's off the top of my head approximately.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): Approximately three years ago, why have you not hired another one?

JOE CASSIDY: We did put out one advertisement and I don't think we got responses to it.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): So how do you expect the private employees are get responses if public employees can get responses?

JOE CASSIDY: We're hoping that, you know, they have different ways of hiring people rather than [Cross-talking].

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): So they have a different way of hiring people. I'm not trying to disrespect any private employee, employers here. What is the difference, pay range?

JOE CASSIDY: Entirely possible, yes.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): Qualification?

JOE CASSIDY: No, qual [Cross-talking].

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): Educational qualifications, how do you know that?

JOE CASSIDY: Because everybody would have to have same the licensing.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): So somebody that, I'm just trying to get to the meat of the issue, someone that is going to apply to be an elevator inspector could get paid $20 dollars by a, in your office and $15 dollars in the private sector and that's the only way you have money, it's a salary issue and you can't find anybody at $20 dollars but they can find

people at $15 dollars an hour. There has to be a difference.

JOE CASSIDY: Well I guess what we want to do is we want to explore and develop a program to see if this will in fact.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): So you want me to put, into the hands of someone who is going to pay workers less, give them no benefits, have no hours of work, be a generalized someone who is gonna work two hours one week, ten hours the next week, maybe no hours.

JOE CASSIDY: I wouldn’t comment on that.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): But you just said to one of the other people here today, you just said, your words, you said that you might, they might work two hours one week. You said they would work part-time, on a per diem basis, on a.

JOE CASSIDY: Those are all speculations from my point. I don’t know what would happen.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH): So you want us, again if this is all speculation on your point, on your part, you want us to take, cause I’ve had them come into the Town of Sprague where the inspectors come in, they do good work, they make sure. We also have a contractor that looks at the elevators should we have a problem with them and so there’s your guys are doing an oversight and that’s what we want but you want me to charge with the public safety mechanism someone who is going to be paid less, not have a guaranteed job, that’s what you’ve said here, and they are, clearly they are not gonna have the same certification because someone is not gonna pay for certification and then work a third or a quarter of what you are paying now. I think you should put

the job out to bid and see if you can get some more people. So that would be my opinion. Thank you very much, Mr. Chair.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Senator. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. And I didn't get your name, I'm sorry.

JOE CASSIDY: Joe Cassidy.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): Joe, thank you for taking one for the team [Laughter]. I just wanted to acknowledge that and leadership should thank you for being here. I understand the idea of being able to create a dual, you know, inspection but ultimately for me and for us as legislator is to ensure the safety of the inspection and the safety of elevators and devices that are moving our people. I think you cited or someone cited in the misconception that you want to clarify that this proposed program would not impact public safety. What are your point of references for this Committee that justifies that statement or validates that and also to follow up that example cited in Connecticut that would be a point of reference?

JOE CASSIDY: Well I think in general what you will see is if you have a building department that is, you know, overwhelmed with work and can't get to inspections in a timely manner, the inspections they are doing are probably a bit rushed as well because they are under time constraints. This would allow, if you had a third party doing it and they were living on the job more you probably would have, you know, more rigorous inspections where a town would

be, you know, a town that was under time constraints to start with.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): These are presumptions?

JOE CASSIDY: Yes they are.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): And they are hypothetical and to put in such a plan based on hypothetical is a challenge, I mean from a Committee that we should focus on ultimate public safety and security so I would ask through the Department and through further discussions to be able to provide some validated documented safety measures as you have just claimed here that it would not impact public safety. I think for me it is paramount. Its six, half-a-dozen in regards to the process and you're recommending something that is very dramatically different than what is current practice but I would hope that you would document and be able to provide reassurances and protocols so that should such a plan be implemented that public safety is never, ever sacrificed.

JOE CASSIDY: Right, I think that goes to some of the development that we have done with the program talking about auditing and, you know, making sure that we are overseeing the work product that is being done by these firms to make sure it is at the same par as you would get from my office or from a local building official.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): But we have no trial basis of documented facts through other states, through other entities that have demonstrated that. That is what I'm saying.

JOE CASSIDY: One of the programs that we're looking at is Washington, D.C., implemented a program I'd

say about four-five years ago that we are looking at as using as a foundation for this program that has a very strong audit and oversight component to it.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): Well through you to the Chair I would like to get that information and if there is more information reflecting current up-to-date with regards to technology challenges and ultimately the latest and best information and data points to ensure again, and I am going to be repeating, that public safety should never, ever be sacrificed. So I want to thank Mr. Chair and I want to repeat again, thank you for standing up and taking one for the team. I appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH): Thank you, Senator. That's true, we recognize that. Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you for being here. You represent the Department of Administrative Services today.

JOE CASSIDY: Correct.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): In an official capacity, correct.

JOE CASSIDY: Correct.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): I know when I met with the Commissioner of DAS one of the things he talked about was the efficiency that this would help to lead and that it would help those who are seeking to complete projects complete them quicker.

JOE CASSIDY: Correct.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Could you just expand on that a little bit and just, you know, in about a

minute or less talk about how this could affect ongoing operations?

JOE CASSIDY: Right. If you are looking at developers doing a large, you know, say year, year-and-a-half project that in a town that can only do inspections, you know, even if at a week backlog, you are probably looking at, you know, a month or several months of schedule delays over the course of a year, year-and-a-half project. As they say, time is money.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): And would you say, I know it's been talked about by my colleague Senator Hwang, but is there any danger of safety in any way?

JOE CASSIDY: The way that in envision the program, no because we would have, you know, the inspectors would have the same credentials as the local building officials that my guys do and we would be looking over their work and editing it to make sure that it says at that same quality.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Okay so there would still be State oversight of any of the work that is happening regardless of.

JOE CASSIDY: Really now there is sort of a black market of unregulated activity that goes on now, you know, with people providing inspections, so you know, we're just trying to kinda raise the floor on that and, you know, put a little control around what is sort of the wild west at this point.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Okay, well thank you very much for your testimony. Appreciate you stepping in and filling in today. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman, good to see you. Ranking Member Hwang and Ranking Member Sredzinski and Members of the Committee. My name is Senator Craig Miner and I used to serve on the Public Safety and Security Committee and I look back on those days with some fondness. I am here today to testify on behalf of Senate Bill 266 and I want to thank you for raising it for Public Hearing.

I have had numerous conversations with EMS personnel in Northwest corner about some of the risks that they face and some of the possible risks that they've yet to encounter but should they encounter them, they have some concern that they may not have all the equipment that they need. I think that most of you that served in the legislature back when we talked about incidents after some of the mass shootings in Connecticut, the State of Connecticut I think has rightly attempted to control the purchase of body armor but in so doing some of the EMS personnel don't believe that they have access to that.

And in the conversations I've had with these folks in the Northwest corner one of the concerns I expressed was I didn't think the legislature was interested in opening up opportunities to anyone that may be a volunteer with fire and EMS or career person to buy it for their own personal use. And so what we talked about was requesting a Bill that would create a statutory pathway for municipalities to, should they chose to, equip that ambulance and fire apparatus with enough body armor pieces for what would normally be a crew on those rigs. That

way it could be controlled. Theoretically when you signed out the truck, you left with the equipment, you gotta bring the equipment back. And just about everybody that I spoke with about this concept, most of them wanted the ability to buy it one their own we willing to consider this. It's probably the most logical step.

The way the Bill is drafted in Section 2, requires the municipalities to purchase that equipment. That was not my intent. My intent was to create the pathway should they chose to. I'm told there maybe federal grants available so that if a municipality wanted to do it there are specific dollars set aside for this purpose. Whether that is exactly the case or not I don't know and there may be municipalities that think this is a logical step. I can tell ya that about 30 years ago when I drove the ambulance there was an occasion when I was dispatched to a call and it was a lump on the head that was caused by an altercation and when we got there, it was a lump on head caused by the backend of a pistol that didn't go off.

And so, you don't really know and I wanted in difference to the volunteers and career personnel here to at least make the pitch for them, offer the Committee an opportunity to think about whether this is a step they think is logical and offer my assistance in trying to redraft this is a way that may be more closely matches my intent. But I do really appreciate you giving us this opportunity.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Senator Miner and you do a great job representing your district, the Quiet Corner,

although in this building you may not always want to be that quiet and because of the good work that you do. Saying that, I think in Section 2 it is really important for everybody to understand beyond reading the Statute your intent is a very narrow pathway to create an opportunity for municipalities to do that. It is not enabling for every municipality. Would that be correct?

SENATOR MINER (30TH): So the intent was to be enabling for every municipality that chose to but not a requirement for every municipality to provide the equipment. I think there are some communities that may want to take this step. There may be some others that don't really feel they are at the point in time where this makes sense for them. I think that dialogue could occur between, for instance in the Town of Litchfield, there are four fire departments and two ambulance services. So I would chose to leave it up to them but I want it crafted in such a way where each volunteer in the community wasn't able to go out and acquire equipment on their own. I think that would be too broad a reach.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): No is there a possibility with passage and a crafted pathway to allow the intent that you cited and to be able to protect some of the interest of municipalities without adding additional burden onto them, is this a possibility of opening pathways to get some federal grants that would allow them to make this purchase to protect their volunteer EMS and fire staff?

SENATOR MINER (30TH): So that in fact is my understanding. It is my understanding also that there may be other non-profits, there may be other fundraising efforts. I know in Canton for instance

there has been a fair amount of ambulance equipment that has been acquired as a result of local activity fundraisers that haven't necessarily been tax dollars appropriated by the Town of Canton so I think the opportunities are almost endless.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): And I appreciate that and I appreciate you raising this Bill with the ultimate goal that should the towns want to be able to do that, and if there are available alternative funds that is not a burden to the State that we are able to get these kind of body armor to protect men and women that are out there protecting us. So, I want to thank you for your efforts in raising this Bill and hope that you will continue to work with us to create a pathway that is amendable to all the parties involved. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Thank you. Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you, Senator. Welcome back to the Public Safety Committee. I know that you are well aware in the past few years we've had Bills that have proposed for the online purchase of body armor for volunteer EMS, volunteer fire and career in both. Is that any of your intent in this Bill?

SENATOR MINER (30TH): It is not my intent. I've expressed that to a number of individuals when they sat down and spoke to me about this issue. I did not want to open up that pathway. I don't believe it is the intent of this legislation to do it. I wouldn't want to restrict a purchaser for a municipality to be able to do it online if that is how they make their acquisitions at the municipal level but it is not intended at all to be for an

individual. It would have to be done under the auspices of the municipality.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you for that answer. As you know it's been something that has come up year and year and we haven't been able to really get too much action on it. And as a former EMT myself I've been assaulted on scenes, I've been threatened with shotguns behind doors, fortunately those threats were not carried out, so I do realize the danger that these men and women put themselves in every day just to go help someone out whether it is on a fire scene or an ambulance scene. Thank you very much for your testimony. Appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Thank you. Thank you for coming here today, Senator Miner. It is important the topic you bring up because police training has changed and in some hot situations the EMTs actually go in with us and so does the fire department. And it is really important that they do have access to body armor to protect themselves and I think as training continues on we are going to see a lot more of that. I think it is important for this Committee to examine this and make this available to EMTs and firemen. Thank you.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Thank you. Are there any other questions? I don't see any, Senator. It was a pleasure seeing you again and we do miss 'ya on this Committee.

SENATOR MINER (30TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Maybe I'll trade the Labor Committee for [Laughter]. Thank you.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Thank you, have a good day. Okay the hour is up so we are going to go back and forth from the public list to the public officials. First up is Maureen Will. Good Afternoon.

MAUREEN WILL: Good Afternoon, sir. My name is Maureen Will and I am the Director of the Newtown Emergency Communications Center in Newtown, Connecticut. I am the Chair of the Mangers of Emergency Communication Centers Association here in Connecticut and I have come before you to speak On House Bill Number 5321 AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE ON PUBLIC SAFETY ANSWERING POINT CONSOLIDATION.

The topic of consolidation has long been discussed here in Connecticut, all right, I'm putting it away, right from the heart. For every three steps forward we take five steps back on consolidation because we start it, we started it with the Kimball report and I sat in an auditorium where it was filled with law enforcement, fire fighters, EMS. N, not here in Connecticut.

I am born and raised in Connecticut, 63 years young and I've spent 45 years of that in Public Safety. I retired as a Police Captain in charge of communications and training. I am now a director of a 911 Center in my hometown.

I can tell you that I have fought for consolidation for well over 20 years and each time it gets harder and harder. The three times I tried it, I was met with a stonewall where, "No can't be done, "ya have to have people who live in your town who know your community, we're gonna lose the personal touch, how much money am I gonna get for this, how much money am I gonna save and it is not a matter of money,

it's a matter of public safety." Because we are 169 towns strong and we are 106 PSAPs too many. We can do this.

I have traveled across this beautiful country and regionalization is not a dirty word and that is part of consolidation. We can do this.

For every stonewall there is a driver that will help us get over it. Our telecommunicators that are here in Connecticut are well-trained, well-versed in the technology and you have the technology in the leadership of DESET under Bill Youell and his wonderful staff.

You also have managers like myself who firmly believe that we can do this for you. When you call 911 you get trained, certified personnel who utilize all the tools and technology that you have given from here with your own Public Safety Committee that has allowed us to get next generation 911. We can text to 911. Eventually we will get video to 911, don't get me goin on that one, cause that is a Fusion Center.

But, we have the tools to make consolidation and do it right. We had an epic failure here in Connecticut when the State Police tried to consolidate. But they didn't have, I think you behind them with establishing this House Bill.

So I am just asking that in Connecticut please let us make it a brighter future for our home. Thank you very much for listening.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Thank you. Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Ms. Will for being here. As the 911 Director in one of the towns that I have the pleasure of serving, Newtown I know that we communicate on a regular basis especially since we are both managers of 911 dispatch centers. As the Managers Of Emergency Communications Centers Association or M CCA as we call it, as the leader of the organization how would you say your members feel? Are they strongly supportive, are they middle of the road, are there some pro, some con and what roadblocks do you see from them?

MAUREEN WILL: Well we've had Glastonbury and East Hampton who are MECCA members who have combined jeans pockets and those in Litchfield County Dispatch, Northwest Connecticut Public Safety, Torrington and Waterbury. The majority of the MECCA leaders are cautiously optimistic that yes it can happen. We also know that there is the personnel issue with people, "you're gonna lose jobs." In the consolidation efforts that I have been involved in and asking for that, we want to make sure that if my center is absorbed, I want my people to be the ones that are marketable. So we highly train them so that they can go into that next town. You are not gonna lose that personal touch. How many of you call someplace and you didn't know what state you were talking to? It happens and we have that technology. Of all the ones in Newtown, myself and a part-timer are the only ones that live in Newtown everybody else lives farther away, 10-30 minutes away. So our managers know its coming. We have been talking about it. Again if it's done and done properly then we will support you. We have always supported it.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you and that is part of the reason that we put this Bill together is because in the past we've had proposals but I don't think they have always been fully flushed out and we haven't had the right players around the table talking and recently we had one of those meetings were there were issues that were brought up. There were concerns about dark centers, about prison monitoring, conditions - work conditions, some union concerns and scheduling, some governance issues. And someone that has been in the business since 1999, I've seen a lot of things happen and I realize that there are obstacles but I think we are at a point now in 2020 where this is not something that is not achievable as long as we all get together and work to the best we can to see what we can achieve. That being said, have you had a change to look at the Bill and look at some of the appointees that would be on the task force?

MAUREEN WILL: Yes, sir I did take a look at it and that's when my eyes went wide when I saw that M CCCA was actually included in it. That is very unusual to have our group to be considered in something like that. Again looking at it, there is players from all over and those players will bring a lot of good to that table, the fact that Bill Youell and his team are on it, that's major to have them there.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): And we thought it was important to bring together everyone from OPM to DSET to people who do this every single day like you and I. There will be no legislators, you will be happy to know on this Committee and the reason I requested that no legislators be on it is because I think it is important for us to hear from you. And it is important that we hear from the experts, the

people that do this every day, also the people impacted by it. So we have labor on this task force, we have the police chiefs on this task force, we have the fire chiefs, we have EMS advisory board on this task force so that everyone that gets touched by the communications center, which is ultimately everyone in public safety gets a seat at the table including municipalities, CCM cost. So we wanted to make sure we had a wide variety of people that could leave no stone unturned and so that we could really address some of those issues. So I thank you for your testimony on this Bill.

I just wanted to briefly ask, with the Chair's indulgence, on Bill 5322 AN ACT CONCERNING RELIABILITY OF 9-1-1 CALL SERVICE. It was a Bill proposed to ensure that our 911 system stays up for the public to use. And I don't know if you can talk briefly if you support that Bill?

MAUREEN WILL: I definitely support that Bill. What is worse than dialing 911 and not having anyone answer? People have to be held accountable and we have the technology, we have the services out there that yes, there is no excuse in this day and age that you cannot reach 911, you can't, you just can't.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you very much again for your testimony. Thank you for taking the trip up. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Representative Hayes.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for coming to testify today. I also come from a law enforcement background, started my career as a dispatcher, did some volunteer fire and EMS, went

into the police industry, made Chief of Police in the Town of Putnam and as such was a director of a standalone PSAP. I guess my question to you would be, is it your hope out of this task force that it would be a recommendation for mandatory regionalization or would it be regionalization by a voluntary basis?

MAUREEN WILL: Right now we have a voluntary consolidation. Regionalization to be is a different word and meaning than the consolidation. When I think of consolidation I am thinking, say myself and two or three other towns that are around me. Regionalization in my mind I think of regions through DMHAS, Region 1,3,5 I'm in Region 5. So a mandate, when you mandate that is really when it is going to become, well Massachusetts has done it. If you are going to mandate it then the resources have to be there for it to succeed. So Massachusetts is a model right now but they have some stumbling blocks and they know it and it takes time. Can we do it, I think we can without that, is the State gonna give us a stick and hit us over the head with it, I don't think that is the answer. I think we need to show that it can be done, that the resources force small to medium PSAP, we should be looking for others to join us and looking at the future. That's what I have tried to do and I am hoping I can succeed but I need some help and this task force I think is gonna show that, that the State can't always support us in this technology, it's expensive. And if you're only getting 2,000 or 1,300 911 calls a year, I get over 6. I can absorb you with the staff and I have and probably taking on one or two dispatchers more.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay, you talked about the disaster that was caused by the attempt to consolidate the State Police Dispatch Centers a few years ago and I wholeheartedly agree with that term. You said that if this Bill was in place that would have been different. What would have made that different.

MAUREEN WILL: I think with this Bill we have the ability to go out and talk to the telecommunicators to say, look this is the plan. This is how we are going to do it. You are not immediately gonna be fired. Yes, know that there is going to be other opportunities for you and to guide them as to what they can and can't do and what could or could not happen. I don't think a lot of information was given out and I am not faulting anyone who did it, it's just that we hear, Oh, my God, all these troops, the equipment got moved, and the staff got moved and the next thing you know, well now we've got to bring it all back. To me as a taxpayer that is a lot of money and manhours on something that shouldn't have happened. So we need to do it and do it right and I believe that your roadmap with this Bill is the right way to do it.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay, I had the honor a few years ago serving as President of Chiefs of Police Association. I can't tell you how many conversations and how many hours of discussions we had on this topic. I think that we have to stop trying to say that one size fits all in this State. What is in the Northwest corner or the Southeast corner is totally different than what is in the Northeast corner. The PSAP that I directed was a standalone with no towns having police departments within 40 miles of us. So I know it's a task force,

I'm kind of reluctant to go with this, maybe we will find something good out of it but I just hope that we're gonna keep in mind that what is good for one end of the State is not good for the other and this could hurt some communities as well.

MAUREEN WILL: And I think your task force will look at that and see that based on the composition of the personnel that you have placed on there in the Bill.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Once again, thanks for coming and testifying.

MAUREEN WILL: You're welcome, sir.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Any other questions? Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Welcome, Ms. Will for coming in this building and your experience speaks for itself and your love of what you do shows. And that being said, what you did in the first minute is something we could all learn, you know, you had a full testimony but then you went with your heart and it showed. And so anybody else that will be testifying throughout this building, they need to recognize they should speak from their heart cause that's obviously the most effective. But I also want to complement Representative Hayes for his questions. They are well founded and they are thoughtful and are part of the purpose why this Public Hearing is important.

But I also want to add the fact that idea of the task force is to incorporate these diverging and contrasting viewpoints and I want to give a big shoutout and compliment to Representative Sredzinski for his work on this Bill for the past years and his experience that he brings into this discussion. And

I also applaud the composition of this task force to not include outside factors but truly incorporate all the shareholders that would be impacted by these kind of decisions. And for me, when I look at the idea of a task force and the greater weight that we give it versus just simply a study, it is important to understand that we also take a serious weighted analysis of this issue to create solutions moving forward, to get buy-ins, to be able to have a plan because the idea of thinking about the things we needed to do, as you mentioned in your testimony, for over 30 years, not having a plan means you are never, ever going to get there. And so I think this is a good start and it is a good start to incorporate all the differing viewpoints. Maybe some strongly conflicting viewpoints and some parochial interests, some valid interest but ultimately this is the place to engage in that kind of dialogue to move us forward because technology and the needs within our community aren't going backwards and we have to create an environment that is adaptable and responsive to moving forward. So, I want to thank you for taking your time in coming up. I want to thank you for your over 30 years of service in our community of which I am so proud to represent but your labor of love is shown by the commitment that you go to work everyday and you had many different spots, in different towns. I can share with you it's a remarkable history that you have and a legacy that every single town that you have service they would all very much love to have you back. So for Newtown, we are thrilled to have you but also for you to be able to come up and speak the voices of moving this forward. So, thank you and I hope that we will engage in this task force to engage in serious discussions about a plan moving

forward that incorporates feedback and insight and needs of every community in this state. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Senator. Any other questions? Thank you very much.

MAUREEN WILL: Members of the Committee, thank you very much.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you for your testimony today. Next up, Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH): Good Afternoon.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Hi, Senator.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH): Chairman Verrengia and Paolillo, thank you Ranking Members Hwang and Sredzinski who was here a minute ago. My name is Paul Formica, I am the current State Senator for the 20th District and I am joined today by Victor Ferry who is joining me to speak favorably of Senate Bill Number 262 AN ACT REQUIRING A STUDY OF THE USE OF COMBUSTIBLE GAS DETECTORS. So with the latitude of the Committee I would like to ask Mr. Ferry to read his testimony as he has been a public safety servant and expert for the last 20 years and is well-versed in this issue and I will defer to him with your permission, sir. Thank you.

VICTOR FERRY: Good Afternoon. My name is Victor Ferry. I am a school administrator, retired in 1997. I have been involved in Emergency Management since 1973 because my school, with property lines from the nuclear power plants was about 1500 feet, closest in the nation I've been told.

So, I've been involved in Emergency Management since that time and with respect to terrorism, the

International Drill we had in London with the Response in 98, Connecticut, Oh yeah, I'm right next door. In my own town I am Chairman of Public Protection and Safety as an elected official and I am a FEMA instructor with respect to "Train the Trainer" status. I train other trainers to run Emergency Response teams for communities and I am certified to do School Safety Security Emergency Management audits for schools and we have the contract through Jennings Smith Investigations to do all 17, actually 19 with the two satellite Voc Tech Schools in the State of Connecticut.

One of the things we always recommended was the installation of flammable gas detectors in facilities that use flammable fuels. There is no law requiring that in Connecticut. Recently I send a letter, I'm ignoring my written communication, cause you already have a copy of that, and I am going to share the letter I sent to Paul, Senator Formica, Donna, his former wife passed away, was a former student of my in the 1960s. I am 80 years old this year but I still do Emergency Management work. I am an on-call consultant for American School Safety and Jennings Smith Investigations.

This letter which you will have a copy cause I gave 25 copies to Kim, his aide will explain some situations. There were two schools in Connecticut that I know of, mine was one of them, filled with propane gas. This is where I learned about sniffers. Fire department people call these things sniffers. They walked into the building and said, "Wow, you're at explosion levels" and we had to, fortunately it was early in the morning, busses were arriving and we did not put kids in the school they went to the playground. Two hours later we were

able to, the building was cleared by the fire department with sparkless fans, they opened the windows and the doors. Fortunately it was cafeteria lady who saved the structure from explosion because she had opened the kitchen door to get fresh air in the building.

Mercaptan is added to both propane and natural gas to give it an odor and that is what you smell. But in the community in which I live, 40 homes, 26 of those homes have the furnace in the attic. So the gas pipeline goes to the attic. If there is a rupture or a fracture in the gas line in the attic do you think the occupants in the house are going to smell that? You know the answer to that. And all I'm saying is that we have the technology. I sent a letter to PURA, first I called the gas company and said why don't you advise the general public about the availability of these gas detectors, flammable gas detectors. They are about $58.00 dollars at *Lowe's, Home Depot* is the same price. I paid less money at the Cash Home Center in East Lyme, I bought two of 'em at different times. I have two in my house at the two levels, one in the basement level, in the finished basement and the other in the living space in the home.

Why Connecticut OEM, what used to be call OEM doesn't put out notices that there are available to seniors because as we get older we lose olfactory nerve senses, I am a former science teacher. The olfactory nerve is the nerve that allows you to smell. You lose that. You lose hearing. You lose some sight capabilities as well. So I am saying to you, this is a no-brainer. It makes just simple sense to say, we need to have this in any new construction, for example schools. We need to have

it in new construction that is fueled by natural or propane gas. Basically that is what I'm saying to you. If you want more detail I can give you more. For example, compression ratio on propane is 270:1 which means it can expand 1350 times and still retain its flammability and explosion power. It only takes 2.2 percent in the air, I'm a former science teacher. Paul's wife was in my classes, I told you when I was a junior high teacher. Your firemen are here, they can verify exactly what I am saying to you.

So I don't think I need to give anymore background but that's it.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you for your testimony, sir. Any questions? Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Dr. Ferry you live in the community, reading your testimony and some of your resonant numbers, you served as President of the Association, some of your residents have already installed this. And we are always concerned about fiscal notes, mandates. What's the cost, I think you said $70 dollars, less than $70 dollars.

VICTOR FERRY: Less than $70 dollars. The actual cost is $58 bucks and they are plug in.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): And for any household that use natural gas and as a State we have taken a policy and really focusing on that natural gas as an energy source as the good Former Chair and now Ranking Member of Energy and Technology Committee, Senator Formica who is your host today, knows very well. Did you read the testimony from Commissioner

Gabel from the Department of Administrative Services as it relates to your Bill?

VICTOR FERRY: I have not.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): I think you should be encouraged to here and if I may.

VICTOR FERRY: I'll get a copy then depending where he put one out.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): I think he did and it was relatively encouraging where he said that the Department is very pleased to discuss this concept to be included.

VICTOR FERRY: Excellent.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): And that there is a agency, a volunteer committee of a 21 member agency that would develop a public and open process to review building and fire codes and they would very much be interested in having your ideas and viewpoints be presented in their discussion. So whether this proceeds forward or not as a statutory point, I want to thank you. I want to thank Senator Formica and recognizing what a great teacher you must have been to discuss this issue and raise it as a public awareness issue. But I think there is pathway for this goal of public safety to be realized and I want to ask Senator Formica in regards to your teaching and your involvement in regards to safety in the community. Dr. Ferry's reputation is very well reserved. Is that correct, Senator Formica?

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH): Yes, the good Doctor has been doing this for a long time. He is very well respected not only in Waterford but throughout Southeastern Connecticut for all that he's done. So

when he makes a suggestion, I take it seriously and I know that he has put some thought into it and I agree with you about the opportunity for mandates and other things and hesitation that may occur up in this building but I appreciate the good Commissioner of DAS that perhaps will open a door that we can continue down if something doesn't happen here. So thank you very much.

VICTOR FERRY: If I may, I did not receive a response from PURA, the only person I received a response from was Senator Formica. Okay so that is party of why I didn't know what OEM had done. And the last time I did something, made a presentation to OEM on school safety in 1999 I was told we are not in the school safety business and then Columbine happened and then they got into school safety business. And then when it came time for School Emergency Planning which I started, I was hired by Northeastern Utilities to do that because I wrote them a letter with five major points identifying where their plan would fail and 22 subsets they hired me after 35 years in education and I worked with them and then went to I'm gonna get it correct the Southeastern Connecticut Council of Governments, performed work for them in terms of running Emergency Response Teams in Southeastern Connecticut. But anyway for what it's work folks, there is no mandate here, my request is if you get the information out to the public, require the public utility's folks to notify people if you have flammable gas in your home, these devices are available, that' all.

And the other part make it a requirement, new construction in large facilities that use flammable gas, they should have flammable gas detectors.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): Well, Dr. Ferry, thank you. You are obviously quite foreseen in some of your observations and focus on public safety. Appreciate that and you're right, you are absolutely right. It is a tremendous credit to your Senator, Senator Formica for encouraging this Committee to raise this Bill, to have an opportunity for you to address this issue, for you to be heard and ultimately for us to be able to create solutions to help residents in the entire State and to create a safer environment and be able to do it in a process that meets all the challenges and the demands that we have. So I want to thank Senator Formica for encouraging this Committee to raise this Bill and I want to thank the Chairs for their supportive efforts and perhaps we can find a pathway to get this done. Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

VICTOR FERRY: I hope so. Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Senator. Any other questions? Dr. Ferry, Senator thank you very much. Up next we have Greg Marschand.

GREG MARSCHAND: Good Afternoon. I am Greg Marschand. I oppose the Bill Number 267, Section 2. I cannot for the life of me see this would happen on the grounds of the policemen are in the same brotherhood. Police investigating police does not work. That is like having the fox guard the chicken house. It's hypocrisy at its utmost.

The following caselaw, I will read a part of it should resolve the police misconduct problem from ever happening. For all it says, I don't see how this case law does not apply to every policeman in our State and the whole USA but it does apply to the Houston Police Department. In this caselaw

partially, the Court found a special need in relations to custom agents who carry firearms or are directly involved in drug interdiction just like every policeman on duty. The Federal Court spent the next decade defining which government interest qualified as "special needs" and defying the scope of those qualified. It soon became clear that special need met that little more than the nature of the employees job was extremely important and that a great deal of harm could be done if the job was not performed properly.

Afterall, police in Connecticut have a reasonable suspicion clause in their contract which is a farce on the ground there is no list of wrong doings so to speak. Police officers can do anything and get away with it as long as it doesn't get videotaped. Since random drug tests are under the reasonable suspicion rule for police, never ever happens or is not done in house. This loophole should become a law for random drug testing including for the anabolic steroid for all police. Remember police are held to a higher authority yet some are running amok doing anything they want.

To continue on Section 2 part of this Law, if the police were randomly drug tested, they most probably there wouldn't be any need for all of this court litigation, investigation and possible prosecution and plea bargaining which I am sure would not be cheap for the taxpayers. Here is the first paragraph in the *Houston Police Contract*, "To establish accountability for the police officers by creating consequences when police officers use excessive force which are Houston Officers get randomly drug tested including for the anabolic steroid." There should be purpose for police like

the City of Houston does of their police. Their police are committed to vigorous enforcement of the law while maintaining the highest level of integrity and professionalism. Illegal use of drugs by employees is contrary to these values. Testing employees for illegal use of drugs is critical to insuring that these values are maintained. Connecticut lawmakers, most likely there would not be misconduct by police officers if you do as Houston do, simple as that. When an officer makes an arrest, he taxies the arrested to the police station, taxi drivers get randomly drug tested, it would seem fair and safe and reasonable to have police drug tested just on that minimal ground of them taxing a handcuffed and seat belted person that got arrested to jail at the very least, police are taxi drivers. At the least, I said, with all due respect.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Greg, if I can ask you to summarize and wrap it up.

GREG MARSCHAND: That was it, I oppose House Bills 5317 and 5318 on the grounds of you, myself do not know if police are acting in a proper state of mind besides they are not medically inclined or educated to administer an injection and who is going to pay for the purchase of these injection kits. If the administer of the injection has medical background as an EMT does that would be common sense to let the injection happen. That’s all I have to say.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH): Thank you for your testimony today, Greg. Thank you. Any questions from colleagues? Thank you for your time today.

GREG MARSCHAND: I thank you and I appreciate your time. Have a good week.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH): You, too. Up next, the Assistant Police Chief from the New Haven Police Department Karl Jacobson. Good Afternoon.

KARL JACOBSON: Good Afternoon, to the Chair and the Public Safety Committee, thank you for your time on these matter. I'm gonna talk about 5316 first and then also 5313 and 5317 if I have time.

I am Karl Jacobson, the Assistant Chief of Police in charge of the Investigative Services Division for the City of New Haven. The City of New Haven has a major problem with the illegal operation of ATV's and dirt bikes which has led to several deaths of riders and injuries of innocent citizens. One of my responsibilities which started seven years ago when I was the Sergeant in Charge of the Criminal Intelligence Unit was finding a safe and efficient law enforcement approach to the reckless and lawless operation of illegal dirt bikes and ATV's being operated throughout the City of New Haven. It is a most difficult and tedious task. We cannot safely pursue such vehicles and we need to use alternative measures to ensure the safety of our citizens and the riders. This in turn creates the need for multiple Officers and extensive Operations set up to deter such riding.

What this bill would do would allow law enforcement to impose a significant enough fine to act as a deterrent without making arrests that put young, first time offenders into the criminal justice system. In one operation in 2015, I was the supervisor of 15 Officers and we were able to stop and seize 46 bikes and make 23 arrests that day. But on these operations officers tend to get hurt, and I was even dragged by an ATV during this operation.

The arrests are misdemeanor arrests and require extensive paperwork with this operation alone tying up those 15 officers and two supervisors for over 8 hours.

Instead, this bill would allow us to write 23 tickets for a large enough fine that would be a deterrent and save us significant and expensive administrative time. For repeat offenders, we can ultimately decide if the misdemeanor arrest is more appropriate, but we want to avoid that and believe that this would also reduce those cases. The fines currently have not been a deterrent and we have multiple repeat offenders when it comes to operating ATV's and dirt bikes illegally within the.

This Bill would allow us to more effectively stop ATV riding, also giving us an alternative to arrests, particularly for those young people. Increasing the fine will be a more effective deterrent to help us cut down on arrests and repeat offenses. It will save the city time and money on administrative costs and hopefully keep more people out of the criminal justice system.

I also wanted to touch base on 5313, last year the New Haven Police Department wrote about 10,000 accident reports, there were actually 9,848 accident reports. This report use to be two pages, it now can be as long as eight to then pages which I don't have to tell 'ya how much that costs us and how much time we are tied on up accident reports. It also causes us to be called back into civil situations, sometimes you can't find out who's at fault or who maybe at fault and officers get called back. I remember I was called two years after an accident to be dragged into court to determine fault or not

fault and I couldn't determine that. So this Bill is important to us as well.

And lastly 5317 that Representative Paolillo brought forward, I don't know how that works but I would say definitely anything to save lives we are for. We currently use tourniquets. The idea of tourniquets was to, if an office was involved in a shooting and another office could be a tourniquet on him, but what we've done in the New Have Police Department, we've actually saved several lives of shooting victims upon arrival. With Narcan we also, you know, I run a Narcotic Unit in Investigative Services Division, we may be exposed, we have been exposed with the fentanyl epidemic so this, carrying these would not only be helpful to help the public but also officers help other officers.

In closing I just want to thank Representative Paolillo and Senator Winfield for their efforts toward and thank you for your time.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you, Chief for being here, really appreciate it. Just quick question on 5313 AN ACT CONCERNING POLICE REPORTS OF MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS. I know in years past there's been an expansion of the PR1 which I'm sure you're familiar with, they got a lot longer and I work for a 911 Center, I am a civilian but I work with a lot of police officers who spend a lot of time documenting motor vehicle accident reports, they go inside, do the reports, they do it from the car, they become unavailable. Do you envision this taking up more time or how do you address that concern?

KARL JACOBSON: Well I believe a shorter form will take less time. I also believe that when they're looking for us to make resolutions to civil disagreements, right with the accidents. Sometimes its not clear. We need to respond, take an enforcement action and then move on so to speak. And definitely I was emailed an accident report today, it was 12 pages. That is just way to long and that is electronically where back when I started with New Haven we wrote the reports, the PRs and that was on two pages but you had so many category boxes you had to fill out, literally took you and hour and a half cause you had to match up the box with the title and it was very difficult.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): And now I know they have you drawing pictures and diagrams and charts and using all sort of functions. But thank you very much for taking the time. I do appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH): Thank you, Representative. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Thank you. I'm gonna comment on the accident reports to because Officers in the Department in the town where I live have showed me how long it takes and it is all on computer and you're right, it can be eight to twelve pages long. It takes a long time to do and for an officer to stand on the side of the road for anywhere up to half an hour trying to get all the data and everything put in, that is a long time. And I think shortening it would help everybody. So thank you.

KARL JACOBSON: Yes, I'm glad I made Chief so I don't have to write them [Laughter]. I also don't

want to make our people do what we don't want to do. You know, we want to make it better for them.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): I agree.

REP. POLLETTA (68TH): Any other questions? Representative Fusco.

REP. FUSCO (81ST): Where are all these reports going and, you know, is there something being done with this new information that you're getting with these 12 page reports that's being put to good use?

KARL JACOBSON: So I believe a lot of the information goes to DMV. One of my other colleagues Lieutenant Renkowitz will speak more about this. It's been years of just, we need this statistic, we need that statistic, we need to. And I know the thought is to make highways and roadways safer I believe but yeah, we do forward the information. The information is sent to DMV, Highway Safety that type of thing.

REP. FUSCO (81ST): So as far as you're concerned somebody else is using it, not you right?

KARL JACOBSON: Absolutely.

REP. FUSCO (81ST): It's not getting correlated and being brought back to you?

KARL JACOBSON: No.

REP. FUSCO (81ST): Okay, thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Any other questions? Chief, can you just talk about, you mentioned the 12 page report you received today. On average what are your officers telling you, is it an hour that it takes for them to fill out this report, is it 45 minutes?

KARL JACOBSON: Yeah, it depends on the severity of the accident and also, you know, you might have a two car accident but ten people, five in each car. Now you're filling out page, after page, after page of who it was, were they injured. It's just not a streamline system. It's not an easy system.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): So you mentioned New Haven handled about 10,000 accidents. Just give us an idea of about how many calls per service at a Department like New Haven handles on a 12 month period.

KARL JACOBSON: Woo! Well I know we pull about 70,000 case numbers so that is 70,000 reports. Its' got to be a lot more than that. I apologize, I don't have that number, but its gotta be 200,000 calls easy.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): And the reason I ask, you're having officers out writing these reports and there's calls for service that are holding for them or residents are waiting a little bit longer for those calls for service to be answered.

KARL JACOBSON: Absolutely. Absolutely and, you know, a call might come in as a minor disturbance but we don't really know what it is till we get there so it's important to free these officers up and get 'em to the call.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): So if on average it is 45 minutes to an hour, when you first started with the two pages going back to that period of time, how long did it take to complete a two page report that had all that relevant information for an accident?

KARL JACOBSON: Probably 15-20 minutes tops.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Just to shift gears, you opened up with the ATVs and can you just talk about obviously with the very mild winter, what a usual weekend might look like with ATV riders in the city, what some of the threats to residents, and to officers, and to pedestrians and to folks that are out on the road on a daily basis?

KARL JACOBSON: Yes, so sometimes we, with the weather we won't have a start in ATV and illegal dirt bike riding until later in the year but it started already. I know that I had a call last night there was 12 to 15, a pack of 12 to 15 riding the neighborhoods. The issue is they are not operating, their whole thrill is to try to get us to chase them which we won't do, to drive recklessly We even have numerous incidents where they will circle cops if the cop is alone in a car and kick the car and try to get 'em to pursue. It just makes the whole situation far more dangerous and harder to do.

The reason we like the fines is obviously if someone kicks our car we are gonna arrest 'em. But we like the fines too so a large pack, if we can identify 30 people in that pack and write tickets instead of and try to get that deterrent that way. Not this particular Bill but there's other Bills that allow us to cease the bike, that's been helpful. We are introducing something in New Haven where we want to find gas stations that serve illegal dirt bikes and ATVs gas. You know, we need to do better. We need to do more but it's a very difficult task.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Chief. Any other questions? I want to take the opportunity just to recognize your work in the City and your ascension

in the Department and a lot of the leads you've taken on investigations over the years, narcotics enforcement and other enforcements so, thank you for being here today and thank you for taking the time to speak on these issues. We definitely appreciate your dedication.

I'd also like to take the opportunity to recognize our Chief of Capital Police, retired New Haven Assistant Luiz Casanova as we have a New Haven contingent here today. Thank you, Chief for stopping in. We are gonna jump back to the public list, next up Ted Schroll. Good Afternoon.

TED SCHROLL: Good Afternoon. I apologize in my haste to get this in, I didn't put a greeting at the top of my written testimony but this is to the Members of Public Safety Committee.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): That will do, that's perfect.

TED SCHROLL: Okay. My name is Ted Schroll and I am the Legislative Representative of the Connecticut State Firefighters Association. The Connecticut State Firefighters Association is made up of more than 22,000 career and volunteer firefighters. We were incorporated by a special Act of this legislature in 1885 and we appreciate the opportunity to testify on several bills on today's Public Hearing Agenda. I have nine Bills to testify on, very few that I have some extra comments. I assume you would have my testimony in front of you.

First Bill is Senate Bill 265 AN ACT CONCERNING REIMBURSEMENT OF FIREFIGHTER TRAINING COSTS and we support the Bill. It allows the municipality to recoup their lost monies on training firefighters if

they move from one department to another within two years.

Second Bill is Senate Bill 266 AN ACT CONCERNING BODY ARMOR FOR FIREFIGHTERS AND EMS PERSONNEL. In deference to Senator Minor, I must say I'm speaking only for the Fire Service and this Bill I realize that the EMS services have been speaking to this for quite a few years but in getting my information from the Career Fire Chiefs Association and Fire Chiefs in the State you can see my written testimony and a couple of more notes. If I may and once again mention that the Fire Service does not oppose the use of body armor. In my 40 years in fire service I was not EMS oriented, so I can feel the pain but I don't feel the pain in a way.

However, Fire Departments is like a paramilitary organization. Fire Chiefs have expressed that if a department decides to use body armor, they will initiate a rigorous department wide program with an authorized training program and system wide SOPs. Fire departments frown on lone wolf activity and self-dispatching of their personnel. And we don't want to encourage individual firefighters to procure these devices in that vein. Body armor should be custom fitted to each individual and certain types of body armor are specific for selected use. Specifically my understanding is since some body armor is used for bullets and a different type of body armor is used for knives. Allowing the individual firefighters to purchase and use personal body armor could lead to a false sense of security and injury and specifically back to my written remarks, Section 2 of the Bill we would definitely like to have deleted. I spoke before to Representative Verrengia to outfit all pieces of

fire apparatus in the State with body armor which the Bill apparently, my understanding says it requires that it be done. It would be quite cumbersome and quite expensive to have body armor sitting sometimes on some pieces of apparatus floor and sometimes maybe depending on the equipment would be months at a time before they go out. It would just be sitting there.

Senate Bill 270 AN ACT REQUIRING POLICE OFFICERS AND VEHICLES WITH BLUE LIGHTS TO BE STATIONED IN CERTAIN HIGHWAY WORK ZONES. My testimony hopefully reads to what we're proposing. Firefighters back in the 1950s were assigned the blue light as an identifier for volunteer firefighters. State Police have started over a period of time using a combination of red and blue lights. According to this Bill it mentions placing a vehicle with a blue light at construction zone or some type of police activity. We understand the need for distinguishing warning systems for all highway work zones including police activity, fire service activity and designated highway construction work zones.

We would just suggest we keep with the pattern that is in use now. When you put a vehicle out there or a police officer out at a construction zone they will continue using the blue/red combination and leave the blue light to volunteer fighters. The public realizes what the difference is and over a period of time they understand it and are better off. Sorry, I'm running over my time.

House Bill 5285 we support the Bill. Unless you have any questions, 5286 we support the Bill, 5312 we support that Bill warranties to police, fire and other municipal vehicles. Back in 1999 our group

helped to pass legislation State Statue 42-355 which is mentioned in the current legislation, we would just like to be sure that the last paragraph in that proposed legislation stays in. We want to be sure 42-355 stays a good statute in Connecticut.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you.

TED SCHROLL: SB 5318 Study on Technology we support that, 5329 we support that, 5321 we support that Bill.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): I think you've covered our whole agenda today [Laughter]. Thank you for your testimony. I had a chance to review a lot of your testimony already. Questions from Committee Members, from colleagues? Thank you for taking your time today, appreciate it. Have a good day. Next up, going back to the public officials list, Scott Jackson, Chief Operating Officer or Chief Administrative Officer for the City of New Haven.

SCOTT JACKSON: Mr. Chairman, Members of the Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify. My name is Scott Jackson and I was confirmed as Chief Administrative Officer for the City of New Haven on Monday night, so I have a very long tenure.

I am here really to support our Guardian Service in the City of New Haven. The way the City is structured Guardian and Protective Services report up through the Chief Administrative Officer. We have exceptional Guardians who are visionary, who are good, who are great, some of them go onto greater things still and they also are endowed with great humor as you heard from Chief Jacobson. I am here today to support them. Their review of the legislation brought out some critical items and so I

am really here to support those experts. So I am going to speak in support of HB 5312, HB 5316, HB 5313, HB 5317 and SB 265 with some adjustments.

First HB 5312 is essentially a municipal lemon law like ones passed unanimously in both New York and New Jersey. This would simply include municipal vehicles alongside existing motor vehicles in insuring that just like everyone else, the taxpayer is not on the hook when someone sells a municipality a faulty piece of apparatus, apparatus that is intended to save lives, preserve property and establish great places for our families.

HB 5316 as Chief Jacobson remarked on is legislation that would increase the fine for individuals operating ATVs or dirt bikes in violation of municipal codes.

HB 5313 would reduce the time our officers are spending on accident repot paperwork as was discussed. It is critical particularly in a City like New Haven that officers are available to respond to calls, that is the number one priority and so making effort to reduce the paperwork while still performing the necessary public service of accident reporting we support this Bill.

HB 5317 that would direct the Department of Administrative Services to purchase an opioid antagonist such as Narcan or naloxone to be carried by our police officers, we think that this is an important piece of, in combating the opioid crisis and would allow officers to carry and administer a life-saving tool when they arrive first on the scene of an overdose. Saving lives is the duty of everyone who wears a badge and we want to make sure this opportunity is available.

The City is also in support of SB 265 but I want to emphasize that this would reimburse communities if an officer who goes through a training, a fire office goes through training and then leaves for another job that city would be reimbursed but we believe that the 50 percent rate would be better for the city in terms of maintaining a well trained force.

Each of these measures plays an important role in keeping our community safe and doing it in a more cost efficient, cost affective way that reduces the burden on our taxpayers. I want to thank Representative Paolillo and Senator Winfield for everything that they do for this State and the City every day and thank you for your time as members of this very important Committee. Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Mr. Jackson. I was going to say Commissioner Jackson but CAO fits now. Representative Fusco.

REP. FUSCO (81ST): Thank you, Mr. Chair. So in 5312 the Act Concerning Warranties, I mean I would have thought that lemon laws were designed to follow the vehicle. How, or I guess why is. How are municipalities current exempt from that status?

SCOTT JACKSON: The way that the Statue was originally crafted, municipalities were not covered.

REP. FUSCO (81ST): So simply stated in Statute that they are not covered.

SCOTT JACKSON: So this is really a correction that we think is just a very logical correction, perhaps a drafting error or some other type of item when it was originally drafted.

REP. FUSCO (81ST): Thank you for that answer. Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Representative Verrengia.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Good Afternoon. I'm just curious, the lemon law has been around for a longtime and this is the first I've heard of this proposal, this sort and was it triggered by something. What brought this to light to the extent there is a problem?

SCOTT JACKSON: Certainly this is my 27th year in government including time dealing in issues of consumer protection and this is the first I've heard of it too. So obviously there was a trigger somewhere but I could not identify that for you, sir.

REP. VERRENGIA (20TH): Okay, fair enough. Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): And I know we have our Fire Chief from New Haven, Chief Austin who maybe can speak on this a little later. Any other questions from colleagues? Mr. Jackson, thank you as always and thank you for your new role in New Haven and the work that you've already done in our City. Going back to the public list, Kyle Zimmer.

KYLE ZIMMER: Good Afternoon. I'd like to thank the Public Safety and Security Committee for hearing my testimony this afternoon. My name is Kyle Zimmer, I am the Health and Safety Director of the International Union of Operating Engineers Local 478. Local 478 represents over 3,000 working men and women in a construction industry working on building projects and more importantly today on highway projects.

IUOE 478 supports this Bill cause many work zones on Connecticut Interstate Highways are not as safe as they need to be. Yesterday traveling from Hamden to Groton I proceed to go 91 South to 95 North. There is a lot of construction on 95 North and in two instances traffic came to a screeching halt and if you look in your rearview mirror in those instances you see the chain reaction and cars starting to go all over. This is because of two things, inadequate speed control and distracted driving.

It is very important that we look at what is going on, on the roadways in the State of Connecticut and in the country. With the new vehicles that are out there semiautonomous, with distracted driving, with the information that the drivers are processing it creates hazards. Now this was ten o'clock in the morning, great day, nice and sunny and those two incidents happened almost causing accidents.

Fast forward to the evening when our brothers and sisters are out there doing paving projects, drainage projects, doing what's needed to improve the infrastructure and stuff happens. These incidents escalate, distracted driving escalates and we are having accidents at an alarming rate. We see it all the time. Twelve Hundred sixty-nine road construction worker deaths occurred at construction sites between 2003 and 2016. Over 1,000 families were impacted by deaths that could have been prevented. Virginia, Texas, South Dakota, Illinois and Minnesota have done studies on the effectiveness of police presence at construction sites and found that just flashing lights alone were enough for drivers to reduce their speed by five to ten miles per hour, many of which brough their speeds under the posted speed limits.

You know, the Connecticut Department of Transportation, our employers, Toll Con for one and ONG Industries, CCIA Connecticut Construction Institute Association which you will hear from and the local unions do a great job promoting driver safety, getting on campaigns and trying to slow the public down. That is not enough. You can only read so many billboards, flashing billboards saying, "Give 'em a Brake", "Work Zone Ahead" and yet the cars are still going through 8o to 90 miles an hour.

Now you are sitting here at a desk which is probably 36 to 40 inches high, envision yourself working on this side of the desk with a tractor-trailer going 80 miles an hour on the other side of that barrier. How comfortable are you gonna be in that scenario.

We need to do something more to slow these people down. People are getting killed. We all face many dangers on the job and if some of these dangers can be alleviated and lives saved by simply having police presence at the construction site then it is paramount that you folks pass this Bill. With that, thank you very much for hearing my testimony.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you. Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Hey, Kyle. Thanks for coming up and testifying. I have a question, so you are really representing the construction aspect, correct.

KYLE ZIMMER: Correct.

REP. MORIN (28TH): In the original language of the Bill it does mentioned maintenance operations as well. Would you be in support if this Bill was

amended, well the intent is for all people who work on the roads correct?

KYLE ZIMMER: Right.

REP. MORIN (28TH): Not just construction workers but DOT maintainers correct?

KYLE ZIMMER: Absolutely.

REP. MORIN (28TH): And I guess and maybe you can answer, if you can't, well get the answer 100 years ago when I worked for the Department it was pretty much built in construction projects that there was gonna be safety personnel on the jobs. Is that changed in the last few years?

KYLE ZIMMER: I think I'll defer that answer to Don Schubert.

REP. MORIN (28TH): Okay, I'd love to grill Don. I intended to grill him, I wanted to be nice to you [Laughter]. So I guess I'll leave it at that.

KYLE ZIMMER: Absolutely [Cross-talking].

REP. MORIN (28TH): Organized labor as part of the unions you would not have a problem if we made sure that this was inclusive to all?

KYLE ZIMMER: Absolutely not.

REP. MORIN (28TH): Because we have put forth in Transportation, and we had a Public Hearing on a Bill cause the maintainers get virtually nothing, there is virtually never any blue on their projects and on the limited access highways and we put forth a plan to consider having cameras on-site in lieu of that because we never seem to get troopers, had some resistance, had some support. It's certainly geared towards maintenance operations, it's not the ideal

fix but it's a fix for a problem that is really existing.

KYLE ZIMMER: Tragedy last week up in Union.

REP. MORIN (28TH): Yeah, twice. Twice within a couple of days, out of control trash trucks were hit and it's time, it's time we give the troopers more time in these zones to actually take care of people that are driving doing this because that is what I see. I was just driving up here from a work meeting in Wallingford and on 91 the Charter Oaks Bridge Project, exactly what you said, behind a Jersey barrier, you have men and women standing there and I, just as I'm drivin by you can see the people not even paying attention.

KYLE ZIMMER: I would invite any members of this Committee if you would like to go on a field trip with me, we'll take 'ya to a construction site and show you what its like, it's incredible.

REP. MORIN (28TH): I have proposed that in the transportation Committee every year since I've been here, this is my 14th year here and I have been on that Committee and I have never been taken up on it, but it's frankly somewhat tongue in cheek but I am tired of being tongue in cheek. The men and women that perform the operations on the state highways are treated like second class citizens and it is about time we give people some teeth to stop it. So I will support you 100 percent and we need to, I'm really looking forward to hearing from Don. Thank you, Kyle.

KYLE ZIMMER: And you're gonna hear from some of our brothers and sisters that actually run equipment and paving projects at night on the highway. It's hard

enough to do the job and then put the stress on whether or not you're gonna go home or not is a big burden to carry and we want everybody to go home safe.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions? Sir, thank you for your testimony today. Next up, the Fire Chief from the City of New Haven, Chief John Alston.

CHIEF ALSTON: Thank you, Mr. Chair and the Committee, I'll be succinct. I am here to give testimony in support of two items HB 5312 and SB 265.

The question was asked earlier about why no one had every heard about this problem before with warranties with fire apparatus. I am originally from New Jersey where one of those law was crafted. I also became the Fire Chief in the City of New Haven in 2016. In 35 years of service in the fire service, I could not believe the problems that we had with a particular piece of equipment nor with the problems that we incurred trying to rectify it. A truck was bought in 2013 within a year it had a six month recall. There was no redress for it. Several of the purchasers of this particular type of equipment, nationwide there were six instances where firefighters were injured, where the bucket either failed to operate and they were stuck in an open position and got frostbite or the bucket dropped and failed and they were injured.

And so we are the originators of trying to get this rectified. Many of the municipalities spend anywhere from $150,000 dollars to pay for an ambulance to $1.5 million dollars for a particular piece of equipment like that. We want to protect

the investment, we want to protect the firefighters and the citizens we're sworn to serve.

But before I go any further I do want to thank Representative Paolillo who as supported the New Haven Fire Department since my tenure and before. I saw some other folks that are here, the Board of Fire Commissioners, Alder Gerald Antunes, my boss the CAO who have looked at this problem in a way that we don't want to denigrate and we don't want to disparage any of the apparatus builders. For the most part they build tremendous pieces of equipment for us and allow us to do a job that is pretty dangerous. But every now and then you're gonna get a piece of equipment that is defective and there is no redress. So in support of this we're just looking at possibly any major malfunction, any failure or defect in the manufacturing of it within possibly the first 24 months or 24,000 miles that the municipalities have someway of either recouping their monies, the piece being replaced with a comparable piece or that we have some teeth when we go through litigation.

SB 265 is for us to attempt to recoup some of the monies that are spent training firefighters. It costs anywhere from $10,000 dollars to $15,000 dollars to train a firefighters to the level of Firefighter II which is the state requirement and EMT when the jobs like New Haven Cities require that. Many times what happens is we train those people and within a year to two years they are approached and they are taken by other departments because other departments may be able to offer them a better health benefits package or retirement package and I don't deny them the access to do that. But what do we do now. If it takes me $15,000

dollars to train someone, they leave and now I have to replace them and spend another $15,000 dollars. It is not fair to the City and it is not fair to the departments as well because now we've lost that person.

So we would look for you to support that as well. That's it.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Chief. If I could start, what was the initial outlay on this apparatus.

CHIEF ALSTON: $1.1 million dollars.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): And that was in 2013.

CHIEF ALSTON: It was in 2013 and it was out of service more than 50 percent of the time. There is a standard, the National Fire Protection Association says that when any of these pieces are built, they should be in service 90 percent of the time. So it was well below the national average with the amount of money we expended towards it.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): And how much in terms of repairs and the like on top of the initial purchase have we expended or has the City expended for that apparatus?

CHIEF ALSTON: Well so I did not bring the exact numbers because I can tell you this, the data on the maintenance and repair for that truck was so large it exceeded 100 pages, we had to transfer it to each other with a thumb drive, we couldn't even email each other. So it is not only the time out, and I'm glad you talked about the time with the mechanics, the time out of service, the time in changing over from one piece to another. I believe you'll

remember we had to borrow a truck from the City of Hartford because they had the same specific type of truck that we had.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): So just in terms of just for the layperson what type of apparatus?

CHIEF ALSTON: This would be a bucket truck. So that's the other thing. When we design these pieces, when we specify these pieces, every community specifies a very particular truck based on their housing stock, and response and the crew level. So each one of these are custom built and that varies in prices. But this particular truck is the only one of its type in the City of New Haven because of where its located in downtown New Haven. It is a bucket platform truck 95 feet. I am being very careful not to mention the name of the company because they do great work. We just want to make sure when that work is found to be deficient that we have some recourse or redress.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): So is it safe to say that the City of New Haven probably had an outlay of double the initial cost?

CHIEF ALSTON: I wouldn't say a million but I'd say pretty close to about $200,000 dollars over that amount of time. If you count in the time, the labor and also third party aftermarket and after warranty.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Yeah, okay. And is that piece of apparatus still in service or?

CHIEF ALSTON: It is now. It took that company six visits to the City of New Haven to finally get that piece right.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Over what period of time?

CHIEF ALSTON: Six to seven months. I didn't want to waste time what the excuses were. Some of them that we applied the wrong grease. Some of them were that the third party manufacturer that did the warranty put the parts in wrong. There are several reasons but the bottom line the City of New Haven was without that truck for a major portion of my three years here.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): And that truck serving downtown is serving a lot of folks around the university, visitors to the town, employees to the town.

CHIEF ALSTON: That one is actually designed because of the high rises downtown specifically for that neighborhood and that jurisdiction, yes sir.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Any other questions? Representative Fusco.

REP. FUSCO (81ST): Thank you. Thank you, Chief for your testimony. So I am sure you had cause for response for the vehicle for situations down in your city so what happened in those instances where it wasn't available. What was the outcome?

CHIEF ALSTON: We had to use a different truck at times but then when we also had to take another truck out of service, we only have four frontline ladder trucks and that's what they are really called, ladder trucks. This particular piece was a bucket truck. We had a spare but that spare became unbailable so what we ended up happening was using a different truck in that house which causes us to change our method of response and operation.

REP. FUSCO (81ST): Sure someone else is without that too. How long do they typically, meant to

last? Of course all municipal vehicles are different but in terms of that piece of equipment what is the longevity?

CHIEF ALSTON: The longest time the PA standard was 10 years on engines, 15 years on trucks but what they ended up finding out was they had to go to use now, the number of hours, engine hours, pump hours because you may have a community that doesn't respond 31,000 calls like the City of New Haven why would you set a standard, and it's not regulatory, the NFPA The National Fire Protection Association is a consensus standard organization. But they set best practices for our profession. They have allowed you to go like volunteer organizations or slower communities to 15 years and 20 years as long as you maintained that particular vehicle.

But our investment in an urban city like New Haven with the number of runs that we make, as the New Chief I set a standard that we would not go beyond 10 years on an engine, 14 years on a truck, 15 years on a truck. But we're finding out that we're gonna have to push that a little because when you lose that piece you start running out of spares.

REP. FUSCO (81ST): That's right. Thank you for that answer, appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions? I know we heard from other departments before and I just want to commend the work that the men and women of the New Haven Fire Department standout work everyday in our City and thank you for your leadership and for your guidance. And thank you for being here today, Chief.

CHIEF ALSTON: Thank you, sir and thank you for your service to us that allow us to do the things we do and I will relay that to the members of New Haven Fire Department which you know most of.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Taking some direction from the Chair here, there is four folks from Tilcon that believe were going to ask to come up together and I have Michael Woodin, Wilson Annette, Ronald Foster and Marcus Stevenson. I think that clears half the room right now, [Laughter] but thank you for being here and I know the Chair worked on that before and I'm looking at his arrow so I think I have everyone. Good Afternoon, thank you for being here today and thank you for agreeing to come up together. Would you like to begin?

MICHAEL WOODIN: Yes, Good Afternoon everybody. Thank you Committee Members for having us here to discuss the blue light Bill. My name is Michael Woodin, the Safety Director of Tilcon CT. I worked as a Safety Director for 22 years.

Our biggest challenge by far is our biggest focus I should say is the safety and health of our employees at our company. Our biggest challenge is focusing on that subject with all our highway workers, that is paving, construction and milling teams. So you have to understand Kyle did a really good job of describing sort of their work environment, their office. What he didn't tell you though was, you if I reach out I could touch a vehicle but that vehicle at night could be a 70,000 pound tractor-trailer.

So our first line of defense, the end best line of defense is the State Police positioned at the beginning of the job. If vehicles are driving through or approaching a work zone, they see the

blue lights, they put their brakes on, trucks in particular put their brakes on. That means everybody behind them also puts their brakes on and by the time they get to our crews which are out there working on the road they are traveling at a slower speed, a speed that we can sorta accept. But you have to realize every night that these workers, I'll give them time to speak, go out and work out there they're nervous. I mean we have safety training every year, multiple times during the year but it is really hard for them to focus on all those things they learned when there head is on a swivel and they are trying to look all around them, be aware of the conditions at night with all the issues that entails. So, I'll let somebody else speak.

ANNETTE WILSON: Thank you members of the Committee, I have worked for Tilcon for over 41 years and I have run a roller for 40. You can find me many nights on a roller in Connecticut on the highways. At night is the scariest time to work. I worry every time I leave my house that maybe it will be the last time I see my family. Have you ever sat on the side of I-84 or I-95 to watch and feel what it is like to cars, trucks and tractor-trailers fly by you at a high rate of speed. I can tell you it is very scary.

Do you realize how vulnerable every worker is out there doing their part to make improvements to the Connecticut roadways. Blue lights are also a first line of defense. They alert drivers, those on cell phones, eating, dozing off to the reality that they are coming up on a work zone. We need blue lights to help our trucks get safely in and out of our work pattern, to escort our machines safely on and off

our road and to alert our workers when something could cause us danger.

I am an experienced worker, I take precautions to protect myself by sitting where I can face traffic, I position my roller to give a much protection to my crew members as possible as their backs are to oncoming traffic. However alert drivers and advanced notice are the best protection we can ask for. We can only get that from blue lights. I invite you to spend one night with me on my roller and I'm sure you will agree mor blue lights are needed. I along with all workers on out Connecticut highways want to be able to go home to our families. I want to see my child walk down the aisle, I want to see my grandchildren grow up and I don't think that's too much to ask for. So please provide the protection, please make it possible to have blue lights on our job sites at all times so that we can get home safe and healthy to our families.

REGINALD FOSTER: Good Afternoon, thank you for having me. My name is Reginald Foster. I am a Labor Steward for Tilcon CT and a traffic control supervisor. I've worked for Tilcon for 20 years.

There are nearly 800 fatalities per year in the work zone throughout the nation, that's about a little over 200 is due to speed. The state police play a vital role in our job as far as safety. They're our first and only line of defense along with our crash protection when I'm setting up an traffic control pattern. With their assistance I'm able to completely shut down major highways such as 84, 91, and 95. This allows my coworkers and myself to set up our work zones.

I've witnessed wrong way drivers, drunk drivers, and high speed pursuits while working on the highway. The state police are very much needed on our road jobs for everyone's safety. Thank you. Thank you for having me.

MARCUS STEVENSON: Good Afternoon everyone, my names is Marcus Stevenson. I've been will Tilcon 34 years and out of the 34 years, 31 of them has been working in the work zones. I just want to reiterate what Reggie has said, what Karl has said, Mike has said and Annette has said, and I really appreciate you two Representative Morin because it was very nice to hear someone cares sincerely about the worker in these work zones. Construction Laborer for

One thing that we're trying to do here because the title of this is called Raised Bill 270, we want to raise the standard and the only way we can do that is by havin our officers in this patterns. Since 1984 I've been working with the State Police , of course we would with municipalities and town officers but when we are on these work zones on these highways they are very extremely dangerous. I've seen four fatals since I've been doin this business here. I know that a lot of companies may choose to go out without the assistance of the State Police and disasters happen. We don't want that to happen and, you know, we just like what happened in Union a week ago. What about last year? We had DOT officers get hit then too. So if we're not gonna take a stand, we gotta take a stand somewhere and I think and believe this is truly a good format, this is a good platform not only to talk about it but do something about it. And when you have the tenure in this business doing this that I have, that is why I'm so passionate about it because I've did probably

more work hours in my company, for my company than probably anyone else. I've had a chance to make a lot of relationships of course with a lot of offices and it makes a difference.

First of all I just want to say if something happens in the work zone, we take the liability to do out there on our own, who are we gonna call? We can't call each other. We have to call the blue lights. So that's why this Bill to me is extremely, extremely important and I would just love, of course, for everyone here listenin would consider that and then as it was said already then if you really want to understand the atmosphere we're in, what we're involved with come out there to any of these work zones that we're in. We will love to have you because that way sometimes you don't understand how the horse is until you get your butt on it and got to ride it. So that's what I would say to anyone here. And thank you very much for your time, we appreciate it.

MICHAEL WOODIN: I'll close by saying there was 35 jobs last year that we didn't go out because there was no blue lights out there, 35 times. So it really is important for us. Marcus did a great job, everybody here did a great job in summarizing the importance of this. They are the ones out on the frontline, I'm not. So you gotta listen to them. It really is important. Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you. We are certainly listening and thank you for your heartfelt testimony. Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you all for coming here. I think the important thing for everyone to hear is it is really great to

hear from people that actually do the work. We respect the lobbying organizations and the labor people, the officers that come out. We get it and that's their job and they do it well. But it is always powerful to hear from the men and women that actually do the work because you can look me in the eye and tell me what's happened. My dad was a Teamster for many, many years, he is no longer with us but he worked for Savin Brothers for those guys that have been around for a little bit, he worked for Balth [Phonetic], he ended his career at Tilcon, always working, I remember my dad working on highway projects. Every time we drove somewhere he'd never cease to tell me that he worked on this 20 years ago and here we are workin on it again. So I appreciate what you do.

You did say though and I really wasn't aware of this that if there is not a blue light on a project you guys won't go out or can make a choice not to and what is the cost to the State to cancel a night out at work?

MICHAEL WOODIN: So that is on a highway project. We will not go out, we will not allow our employees to go out on the job and these guys can speak about the effects of that if they are going to miss a night's pay.

RONALD FOSTER: We choose to miss a night's pay because we understand how important it is to have the blue lights out there, that's why our company initiated that policy. At first some of the guys didn't like it because they were missin a day's pay but to me is way more valuable to miss a day's pay then to take the chance to go out there and the negative happens. When you see the negative like

I've seen it then you don't want to go home and have to get that knock on the door that your loved one is not comin back. Our business is already dangerous enough as it is and so we just enhance it when we take chances and that is what we're doing. This is what we don't wan to do. We've been around this structure, in this environment long enough to realize now that when you come into an arena like this here, you don't want to take no chances. You want to do the right thing. The right thing has a price with it but so does the wrong thing. So I would say do the right thing.

MICHAEL WOODIN: I was gonna say, I hate to talk about the financial side of things and Marcus covered that because that's not what it is about.

REP. MORIN (28TH): But it kinda is right, because you guys, men and women lose money at some point and now the company, how does that and if you can't answer it, maybe Don will have the answer or someone else. So you're working on 91 and you are made aware that there will not be a Trooper on the project so you make the decision, the company makes the decision not to send their people out. Where does the responsibility, cause you have a contract to get a job done in "x" amount of days so how does that work? If you don't know that's okay.

MICHAEL WOODIN: I'm not gonna talk about specifics and maybe Don can. You know, there is the indirect cost associated when the job gets delayed, you have work zones that are still open longer than they should be so there is potential issues for the traveling public. I mean we don't want, we want to complete roads as timely as possible for the contracts so we don't want to leave those delay and

sometimes, you know, that could be a potential issue especially if you get bad weather, have a short season all sorts of issues that can go with that as well, so. But again it's what everybody has talked about here. It's their personal safety, it's the safety of traveling public and, you know, outside of seeing some of these tragic events, I do not want to go through those again, that's what we don't want to do.

REP. MORIN (28TH): And I don't want you to go through them again either.

MICHAEL WOODIN: We have to, you know, have this Bill passed, another reason, this is not about Tilcon either. This is for all of us. I mean earlier I heard the firemen talking about how they would like to have the blue lights also. We talked about the DOT that they need them in their existing patterns also, their work zones. So this is for all of us so that's why we are here for. I'm representing all workers that gotta go in these work zones no matter what time of the day.

REP. MORIN (28TH): And I appreciate that sentiment because often times, and not through any fault of anybody but I think we become parochial, we are with our own. So the DOT maintenance workers feel like they are in one place, your folks kinda feel like they are in one place, lets forget the one places and put everyone in the same, in the same ballpark that your lives are equally as important and its something that the State has to recognize that the safety of the people, the men and the women are in between those Jersey barriers that are two or three feet next to those cones, regardless of what uniform you work or who signs your check we got to pay

attention to this. So I appreciate all of you coming up. Thank you.

MICHAEL WOODIN: We all do the same work and all have the same, so.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Representative. Representative Hayes.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you guys for being here, I appreciate it. I had the responsibility in my past career of assigning police officers out to construction jobs, obviously not out on the highway but it was a municipality. I do have to agree with you starting off that the red and blue flashing lights draw a lot more attention than just a truck on the side of the road with some lights flashing. So I will agree with you there.

Often times so we have the people from the community come in and complain about a police officer sitting on the side of the road in his car at a construction site. They would feel a lot better when I explained to them that the contractor was paying for the police officer and not the town. So I guess that is my question to start. Is that the same scenario if your work, if your company is working as a contractor on 84 or 95 is the company paying for the police officer to be there or is the State?

MICHAEL WOODIN: We're gonna let Don speak on that.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Excuse me, one moment. I am going to ask Don Schubert to come up to join. There's been a couple of questions and I think we can have this conversation and. Please.

DON SHUBERT: Thank you, Mr. Chair. My name is Don Shubert. I am the President of The Connecticut

Construction Industries Association. I'd just like to make a couple of quick comments before we get started.

We support this bill basically because as you've heard blue lights are important to us on highways. We all, I think we all recognize the fact that cars are getting fasting, travel speeds are increasing, technology in cabs is affecting people's attention while they are driving and in a lot of cases driving is just more aggressive these days on highways. And when you are out there at night, you know, I've been there myself, most people relate amber lights to construction. People relate blue lights to emergency situations. They pay attention more, it wakes them up, it draws their attention. There is an obvious difference.

I think the situation we're talking about here today is a situation where a construction company will hire an asphalt tanker to all asphalt to their asphalt plant. They will have hundred of tons of asphalt up in the silos. They will have trucks lined up at the plant ready to get loaded. They will have people out in the field on the side of the road getting ready to put out a sign pattern and there is no State Trooper and the Connecticut Department of Transportation says because the MUTCD does not directly require State Police you go. Go! And if you need an extra crash truck with these amber lights on it we'll give you one. Go! And companies will say, no thank you. I am taking a financial loss, my employees are takin a hit and we're callin it a night. And I think Mike just told you it happed to Tilcon 35 times this year.

Our contractors would rather shut down and take the financial loss than put their employees and the traveling public at risk. That's why we're here today. We think we need blue lights on highways, the Department disagrees. I have two sections of the MUTCD in my testimony, you can see that. The guidance suggest considering public safety officer with blue lights, and especially at night. We disagree with the Department's interpretation but they stand by that interpretation for one reason, to make the contractor pay the losses. That is the only reason.

CONDOT is probably going to send a fiscal note on this Bill that is astronomical and that is what it costs us every year. So we are encouraging you to pass this Bill and move it forward, require the Department to require blue lights in work zones, especially at night and so that, you know, Marcus said it, all you have to do is have the experience once in your lifetime when somebody doesn't go home. Let me tell 'ya, it takes five years off your life in a minute. So that's our situation. I'd be happy to answer any questions you have.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Representative Hayes had the floor.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Yes, thank you, sir. My question was when your company is doing a job on a state roadway whether it be 95, 84 or any state road is your company paying for the State Police Office to be there or is the State paying for the State Police Officer to be there?

DON SHUBERT: The DOT pays for it. The Department of Transportation pays for the State Police Officer on their projects.

REP. HAYES (51ST): So part of your bidding process is not the payment of the State Police Officer?

"JOE:" No, what we'll do is we'll bid maintenance and traffic protection item, crash trucks and things like that. But ever since the I-84 debacle in Waterbury that time, there was some problem with the State Police being paid through the system that was in place at the time. Right now these contractors will put in a request for the Department of Transportation, the DOT will submit their request to the overtime duty officer at the State Police and then all the trans ad police and the DOT is between them. We've been removed from the process.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay, well quite honestly that answer was surprising to me. If the case was that the State Police notified you that there was not gonna be a trooper there, you decided not to go to work did they tell you why? I mean why wasn't a trooper going to be there?

"JOE": I don't think we ever find out why.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Could it possibly be that they've worked 15 or 16 hours on a patrol shift and they don't have anybody that's fresh enough to be out there?

"JOE": I don't know, you'd have to talk to the State Police on that to get an answer to that.

MICHAEL WOODIN: You know what happens sometimes sir, is that a lot of times with these troopers if, you gotta remember these jobs are already preassigned. This is not a last minute thing. So we're talking about something, that when we go out, like Don was saying, we're ready to go because we're already under the assumption that the trooper that's

assigned for the job, you know, is there. Then of course certain things happen and then there is no trooper. So yes, our company did take it upon themselves to say, well, you know, no trooper, we're not gonna go. But that keeps us safe. This Bill is gonna allow us to have the troopers there, so we don't have these difference scenarios in this situation when we, you know, gotta go on this different work zones, especially in the evening time.

DON SHUBERT: And the contractors have been trying to, you know, instead of makin the decision not to go out, they will call each other and they will ask 'em do you have a trooper I can use to setup my sign pattern, some of them share troopers. If there is another project down the street that they know about, one contractor will use the trooper to set up their sign pattern if the other wants to go, they will share the trooper. They will send him down to set up the other sign pattern and try to manage that way. So it's not like we're not trying to cooperate here, but its that hard line from the department that says because the MUTCD does not directly require a trooper in every sign pattern in all case, you don't need 'em, so we're not paying your losses if you decided not to go out. That's where we're really having a problem.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Well quite honestly I'm glad I asked the questions because now I believe this is gonna force troopers to be out there whether they want to or not. So I appreciate you coming for testimony and thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Representative. Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you all for being here. I do appreciate the work you do out there and often it goes overlooked but thank you. Do you, any of you care what kind of lights are flashing, whether they are State Police or municipal police?

JOE: I don't know if we're in any position to comment on that. I don't know how we can comment on that.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): The reason I ask is that obviously it is for safety and in some towns throughout Connecticut there are the road jobs, right, where you hire an officer to stand-by for safety whether it is tree cutting, whether it is utility work, whether it is road work and some towns have agreements with other towns. So for example, I used to work for Easton Police part-time and if Newtown had 16 road jobs and only 14 of Newtown officers were available to work or wanted to work them, they would hire from surrounding communities and they had agreements to do this. And if Easton had too many road jobs then they would hire, so it was a mutual aid type of agreement. So I know that there would obviously be a massive collective bargaining discussion around this issue but just since we're having this discussion, spit balling a little bit, would it matter to you as a company whether it was a State Police trooper or a Bridgeport Police Officer or a New Haven Police Officer or an Enfield Police Officer or whoever it may be that was protecting you on the side of the road with the same lights protecting the scene?

MICHAEL WOODIN: It would be very hard for us to answer that. We don't know the jurisdictional issues or anything else. What we do know is that a

lot of State Police officers are familiar with working on the highways and they are familiar with, very familiar with what it takes to set up a sign pattern on the highway, how to protect the workers that are on the back of that truck putting the cones out while all the cars are trying to sneak around them. So I think in our mind we don't understand any of the jurisdictional problems, the collective bargaining issues or things like that, that would answer that question. But what we do know is that a State Trooper that is familiar with what it takes to put out a sign pattern on a highway, especially when you're like in a three lane situation and everybody is trying to sneak around you while you're trying to put 'em out, that experience that the bring to the table is very important.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Understood and I'm just trying to come up with some sort of solution to keep you safe while you work and get the projects done without this inefficiency and while there are certainly be jurisdictional issues, I'm sure that the State Police and the unions would also have a big concern with some if not all of it, just throwing it out there as an option because if I was a construction worker, I wouldn't care what the name on the side of the cop car was as long as it was a cop car with a trained police officer that was able to light the way and keep us safe. That would be my opinion but I appreciate you taking the time and obviously we can continue the discussion. So thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions? Thank you very much for your heartfelt testimony today. We support you and the work that you do every day. Next up back on the

public official list, Alder Jerry Antunes from the City of New Haven. Good Afternoon.

ALDERMAN ANTUNES: Good Afternoon Mr. Chair, Co-Chairs, Vice-Chairs and Ranking Officers and Committee members. My name is Gerald Antunes. I am an Alder in the City of New Haven and I serve as the Chair of Dead Bodies Public Safety Committee. I am here today to speak on three Bills that you have on your agenda, 5313, 5315 and 5316. I'd like to thank you for raising the legislation and for the opportunity to be here to speak on these items.

Let me first say that I am in support of these three items that I speak not only for myself but also for my constituents. I will explain my feelings and I will do my best to be brief, I don't want to hear that little alarm go off [Laughter]. Oh, that's bad. So I will try to be brief and keep it down to about seven minutes.

I'll explain my feelings, I'll start numerically with 5313, AN ACT CONCERNING POLICE REPORTS OF MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS. I didn't mention it previously but I served for over 32 years in law enforcement retiring as a Captain in the New Haven Police Department. Now when I was on the street, decades ago, it would take an office about 20 minutes and I think Assistant Chief eluded to this earlier. Take about 20 minutes to do an accident report, simple, front and back and you're done. And that would include writing the report and taking any actions that needed to be taken as far as arrests, infractions, warnings, that sort of thing. Recently I was doing a little research on motor vehicle accidents in my particular district of New Haven and was amazed at the amount of information that was

available, really good. But it peaked my curiosity and wondering how did they get so much information so I asked the lieutenant that works in my district, how long does it take for an officer, does he gather all this information himself, where do they get it from. And he explained as the Assistant Chief said earlier, that two to three hours is what it takes now to do an accident report. When I was out there 20 minutes, half hour, now its two or three hours. I don't know what it's like in your town but the police in my area, my particular area have to cover five mile going from one end of town, North Haven town line to Morris Cove Lighthouse. And we sometimes have three officers covering that area, just one part of town. Now not to mention the office who has to also now assist at the airport, according to FAA Regulations we have to have an officer there on all departures. So that is another officer out of the route. Oh, man times up already? {Laughter].

All right to add a little more to the perspective of our situation, part of the district includes Route 80, that's a road that handles over 37,000 cars, trucks, busses, school busses every day and annually within a 1,300 foot area averages 100 motor vehicle accidents. That's a lot of activity. A lot of accidents to investigate and my opinion it appears that there is a lot of information that a police officer is required to gather that focuses on needs of insurance companies and statistics and very little is needed for the investigation and enforcement. I hope that you will consider reviewing and modifying the needs of this time consuming type of report. We really cannot afford to have officers unavailable to serve the residents

in order to gather statistical information for insurance conglomerates.

If I may continue on, Bill 5315 concerning street racing. As we've seen street racing has changed, type of cars, the type of people and the basic reasons why they're out there. Many times these races are just showing off their cars, there is no money, no bets involved, it's more about bragging rights. The old theory of mine is bigger than yours concept. Let me refer back to Route 80 in New Haven. If you look online you'll see the videos of the activity happening at that very location. The location where an average of 100 motor vehicle accidents a year, 37,000 buses, vehicles of all types travel day0in and day-out. These racers send out notices to all their friends, where and when these races are gonna occur. The races get into the street, stop traffic and conduct their demonstrations of speed. Also they gather in parking lots of local businesses, the *McDonald's* we have there, the *Walmart* and *Lowe's* to put on these displays of spinning their tires, racing their engines and driving recklessly around the parking lot amongst hundreds of spectators. And that is no exaggeration, there are hundreds of spectators. Police officers will support that. The key change this Bill provides is to include demonstrate the persons skill or speed. This I think will help our police officers to be able to enforce the laws and make the streets safer and quieter. I live over a mile away from this location and I can still hear the engines and the squealing tires. So I really feel my constituents who live only a block or two from there and have to put up with it every Friday and Saturday night. And as summer comes on it will

be Wednesdays and Thursday. And if there is an accident well, it'll take more than one office, more than three or fours to complete the reports.

Now Bill 5316, this is the last and maybe I won't hear the Bill go off again [Laugh], thank you. Concerning fines for operations of snowmobiles, ATVs, mini-motorcycles and dirt bikes. New Haven is not the only place where this problem exists but it is the only one I have firsthand knowledge and experience. These vehicles alone are not the problem. It's the people who get a thrill out of doing all kinds of stunts, some cases the bikes are stolen and in most cases they are not even registered. The largest impact of this proposed legislation is the increase in the fines. This may be a step in the right direction but has increasing the fines for not using hands-free devices while driving made any significant impact? The fees have been increased a number of times. It doesn't appear so. Thank you for proposing this change, however. And I certain do support it. However, there are needs, it really needs to have more solutions. And I am sorry I don't have the answer. I wish I did. But I am sure with a little more time and a little more stimulation you can find the best course of action. Maybe for those who have an operators license, suspension is appropriate. Again maybe for those who don't have a license, well I'm sure you'll think of something. Again thank you for giving me this opportunity to voice my feelings and opinions and to represent my constituents in the City of New Haven. Is there any questions I'll do my best to answer.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Are there any questions? Jerry if you could just talk a little bit about you

mentioned the drag racing on Route 80. How many cars on that particular state road pass through on a daily basis.

ALDERMAN ANTUNES: On a daily basis, the numbers come up to, the highest I've got was 39,000 per day but I've seen recently 37,000 maybe it's getting better.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): So they are street racing on a state road that has cars 39,000 total?

ALDERMAN ANTUNES: Yeah, that's on a daily basis. So at night it's certainly gonna be less but we still have the buses, the city buses or State buses and a lot of trucks that come up and down that street. We have gas stations in the local area where they may be getting delivery's in the evening hours.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): As far as constituents you mentioned the level of complaints, the level of concerns is it just from constituents, there's neighborhoods that are bordering that State road, can you just give us an idea of what that neighborhood, that community looks like.

ALDERMAN ANTUNES: On one side of the road is our middle school. Right next to where they start their racing is a hotel, then behind the hotel and middle school of course is our residential neighbors all one and two family homes that have kids. Matter of fact I just requested some signs be put up on the street right behind that for autistic children in that area. Now, yes we don't expect them to be out at one or two in the morning but other people are. It's a state road, it's a busy road, it's the road

that leads from 91 to East Haven, North Branford. It's the way people come in and go out of New Haven.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): And on the first Bill you testified on, the streamlining of the police reports having grown up in the City and knowing your work for 32 years as a standout police officer and supervisor and Captain and watching your work on the Board of Alderman, as the Public Safety Chair for the last 13 years, you've distinguished yourself on both sides of public services, what would you eliminate or what doesn't need to be included in that seven, to ten to twelve page report with your law enforcement experience and still being connected to law enforcement today with your work in New Haven, what would your recommendations be?

ALDERMAN ANTUNES: Well I haven't looked at every column and every box but I looked at many of 'em. Got tired of going through the columns after a while. But you look at some of the ones that want GPS locations. There was one that really surprised me, was there a school bus involved. Well I think if there was a school bus involved that would have been on page one, that would have been one of the first things that are listed there. There is some assumptions that you can make that they ask for specific locations, specific information and they vary. I think I would refer more to Lieutenant Renkowitz who deals with that a lot more closely than I do but when we did, back in the ancient times, when we did police reports on my tour, it was a two sided form. The front side was basically all your location and who was involved. The back for the most part was a narrative and what action you took and that was it. Case closed. How much more do you need to investigate a motor vehicle accident?

Now I'm talking minor motor vehicle accidents, maybe no injuries or minor injuries, a bump on the head, cut on the arm or something like that, not like those where there is a fatality or near fatality. They take a lot more work and you can understand why. But we have to stop doing work for simply gathering information for insurance companies. When you look at some of the numbers, the insurance companies rate zones and New Haven is one of the highest rate zones but when you look at many of the accidents particularly look at Route 80 how many New Haven residents are in accidents there or causing the accident. There are people who are coming from out-of-town, rushing to get to work, rushing to get from point A to point B. Their rates are lower because they live in another town, a small rural town whether it is Gilford or Branford or East Haven but our rates in New Haven where you're familiar with the roads, you know where to go, when to go, rates go up. We're doing all that work for the insurance companies, they charge you enough for insurance, let them send their own investigators out and get their statistical information that they need. We need police information, what happened, maybe who's at fault, was there a violation of the city code or the state laws.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Well said, Captain, Alder, I'm not sure what to call you today but thank you for.

ALDERMAN ANTUNES: Just sign my check.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): That pension check will be deposited I'm sure [Laughter]. Thank you for your continued service on behalf of the residents of the

City and thank you for coming here today. Next up, going back to the public list we have Rob Glasby.

ROB GLASBY: Hello, my name is Robert Glasby. I am the Director of External Affairs for the Connecticut Association of Paramedics and EMTs. I just want to thank the Chairpersons, Ranking Members and esteemed Committee members for the opportunity to come and speak today.

Legislation was passed last year to amend the initial certification and licensure for requirements for all EMS personnel. The amendment required all candidates for initial certification and licensure to complete mental health first aid training course. While CAPE agrees, CAPE is our acronym, with the importance of the material that is now required the delivery and the rollout was what we believe was somewhat flawed and it caused many hardships. CAPE is not interested in eliminating the requirement all together as we stand behind the goal of the legislation. However, he do believe critical changes need to be made.

To start, the current law mandates that all EMS professionals take required training from one single private company as we understand. This has effectively created what we see as a monopoly. No other aspect of training for EMS requires providers to use a specific company.

Second, the current law does not allow, it doesn’t specify any particular curriculum. The private company many offer many different sections as far as the training is concerned. Some may be for EMS and for different age groups. Simply put that is kind of like mandating that somebody get a driver’s

license but there isn't particular curriculum, just didn't really sit well with providers.

Thirdly, the current law creates huge financial burdens for providers, instructors as well as EMS agencies trying to figure out how to pay for that and enroll students has been difficult at best.

Another concern has been the fact that the Connecticut Department of Public Health has no oversight as far as the private company is concerned, the curriculum or who can be instructors. We believe that kinda sets a dangerous precedence. As the governing body of all EMS or Emergency Medical Services personnel in Connecticut, we firmly believe that DPH should have complete oversight in any and all matter concerning EMS. What's the solution? The law needs to be amended to be consistent with the way rollout happens currently.

Currently new educational requirements are vetted through DPH and then discussed at the State level to certify EMS instructors and in turn those EMS instructors are then authorized to educate EMS personnel. Some recent examples are BLS Administration Of Aspirin, 12 Leads and Check And Inject Epinephrine Training. So we are here to assist in anyway possible to kind of clarify some of these issues that are perceived from EMS personnel. We're glad to help. If you have any questions for me, I'll do what I can to answer.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you. Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you, Rob for coming up and waiting to testify. Do you know of any individuals who went through the training?

ROB GLASBY: I have myself.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): So, I should be more specific. EMT training or paramedic training and had to wait and therefor delay their certification because of the availability or of the lack of convenience of the mental health training?

ROB GLASBY: Individually no. I do not know specifically. I do know that it was expressed to me that there were a lot of concerns because there were classes that were gonna be held and there was a rush to enroll some of these students. I'm not sure if any of those classes had to wait or not. I don't have an definitive answers to that.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Gotcha. I've heard of at least two cases where people had to wait several months in order to get their paramedic license.

ROB GLASBY: Correct.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Also the Bill we deal with really removes the mental health training for paramedic licensor mostly because as an EMT you get this training as an EMT, it in regulations now which I know we need to tweak anyway but this would require that paramedics do not take that class because, as a paramedic you have taken the EMT class which means you've got the mental health. So can you speak to the duplicative nature of the way it's written?

ROB GLASBY: Well it's somewhat redundant, you know, because we have been exposed to some of the information that was reiterated in the Mental Health First Aid Training.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): And I also think it is important to note that this in now way is saying that you're gonna receive less training in mental health awareness, it's not going to take away any care of training you received in regard to mental health patients, it's just a different way of receiving their training which when I took my EMT class back in 1995, was very limited, very limited and it's come a long way and I'm glad it has. We just need to make sure that we work with the EMS community to make sure that this is something that is helpful and is not a roadblock to your certifications and licensing. So Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you. Any other questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony. Next up is Representative Buckbee.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH): Apparently is the bald-bearded portion of the day, right [Laughter]? It's a good look. I thank the Public Safety Committee for giving us a few moments. I'm Bill Buckbee from New Milford and with me are two constituents from New Milford, Tony and Tracey Morrissey who will speak, I will be yielding some time to. We are here specifically for 5318 today.

As Tony will speak more to, it's something that we've been developing as far as the utilization of technology that we should be using to track information from our first responders and again I'll let Tony get more into that to discuss exactly how we're gonna work into that and come back to me for any questions as we continue later on.

TONY MORRISSEY: Good Afternoon, my name is Anthony Morrissey of New Milford. My wife Tracey is here

with me today. I want to thank everybody in this room for looking at, you know, any matter that is gonna help us with the opioid epidemic.

My wife Tracey and I lost our son, Brian Cody Waldron in August 2019. Our new plight is along with our growing coalition of your constituents to bring a fresh approach and new ideas to our battle. We can no longer stand the loss in the numbers that we have over the last several years, like last year was a record you as you all well know so we commend you for your time and commitment and compassion on this topic.

We are here to talk specifically about two Bills today, one that we just learned about as we came into the room HB 5317 and HB 5318. I'll start with 5318 if I may. IN the days after our son, after losing our son, we met with Mr. Buckbee who corralled the troops in our hometown of beautiful New Milford and we started to develop, you know, ideas for what we could do locally. One of the things Mr. Cerutto suggested was to investigate the notion of, you know, overdose mapping. I am in an IT line of business. I work for a very large company in Bristol, Connecticut and I run a team that basically does this kind of thing every day so I happily offered to volunteer to look into this and to help kickstart a program. There are many different opportunities in the market today but the best one we found was one particular software package that is actually free, there is not cost to it and it's actually spreading across the country and municipalities are coming on board and sharing information. This particular software package allows us to give the ability for first responders whether they be, you know, police, paramedics,

supplier what have you to enter a system that automatically locates them via GPS coordinates and they put specifics. There are, I know I'm out of time, so I will yield back but there is a lot of things I would like to share with you about that particular software package and I would like to commend the Town of New Milford for the work they have done already with that. It's proven to help us analyze data coming out of this.

And very quickly on 5317, the goal of our collation and you have hundreds and hundreds of petitions and testimonials that I have provide to this Committee, the goal of our collation is to remove any impediment, any blocker that is standing in the way of those folks looking for help. All too often, our folks, our kids, our brothers, our sisters, our fathers, our mothers are being told they can't get help when they are asking for it. SB 5317 strikes right at that, 5317 allows families to get Narcan from, you know, the police, the first responders and have that on hand for when they have, you know, a situation with their family member. So please do, look at both of these Bills and please support them. And with that I want to thank you again for what you're doing. Please continue that.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH): Be happy to take any questions, I know we had some time here but I'm sure there's a few.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Representative Buckbee, thank you Morrissey family for coming up. I'm sorry for your loss and unfortunately that is something that the State has experienced over and over again as you

know and its something that we're trying to get our arms around not just in Connecticut but nationwide and so I applaud you for putting that energy into trying to help others because that's really commendable. One question I have for you is how much of this type of technology has been done in other states nationwide?

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH): So some of that, I sure you were looking at some of this as you went, currently about 500 cities through the CDC are looking into this. So and being utilized too already to track health issues and more, moreover within the country. Lancaster, Pennsylvania, Orange County, California, Kentucky had a huge piece on this too and so we are not reinventing the wheel but I think we are really, quite frankly with the help of Mr. Morrissey we've done quite a bit in perfecting this along with Chief Cerutto, you will have his testimony as well as Justin Kulmer who is our High Risk Navigator in New Milford who has really taken steps forward and the coming together of the community on this piece is really tremendous, its worked already in our community and I think it can really work well across the State if we implement this properly, especially I don't think there is anyone on this Committee that was expecting to hear the word "free" when we talked about the software. You know, how wonderful is that? I think this is something, it's foolish for us not to consider this.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): And understanding it is a study Bill, we are going to be looking at this more closely and I think getting more information which I think is important, what is either to the Morrissey family or Representative Buckbee, whoever wants to

take the question, what do you want to see this ultimately accomplish.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH): This is you, go ahead.

TONY MORRISSEY: So the reason why we're so interested in this, you know, kind of, you know, growing throughout not only the State but the country is because this particular piece of software is very sophisticated in that not only does it capture the data at the time of an overdose but it has some predictive qualities to it so and there is also some ways that we can set and stage alerts so we can kinda see an outbreak of a "bad batch" sort of run its way up the corridor, the 95 corridor for example of the 84 corridor, the Route 8 corridor and we can work with out local first responders and in our town, we've already started to do this to establish mitigation plans and strategies for when we see these alerts coming to us and basically proactively, you know, kind of predict where this stuff is going to happen. So, you know, effectively I think that this, you know, in conjunction with some of the other proposals that we have with not only this Committee but other Committees could be sort of a trifecta. You get something, some software program like this that will help you predict these things and track these things along with other proposals that we have for the like the Community Navigator Program, right. So that not only are we responding onto data that we are receiving but we are also, we've got humans on the scene that have, you know, training in this to help guide the families that are in trouble through these things. You know, you start to combo these things together and you have a very effective strategy to reduce the numbers. There is no doubt in my mind

that if you do a combination of these things, we will save lives. We will become a leader in this fight as opposed to one of the record setters in a bad way.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you and as someone who is involved in public safety communications, you know, I've seen information is power whether it's weapons information I'm seeing, criminal histories, whatever it may be. So obviously keeping our public and keeping our officers safe is of utmost priority to once again, thank you very much for taking the time to be here. Thank you, Representative for bringing them and I look forward to supporting this Bill. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Representative. Representative Allie-Brennan.

REP. ALLIE-BRENNAN (2ND): Thank you, Mr. Chair. The Ranking Member selfishly asked the question that I was kind of interested in. I want to thank you guys for coming here. I know we met in Danbury over the, you know, in the fall and, you know, it's just inspiring to see you here. You know, we have no time obviously to take a break and to look at this problem, you guys are just jumping in and it's very powerful.

I did want to kinda touch back on 5317 and talking about Narcan. You know, I've worked on this issue in the area and I kinda wanted to give you guys an opportunity to explain more, you know, how readily available is Narcan for a family like yours which was trying to help someone, you know, who is trying recovery?

TONY MORRISSEY: Thank you for the questions and more importantly, Representative Allie-Brennan thank you for your support of our coalition and movement. We are very proud to, you know, have you in our local community and thank you for your work. You know, the truth is that our son overdosed three times. Not one time were we offered a Narcan kit. That's a tragedy. Shame on me, shame on me for not asking about it and not really blowing the door open when I get, you know, results that weren't what I should have gotten. But really, it's just we've got to learn our lessons. We've learned the hard way, the hardest way possible. We've lost our son. Our goal is no other family goes through this and what we are proposing is to make it easier for those Narcan kits to be distributed to the families that are in crisis. You know, again three times. We had three opportunities to save my son and I failed him and my goal is not to wallow in that because I'll kinda pay for that the rest of my life. But my goal is to make sure that your son, your daughter, your sister, your uncle, your whatever is not gonna be at risk because these things aren't available. I see a friend in the audience today, I'm not gonna steal his thunder, his name is Michael Poparo [Phonetic] but he actually worked with our community on connecting us with a hundred kits. The community needed help from the private sector to get kits of Narcan that we need desperately in our community.

Like that is a great, great thing, you know, in terms of the coalition between private and public sectors, however it's also a really statement that we aren't taking care of this at the community level like right straight out, upfront. So a long winded response to your question, thank you again for

asking it and we are, again several thousand people deep in terms of our coalition. Every single one of them, every single one of them are behind both of these Bills. Again please do read those testimonials that we sent over. Folks took time out of their day to write their story, they're powerful stories. They are gonna show you that this is not just Tony and Tracey Morrissey, I know that you know that but there is literally hundreds of these folks that have lost somebody and are crying for these sorts of assistance and supports.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you so much.

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH): If I may jump into that and really, that's a critical piece. How many times do we sit on our Committees and we get testimonials from people that are, you know, a form letter, right and we get some, nothing against any of our friends here in this room, but some that are paid to write the testimony and we go okay we saw it, it's good, I understand. But when you look at each one of these families that share their full story, its touching. What this has begun in this year, I know it's short session so a lot of things that take priority. This is one of those things I think steps in front of any priority that we have because everybody across the country, all these 500 cities are talking about putting in this program they are making, there is something, something is starting to spark. Every single area is saying we need to do something but what do we do. How many of you have had that same meeting in your communities where somebody goes, do something? This is a lot of something and there are several pieces to what the Morrissey's have really started and the other people in out community have really gotten into.

I mean you talk about the GIS, GPS system that has been put in, Chief Cerruto was out in Waterbury the other day showing them the program. Not because he was paid to go do it because he wanted them to see how well this works. Our communities are coming together. We need to d everything we can to help our communities help themselves and this is something that really, this as much as it is a study, it should move right on past that. It really should. This hits home for a lot of people and every single one of us that's been asked will you do something, and we all go I don't know what to do, this is one piece of that big puzzle. I hope you take a good look at all that testimony. Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you. Thank you, Representative. Representative Hayes.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you for being here. I lost a nephew two years ago to the same problems so this kinda hits a spot with me. In reference to 5318, this study, I realize that it is just a study but where would this initial data input come from? I mean would each emergency service be putting information into a system?

TONY MORRISSEY: So there's a couple of different entry points. It could be through dispatch at the time of dispatch, right. It could be when the first responder is on the scene we are able to install effectively a link to this application or this website that is secured, it's only available to local governments and things like that. Or it can be done post, I'll share a story with you. My wife and I went into Chief Cerruto's office, our son passed away in August but we were able to enter that record of our son with Mr. Cerruto's hand just a

couple of weeks ago. So there is no chance of losing data or losing your window of opportunity. The software programs that are out there allow you to do it at the time of or at a later point in time. They also allow modifications and audit trials for those modifications and they are very, very simple. Like literally there is like enter a name, click a couple of things and then you're done. Like its no as in testimony earlier where we've got 12 pages, this is literally like a three second kind of thing, maybe five that has the ability to be modified and updated.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Do you foresee any kind of HIPAA type problems with any of this?

TONY MORRISSEY: Well you know, I think we can have a long conversation about HIPAA is very, very important and I'm certainly a layman so I couldn't speak to all of the HIPAA things but I'll tell you this, I will tell you that there are protections for personal information protections within this system. Nobody, like the Chief, I worked with the Chief on the rollout in Milford, I help with the training, I coordinated with the actual software vendor, however at no point did I every have a chance to look at the data that was inside that system. That is done through, you know, the channels, the secure channels between the Chief and his liaisons and the software package itself. That said, I do want to tell ya that as a parent, it would be incredibly valuable to me to know if my child was in an area of risk. I'm not saying a house, I'm not saying a name of a person who rents a house, however this software does have the power with it's heatmap technologies to kind of show the community that we've had some problems in a certain area and, you know, you can

kinda as a parent, you can kinda look and see, you know, why is my child down in this area. Maybe start to challenge your child a little bit more and educate and pull them in closer. You know, had we know that our child was visiting a trap house in our community that he ended up dying in, set aside numerous overdoses in a very short window of time, numerous. We would have had tougher conversations with him at that time. This software package has the potential to do that if that is what we seek to do. You know, so, I encourage this study, I encourage you guys to look at not only the primary benefits of it but also the unintended benefits of software programs like this and also lets challenge each other on what the unintended consequences may be. However, we can't wait on this. If we wait another year we are going to set another record and I've been born and raised in Connecticut, we're better than that. So please, I implore you to get this study done, get it done. Do your due diligence, lets not let this be something that we talk about year, after year, after year. We're losing time and that ultimately results in this case to losing lives.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Once again thanks for being here. I look forward to seeing where this goes and Thank you, Mr. Chair.

TONY MORRISSEY: Thank you, Mr. Hayes.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28TH): Thanks, Mr. Chairman and Rep Buckbee and the Morrissey family thank you for coming and bringing this to our attention and advocating. I'm a dad, I'm a grandfather. Your testimony breaks my heart. And, you know, it's a

study, maybe we want to move faster. I understand why you want to move faster and I appreciate that passion cause it's got to be miserably difficult for you to be fighting for this but nonetheless greatly appreciated. So I'm happy to work with the Representative and anybody else that wants to get going on this.

Just to go on, I think its 5317, the one purchasing. Is that something you're pushing, Representative I guess let me ask you, right now communities can purchase these things. Your goal is to have DAS put it out there so everybody can get better access to it at a better price, is that the goal?

REP. BUCKBEE (67TH): Thank you, Representative yes that is the idea. I saw there was some pushback from one organization pushed back and really is open to them to join this if they want to. It's not something they have to go buy Narcan but their concerned that the opponent of this had written in their testimony they were concerned because it was not in their wheelhouse really, it was more of paramedics thing and I understand that. But in the same respect I'm sure, you know, one of the first things you can learn when your training, is learn how to do the Heimlich and it's really something along that line, its instant need, instant response and something that if we can really work together, even work within those communities who want to have larger, stronger purchasing power I think it is a great idea.

REP. MORIN (28TH): And I'm glad you bring that up because many communities handle things differently. Some communities firefighters are first responders, some they are not. Mine they are not, they are

volunteers. But often times our police department gets there before the ambulance and time is of the essence on that. You know, this isn't an urban/suburban or rural matter, it's all of our matters and, you know, in my small town of Wethersfield I know personally three families that have lost a child from this and, you know, we all read about things in the newspaper and say, yeah it's somebody else. It's not somebody else. So I think I like the language because it doesn't, you know, those of the people who jump up and down, saying you're mandating. You're not mandating, we're offering people that want to participate the opportunity and if we can get a better price to help out communities so be it. But I thank you for being here and the Bill for going forward on this. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Representative Morin. Any other questions? And I would just like to say, Representative and the Morrissey family for being here and there are several Bills that have been presented with equipping police officers and it's a supplement, the work also that our first responders do every day and having this conversation and having so many folks from our New Haven Police Department today, our FD is our first responder but many times like last month there was a house on fire and the police officers were there first and it's a coordinated effort and it's a equipping as many folks as possible and its offering the same way around body cameras for instance. Making that offer and working together and having the State work in concert with municipalities to put this on the street. So thank you again for the testimony and Representative Buckbee for your work on this issue.

TONY MORRISSEY: Thank you very much everyone, thank you and God bless.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Next up we have Chief Dryfe and Chief Wright.

CHIEF WRIGHT: Good Afternoon, Mr. Chairman and members of the Committee. My name is William Wright I am the Police Chief in Wallingford and to my right is Chief Neil Dryfe from the Town of Cheshire Police Department. We represent the Connecticut Police Chiefs Association and our approximate 8,000 members across about 100 police departments. You have received written testimony from us. We want to speak briefly to you specifically on three of the Bills that we've listed for you, Senate Bill 267, House Bill 5283 and House Bill 5316.

First House Bill 5284 AN ACT CONCERNING SERVICE OF PROCESS FEES. All police departments now if they are incurring large amounts of fees from specifically Google and Facebook for records that have been ordered as a part of a subpoena or search warrant, and while the companies are complying with the terms and conditions of the court order, being the search order or the subpoena, they are also now billing the police departments for the time to accumulate such records. Personally in Wallingford we have accumulated almost $1000 dollars in the last two or three months for fees associated with these records.

Our second Bill that we wanted to discuss was the 267, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A DEPARTMENT OF CIVILIAN JUSTICE. The CPCA respectfully opposes this Bill. The Association sees this bill as an unnecessary there are already ways in which law enforcement officer and the public can file complaints regarding

activities of police officers and those complaints could be made either internally at the police department or externally at forms of government, police commissions, boards of commissioners, boards of selectmen as well. Speaking from Wallingford if you wanted to make a complaint with us you can come in to see us about it, we will mail you the form, we will talk to you on the phone about it, you can download the form off of our website, it's both in Spanish and English, you can download the form from the town clerk's site on our website, you can go to the town clerk's office grab a form there, you can actually go to our public library and file your complaint there as well. So there are many avenues available currently for filing such a complaint.

House Bill 5316, AN ACT INCREASING FINES FOR OPERATING SNOWMOBILES, ALL-TERRAIN VEHICLES, DIRT BIKES AND MINIMOTORCYCLES IN VIOLATION OF A MUNICIPAL ORDINANCE. Testimony has already been given by our partners in New Haven. I will tell you that coming out of New Haven on Tuesday from a meeting, I was encountered by a four-wheel ATV on State Street, and actually a full wheelie at 12:30 in the afternoon roaring down State Street. Absolutely unsafe, I can't tell you how fast the operator was traveling but I can tell you it was well above the posted speed limit. So we support that Bill to increase those fines. Thank you very much.

CHIEF DRYFE: I am just here to answer your questions. He was the testimony guy.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair and thank you Chiefs for being here today. The Bill 267

that has to do with the Department of Civilian Justice. The way I read it, it really refers to complaints officer to officer. I imagine that would be officer to sergeant, sergeant to lieutenant, office to lieutenant, office to chief whatever it may be. What happens now if either of your departments if an office has a complaint against another officer whether it is a superior or anther rank and file officer. How is that handled and I would assume it would be handled very similar across the State, if you could just speak to that a little bit?

CHIEF DRYFE: Basically it is handled the same way as any citizen complaint would be. You know, I can tell you right now, I have three internal investigations going on in the Cheshire Police Department. They are not, you know, major misconduct cases, but two out of the three of them were brought forward by members of the police department complaining about the conduct of another member of the police department. Again this seems like forming an entirely new State department with commissioners and deputy commissioners and hearing officers and everything to, with that stated goal just an office to investigate complaints that are made by police officers against other police officers. It sounds a little bit, with all due respect to the author, like a solution in search of a problem. Again there are multiple ways for that process to take place now, department policies, caselaw and in many cases for example with sexual harassment members of the department are mandated by policy, they can be disciplined for being aware of a sexual harassment incident within the department and not bringing it forward.

You know, police officers can go to any other State Agency that they feel like it if they want to make a complaint if they feel for example, again, to use the sexual harassment example. If the police officer is making a complaint against a supervisor and therefore is unwilling to do so within the organization, they can go to the town manager's office, they can go to the human relation personnel director, there are, you know, many, many avenues for people to make complaints outside. They can also go to their union and file grievances if they feel they have been the victim of some sort of misconduct. Again I think this, you know, this thought that we need an entirely new State Agency to investigate what I would imagine would be a very small number of complaints that fit the parameters of what they, you know, what this Bill contemplates seems to me like again, like a little bit like a solution in search of a problem.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): So just to clarify, there are plenty of different ways for an officer to make a complaint against another officer or another member of the department whether it be an internal investigation, going to human resources or even at state level you said?

CHIEF DRYFE: Sure, there's nothing that stops a police officer from going outside the chain of command if they claim they are not comfortable making a complaint through their own department to go to the State's Attorney Office to, you know, any number of other state agencies to bring this, you know, this act of misconduct that they have witnessed to light. I mean obviously the number one way we would prefer they do it is to come through the department process, you know, there is not a

police department in the State of Connecticut that doesn't have a complaint investigation process in place designed to do this and again, I think it is more common than most people will think that police officers initiate complaint investigations by bringing some information forward to a supervisor or to the Chief's office.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): That's interesting because I mean in this Bill, I'm look from what I can count at least five fulltime positions commissioners, deputy commissioners, investigative and some that conduct outreach activities which isn't really defined in here, so there's a lot of questions that I have in regards to the need for this and from what you're telling me it doesn't seem like there really is a need. I don't want to take up too much time but in your experience, who is best to investigate a fellow sworn personnel, a civilian or a fellow sworn personnel?

CHIEF DRYFE: It almost always has to be the employer, somebody affiliated with the employer. I mean there are logistical nightmares created by the way this works. I've been a police officer for 30 years, 21 years in Hartford including four years as the Commander of the Internal Affairs Division. I can tell you that this 14 days to get an investigation done, 30 days to make it is absolutely impossible to do. There's all kinds of protections that police officers as public employees have, you know, the subpoena power too, I'm not quite sure where it's all going I'm just reviewing the Bill, who are you going to compel to testify. Are you gonna go after the alleged victim of the misconduct.

Again, just a quick example. A police office comes forward and says, last night on the midnight shift my partner punched a guy in the face who had spit on him after he was handcuffed. Makes that complaint to this agency here. They have to start an investigation. They have 14 days to complete it. Again, the police department has to assign somebody to work with them to collect the documents and the evidence that they need. They have to be aware of again it contemplates that this agency could find somebody in violation of a department policy. The implication there being that this agency will somehow have access to every single department policy from every police department in the State so that they can make that determination. I just don't see it happening. I mean, I can probably count on one hand the number of times I got an investigation completed in 30 days and this contemplates that the investigative part will be done and the adjudication part will also be done in 30 days. It's extremely unrealistic in my opinion.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Not to mention that this provides for a six month time frame. So you could go back five-and-a-half months complain about that today and expect that to be resolved in 30 days. I just think that the timing of this is very concerning. Thank you for taking the time to speak on this Bill, I know others have questions so I will thank the Chair for my time.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Thank you. It's an interesting Bill. I don't know who wrote it, I do know who wrote it. But when I go through this Bill,

this is actually a duplication of what we already do in police departments, correct?

CHIEF DRYFE: Absolutely, every single police department in the State has a citizen complaint process and up until recently that was resolved with the CLESP legislation that came out recently.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Right and in fact you can basically if you had a complaint from the mayor's office, from the town clerk, from the PD online, and the officers have many avenues as well. There is an interesting line in here, starting at Line 192, "The department's authority to impose discipline on a police office shall be in addition to the authority of the employing agency, licensed authority or other entity with authority over such person." You know, so you do your investigation, hand out a discipline, this agency would do their investigation, hand out a discipline I don't know of any other careers where that would occur.

CHIEF DRYFE: I actually wrote a note next to that one, I know double jeopardy is a legal term but I wrote administrative double jeopardy. One of the other things just in that very area there, is the fac that you could have a situation where this agency has gone through and let's say they, first of all their standard according to the policy is probable cause when the general standard for administrative investigations is preponderance of the evidence. So this agency could come out and say, we're exonerating the officer, we are dismissing the complaint and we don't think there was a infraction here whereas my investigation could still be ongoing and I could uncover misconduct and say will I do believe that it was. What do I do

now? Do you think the union is goin to sit there with the office and say, well this has already been reviewed by an independent investigator and they said there is no misconduct Chief. I may get that passed my town manager but when it gets to the Labor Board I'm gonna send somebody else.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): There is a couple of other things in here that kind of drew my attention. One of them is, basically says that when the contract negotiation comes up that you have to put this in there. What do you think if the law says you've got to put this in here, what do you think you're gonna have to give up, to the union, in order to get this in here?

CHIEF DRYFE: Well again I do have a highlight there at the end because, you know, even if somebody was inclined to think this was a good idea, there is that section right at the end that says, Oh by the way, the "provisions of section 2-8 inclusive of this act shall not be applicable to any complaint against a police officer who is covered by collective bargaining agreement that governs the investigation and discipline of such person." So it's gonna encourage unions to try to put the entire disciplinary process into the contract which as administrators and Chiefs can certainly, I mean that's just a nightmare. Now if you want to change your investigative process, your citizen complaint or your disciplinary process later you have to actually go and negotiate with the union to change it because its in the contract and now again, you might have to have somebody come forward with a legitimate complaint and the first thing the investigator does is call up the Chief, Oh Chief you got a big problem here, I've got a major complaint

against one of your guys and I get to say, its in our contract so, bye because you're not allowed to do it because this last section 9 says if you are covered by the contract it doesn't apply to you.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): It also says somewhere in here you can't be a police officer to be part of this. Investigators are not law enforcement officers, or maybe that's just saying that are not law enforcement officers. But to have a civilian and have them overlook police work, police work is something totally different then anything else and if you don't have people with law enforcement background, I don't think they can understand some of the things we go through. One of the things we just heard from the New Haven, one of the New Haven Chiefs was that his crew was surrounded, somebody drove around him and was kicking the cruiser. How many times have we had officers get spit in the face? It's common now for somebody just walk up and curse out an officer and then walk-away. I mean there's truly a lack of respect towards law enforcement by some whereas most of the people have respect for it.

Kind of look at this and I know this was all done through the police department, and most of them have internal affairs, but I look at this and my mind goes somewhere else when I start thinking the motives behind this, and I'm not gonna do that, but you know, we have something that works and we want to create a bureaucracy to repeat it. It just doesn't seem responsible.

CHIEF DRYFE: Again my biggest concern with it I don't think as written here it will work. It won't. It's not possible. I think there will be a lot of

mandates associated with this too, you know investigators from department show up, you have to make then available, what if the officer works the midnight shift. I have to call him in now on day, pay him overtime, I've got to get a union steward form, he's gonna have a right to an attorney to be there depending on the circumstances. I've got to have one of my administrators there to order him to answer questions, you know, again use my example before. Punched this citizen in the face after they were handcuffed. Now you go to that civilian, this organization goes to the citizen and says we would like to interview you and the guys says I have a lawyer, I've been arrested, I have a criminal case going, I'm not gonna talk to you, my lawyer says not to talk to you. Oh, but we're from the civilian justice agency. I don't care my lawyer doesn't want me to talk to you. When were done with the criminal case we are going to sue the police department and the police officer. Well this legislation would allow this organization to get a subpoena from the Superior Court in Hartford to compel that person to testify at a time when they have a criminal case pending and want to pursue their own remedy. So, again, I just think it's unworkable to being with and again I think the average citizen reading about police misconduct would be surprised at exactly how many of these complaints come up internally. Whether it's a supervisor reviewing body camera footage. Whether it's a supervisor talking to somebody in locker room who hears hey, I think Jimmy's got a problem, I think you guys should take a look at, you know, all that kind of stuff.

I know we get the high profile, you know, tape recorded incidents where people look at it say ah

ha! That's what police misconduct is. My experiences as a practitioner for 30 years is much different than that. Again two out of the three investigations I have ongoing right now were brought to light by sworn Cheshire Police Officers concerned about the conduct of another Cheshire Police Officer.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Do we have a fiscal note on this?

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): I didn't see one.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Didn't see one, okay. All right. I am going to finish my questioning there. Obviously you know where I stand on this Bill. You know, there is no reason to repeat what already happens and anytime a civilian has a question as to an investigation especially after they made it where an office, they are free to go look that up because it's under freedom of information. I suspect the local newspaper comes knocking on the door every couple of months wants to see all your internal investigations. So there's nothin hidden and they're right there. And with the body cameras now and with every cell phone out there having a camera on it, you know, it's a different world unfortunately. You know, when I retired it was just before all that started taking place but, you know, you go to a scene, you see it on Facebook, there's a million cameras out watching an office get beat up and nobody is stepping up to help him. You know, they'd rather record it and hopefully it goes viral than actually step-in and help. And you do get some of those times where people step-in and you know, I congratulate them and thank them for their help. Thank you, guys.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Senator. Representative Hayes.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you guys for being here. It's always great to see you up here and I know it's been a very long day and I know what your schedule has been like. So, I'll try not to keep you to long but if we could start with 5284 which is the Service Process Bill that we're talking about. I know that the language that's written in that Bill as it is was not the intent of what you wanted to accomplish with this. Could you try to tell me what you want to do with this Bill.

CHIEF WRIGHT: So I think what we're trying to accomplish is we understand the implications of these large companies processing these subpoenas or search warrants. That is not lost on us. I think what we're trying to do is formulate some financial or monetary control over how much or how much per page or how much per search warrant or subpoena that should be only in a sense that I can see this as a runaway train. Some of the larger banks have been imposing fees for the past couple of years now, this is not totally new to us. What is brand new to us is the, what we consider collective of the absorbent amount of money that these places are charging for records. As I said in our case locally in Wallingford thus far almost $1,000 dollars' worth of fees associated with these search warrants and these subpoenas. So I think we are looking to put some bookends on, you know, how much that is recognizing that there is a cost associated to producing such records.

REP. HAYES (51ST): So the intent of the Bill really has nothing to do with State Marshalls and the paperwork they serve correct?

CHIEF WRIGHT: No, sir.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Good just so we get that clear. And if I'm understanding this right, now that we're in the age of technology that we're in, your criminal investigations often lead you down a path where you need to go to one of these service providers or these search agencies to gain information like IP addresses and other things in order to continue with your criminal investigation. Is that right?

CHIEF WRIGHT: Absolutely.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay and these are, the information that you search is usually not released without a search warrant which you would get from a court which is signed by a judge.

CHIEF WRIGHT: Correct.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay so we are not really talking about any kind of civil investigation, we're talking about criminal investigations where you need to gain access from one of the internet service providers or search engines and you go to a judge, you get a search warrant, you submit that search warrant to the agency and up till this past January there was never any charges for that.

CHIEF WRIGHT: Correct.

REP. HAYES (51ST): And all of a sudden in January at least one of these providers comes out with a cost and says from this point forward we are gonna

charge you $245 dollars for each search warrant you send to us to try to get information?

CHIEF WRIGHT: Correct.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Do you have any idea, not only by department but could you give me an estimate statewide how many search warrants of this type are issued during routine criminal investigations? I know that's a far fetched question but I'm just seeing if you had that type of information.

CHIEF WRIGHT: I don't have the specific data. I will tell you though without any question that its gonna be into the hundreds. I think we've submitted a dozen ourselves just from my agency. So there's a hundred of us statewide, a little bit more, 105.

REP. HAYES (51ST): So this turns out to be a burden not only on the police departments cause they now have to pay for this information but realistically it comes from the taxpayers because they pay the budgets of the police departments so it's actually coming from them, is that correct?

CHIEF WRIGHT: Correct.

REP. HAYES (51ST): And this Bill would make it easier with not having to pay these charges or at least if we could set one charge so you would know what you're gonna have to pay is that what we're trying to do here?

CHIEF DRYFE: Yes.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay, thank you. I know you didn't come here to talk about it but I know you were in the room when we were talking about what they call the blue lights on the construction sites on the highway. I'm actually thinking it should be

red and blue lights but there were comments made that often time they can't get the State Police to come out there, so the job is shutdown, it costs the contractor the money, apparently it must cost the State some additional money. If, in your opinion, I don't want you to speak for every Chief in the State, but you guys have been at this long enough that you should know, if there was an occasion where the State Police could not supply vehicles and troopers to a construction site, would you believe that police departments that border that highway or in close proximity to that highway would be willing to send their officers and their cars out for the same fees that the State Police are getting for theirs so that they don't have to shutdown their job?

CHIEF DRYFE: Yes, so again, look you can't go too far in this building anytime without hearing about the pending personnel crisis with the State Police. I don't know if that is what causes it, I certainly know when the Town of Cheshire, we have a private duty program in place where vendors call us for construction work and there are times due to training and vacation times were sometimes we can't provide an officer. I imagine the same thing happens there. Somebody says worked three road jobs already this week, I don't want to work on Friday night on 84 or wherever. Almost all of these multilane or limited access highways pass through town. I know of the Chief in Cheshire 84 and 691 meet, the intersection is there, parts of 691 parts of 84 are located in Cheshire. We have a program in place to hire extra duty police officers and that is essentially the same thing that is happening there.

I certainly think that if the choice for the taxpayer is (A) the construction company gets told to go out and work on the highway without a police presence at all or; (B) they don't go out on the job, gets delayed because there is no State Trooper available then they would be better served by; choice (C) which would be call the local police department in that, you know, where the job is located and see if they have somebody available. And again I'm sure not breaking any news to you but I can get cops to work a lot of stuff when you're gonna pay them overtime to do it and again if it's truly about safety of the workers up on these jobs I certainly think that's a viable, that's a viable opportunity to do that. And again I understand it would be limited but I certainly think the State Police would have to have the right of first refusal obviously for the highway work but again if it comes down to we just don't have anybody willing to work this job, certainly there are municipal police departments all across the State who would be happy to go down there procedures that already exist and get somebody to go up on the highway and work that extra duty job which is very similar to the work that they do in their own town.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay and I guess I was led to think that is was a technical type of training, specialized training that you need to set up these track patterns and know how to work a highway during construction job. Do you think that municipal officers are smart enough and trained sufficiently enough that they can go up and direct traffic on the highway?

CHIEF DRFYE: I certainly think there is something to when you are first setting up the cone pattern on

a three lane highway where people are going 75 miles an hour is a lot different than doing it on some cul do sac local road. But, you know, with all due respect it's not rocket science either and I think we could train our people in the effective ways to do that if that was a concern.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay, thank you and I would just like to touch, if I could, on 267 which is that Department of Civilian Justice. I heard you say when you first sat down, 8,000 police officers over 100 plus police departments, is those numbers about right?

CHIEF WRIGHT: Yes, the Connecticut Police Chiefs Association represents roughly 8,000 police officers and what I believe is 105 police departments.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay and if you add what is it, another 1,200 from the State Police on top of that and then I guess you could add DEEP and the other enforcement officers which I think would fall under this Act if it were to be put in place, we're probably talking 11,000 or more?

CHIEF DRYFE: It may not be quite that high right now, but yes, somewhere in that vicinity.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay, let me ask both of you and I would appreciate if you both would answer. Chief do you tolerate any kind of misconduct in your department?

CHIEF DRYFE: No, absolutely not.

CHIEF WRIGHT: I have no tolerance for it.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Do you tolerate misconduct being covered up, or hidden or not reported?

CHIEF DRYFE: No, it's a violation of policy and your oath of office and any number of other things.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay and I guess if you were to tolerate that it wouldn't take long before your town would come down on you and remove your from your position, would that happen you think?

CHIEF DRYFE: Pretty quickly.

REP. HAYES (51ST): And they would bring somebody else in that wouldn't tolerate it?

CHIEF DRYFE: Exactly.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay, I would also think that if we're talking 10,000 to 11,000 police officers we're got to expect that there is gonna be some misconduct out of those 11,000 officers, someplace in their careers?

CHIEF DRYFE: As long as we have to keep hiring human beings to do these jobs there will probably be mistakes made and misconduct [Cross-talking].

REP. HAYES (51ST): And I would also think that is the same with teachers, it's the same with doctors, it's the same with attorneys, every profession has that problem that they have to deal with and they have to handle. Correct?

CHIEF DRYFE: Yes.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay, so I heard my Ranking Member say that he thought it would be at least five employees in this new department to do the investigations on some 11,000 police officers. You guys have both done personnel and filling positions, does that sound like a low number to you?

CHIEF DRYFE: It sounds like a low number but I don't know how many complaints would fall under their jurisdiction. You know, again bearing in mind this is just complaints made by police officers against other police officers.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay, I can appreciate that but you're pretty comfortable with the fact that the way it works right now and the ways these misconduct complaints are handled within your department that we're getting to the bottom of it, its being rooted out and is being corrected?

CHIEF DRYFE: Yes.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay, let me ask you this, if we were to form this new Civilian Justice Department who do you think should investigate their misconduct should they have any? [Laughter]

CHIEF DRYFE: The Attorney General.

REP. HAYES (51ST): You just agreed that we're gonna have some misconduct no matter where we go, so if there's misconduct in this new department I am trying to figure out who would investigate that misconduct. Maybe we should start another State agency to investigate the misconduct of the Civilian Justice Department and is investigating police officers. Thank you both for being here.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions? Chiefs, thank you for your time today. Okay, next up is Lieutenant Renkowitz. Excuse me, Lieutenant, you can just hit the button to turn the mic on, please.

LT. RENKOWITZ: Is that a little better? All right. This is my first time in the room, so I'm still

trying to figure it out. I would like to give testimony on House Bill 5313 AN ACT CONCERNING POLICE REPORTS OF MOTOR VEHICLE ACCIDENTS and also 5315 AN ACT CONCERNING STREET RACING.

To begin with the street racing, I think one of the biggest problems we have is that the current language in our current Statute which is 14-224 is difficult to enforce. It is challenging to establish a probable cause and during those cases where we have made arrests they most likely end in a dismissal. So over the years the trends in street racing have changed. We're no longer seeking wagers and placing bets for trying to establish speed records but more so it's for thrill seeking. It's for gaining attention and producing content for social media. Also just to simply demonstrate your skill and show off your vehicle. So the current statute it reads that, "No person shall operate a motor vehicle upon any public highway for a wager or for any race of purpose of making a speed record." So for wager, we simply don't know. Over the years, street racing has become so decentralized, we don't know who's in charge. We don't even know who would collect a wager for any race. I like that part however our court likes to know what exactly is a race cause now days its not simply two cars lining up side-by-side, waving a flag and race to a finish line. There are more so traveling in packs now. And the purpose of making a speed record, like you heard from Alder Antunes on Foxon Boulevard, there's no set drag strip, the racers will just, they will block of portions of the road with their vehicles to prevent regular traffic from entering and they will just race during whatever portion they can close. There is no like quarter mile. You're not hearing

someone say I want a ten second car, so there's really no speed record. I think it should be worded more to the effect of you can't operate a motor vehicle upon any public highway for any race or contest or demonstration of speed or skill cause ultimately a race is described as two people or items competing to see who finishes first. And also I think that touches it on the street racing. I think the most important part is to revisit that Statue and update the language to reflect the current trends.

So would you like me to move on, is that how this works. So just go there on my own? I'm gonna talk about the accident reports now. So we heard from the Chief how it uses up a lot of time. So and it was asked like what parts could be reduced or be removed, it's a lot of redundancy. If I just look at the first page, this box is checked off for traffic ownership, traffic class, the location of where the cars collided. And those are all on the diagram. Same way if you go further down there its talking about body type that is already in the registration information. It talks about the vehicle accident, that is already in the narrative. So we are checking off about 50 boxes that are already described in the narrative, the vehicle information and diagram. So it would be smart to remove either the diagram or all those boxes.

Additionally I think that the police officer should not be the ones left with the determining who's at fault for property only damage accidents where there is no enforcement action being taken, it's just simply checking off a box for the insurance companies. One last thing if I can fit it in, the Chief mentioned that after he got promoted he no

longer has to write accident, he no longer has to approve them. So for like the hour it takes an officer to write this, it also takes the supervisor about 15 minutes to navigate through the 50 boxes to check it for accuracy and completeness before he approves it. Here in New Haven a patrol sergeant can have upwards of eight to ten accidents a day which could equal two hours spent reviewing accidents instead of supervising officers out on the street. Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Okay, Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Thank you. How many sergeants do you use to review the reports?

LT. RENKOWITZ: So sir, we have depending on the shift we would have two to four sergeants out on patrol and if it’s four they will be in change of a quadrant, a quarter of the City and they would review the reports that are entered from their officers. So there is the regular incident reports and then there is also accident reports. So in between his regular supervisory duties, the sergeant would also be reviewing all those reports electronically.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Does he have to go back to the station to do that?

LT. RENKOWITZ: We can do it from his car.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): He can do it from his car.

LT. RENKOWITZ: He can, yes.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): And then I always note no matter how good you are at reviewing those, it goes from the officer, to the supervisor and then the

records clerk and usually a couple of those get kicked back by the records clerk cause there's so many boxes to check, somethings wrong. Do you get any of those back.

LT. RENKOWITZ: Yes, sir. And the worse part about when its kicked back from a supervisors' standpoint is that it could be resubmitted with corrections after that supervisor ended his shift and now there's the next shift supervisor who is not just lookin to see if box 51 was checked off, he has to go review the whole thing again to see if anything else, if there was any other errors. So certainly time consuming for the office himself and then for the supervisors reviewing it.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Okay, I know, do you guys do private property accidents?

LT. RENKOWITZ: So as of very recently we developed an exchange form for private duty accident where no crime has been committed, so it can't be like an invading or no-insurance and no injuries. And it can't involve like a city vehicle or police car. There's stipulations to it, so if an officer hears him getting dispatched to the *Walmart* parking lot and there is an accident there, he's gonna have a good time filling out the exchange form. But most often these are out on our public highways.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): So if we change the law and made it back to the old style where it was just the two page, how many hours do you think that would save?

LT. RENKOWITZ: So I think if we keep the same electronic format with the vehicle information that we do have the ability to copy information from our

collect system and into. So if we take that into consideration and knock off choosing all the boxes and all the dropdowns you can probably cut that report in half. So I think this report, now I think Chief Jacobson might have had a little reversed, the old format a seasoned officer, he'll knock that out in about 20 minutes. This even if you're going really fast and not really typing much, just for the amount of time it takes to click on all the sections and subsections, dropdown boxes it takes about an hour, so I think we can knock that down to half an hour which considering 10,000 accidents a year that could be 5,000 hours saved and a couple hundred thousand dollars salary.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): And those officers can be out there patrolling.

LT. RENKOWITZ: Yes. And that's another thing, I know when we don't just want to finish our accident reports then we can go finish the other report but our goal is to be patrolling in between all this report writing and essentially preventing crime from occurring not just documenting crime that had already occurred.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): That's funny because we get a lot of complaints, hey the officer's been sittin in that parking lot for a long time, you know, he's in there doing accident reports, he had three of them tonight so he's got three hours' worth.

LT. RENKOWITZ: Absolutely. I get that, I explain that at least once or twice a week to people concerned about the officer not patrolling. So, I'd rather them be out in their car, typing out in their car than sitting in the substation being completely

invisible but still the perception of the community is we're not getting patrols, whether he is sitting in his car, watching the waves at the park of writing an accident report the perception of the public is he's not patrolling.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Right. Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Any other questions? Lieutenant can you just talk about any other recommendations that you would have for decreasing the size of the report or looking at modifying and taking away, any other recommendations for shortening?

LT. RENKOWITZ: For shortening it, I mean I could go box by box but specifically just like Alder Antunes mentioned, like if we have a box right here that says the vehicles VIN number, the make, the model, the year, the color, the plate number I can read that and see if that is a bus or not. So we want to eliminate what's redundant. So basically all the crash factors and considerations on the first page and basically all of the motor vehicle crash information. Not only that you're entering motor vehicle crash information for both cars. So if I look at this and I see a dozen and a half boxes and if there's two cars involved now that's 24 boxes, these click down boxes that I believe are just for statistics for DOT serves no purpose for law enforcement, it serves no purpose for us investigating the crash. I believe those two sections could be completely eliminated.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): So you answered the next question but the redundancy there is not for law enforcement. This is not relevant for any of your work or any of your officers work but other state

agencies that maybe benefitting from that information?

LT. RENKOWITZ: That's absolutely correct, sir. And I review crashes to determine speed enforcement where other safety measures could occur and I never one time used the data that is collected in this accidents. A lot of time the police are more focused on the location where it occurred, the manner of where it occurred, I can look at the diagram and see if this one was a rear-ending, to see if like there's red light violations. As far as making the roads safer for determining how much, how more accurately we can enforce, I never cared if it was, you know, a certain traffic weight class or if there was a golf cart involved, I mean that stuff we just don't look at. {Laughter} Yeah, I mean even like the roadway grade, now we have an office looking at the road to determine if it's a slight slant, is it uphill, is it a hillcrest, I don't even know what a hillcrest is. I mean I probably do but. The same like with roadway alignment, that is what the diagram is for, so, it's just. Mind you, this is completed after the officer has left the scene. He's already arrived at the scene, makes sure the scene is safe, making sure that traffic is able to get through, making sure medical attention has been called or needed, damaged vehicles being towed, speaking to all parties involved, looking for witnesses and ultimately conducting an investigation, all that itself really has to be half an hour but more inline with 45 minutes. So it's a substantial amount of time officers are spending on scene investigation and completing reports for motor vehicle accidents which most of them are probably damage only, not even a criminal matter.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): So you supervise the largest district, police district in the City of New Haven?

LT. RENKOWITZ: Yes, sir.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): And as you talk about the challenges, your Chief talks about the challenges today around traffic. We had chiefs from other towns today talk about the challenges they have driving in the city of New Haven. Is any of this information ever furnished to you when you're looking a traffic coming projects, when you're looking at speed enforcement is any of this data available to you from the DOT ,or is there any data sharing or any cooperation?

LT. RENKOWITZ: Sir, I don't know where to get it if I wanted it. I know that if I do my own search through our records to find data I'll get locations were it occurred, the severity of the crash, the action that was taken, certainly none of this data that we're collecting.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Lieutenant, I just want to say thank you for your work. I've worked with a lot of lieutenants and your ability to bring the community closer to what law and the police department does every day is phenomenal and you work at that every day and just the fact that you're here to report what you see every day I really appreciate your work and taking the time to be up here today. So, thank you.

LT. RENKOWITZ: Thank you, sir and we appreciate all your help as well.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Next up, Mike Barbaro.

MICHAEL BARBARO: Good Afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Ranking Member, Members of the Committee that are still here, my name is Michael Barbaro and I am a real estate broker out of New Haven and I am here today on behalf of Connecticut Realtors. We are a trade association with over 17,000 members practicing all aspects of real estate. We are here today speaking in support of HB 5117 AN ACT CONCERNING PURCHASE OF OPIOID ANTAGONIST AND CARTRIDGE INJECTOR PRODUCTS FOR LAW ENFORCEMENT USE.

We have submitted written testimony for the record and I will allow that to speak for itself. I just want to add a little context here. In 2019 our association embarked upon a multimillion dollar awareness campaign for opioids. I was very involved in the whole process. We partnered with *WTNH - Channel 8* and we also partnered with *I HEART radio*. I was given a very large education on all aspects of the opioid crisis that we face here in Connecticut.

And one of the basic things that we heard time and time again and I think you heard Mr. Morrissey testify that it was a problem for one of his partners in this fight was something we would think is very basic, and very rudimentary and very easy was actually access to Narcan. And I've talked to, I've spent hours on the phone over the last few years, over the last year-and-a-half with grieving parents all of which, many of which I should say saw their children lives saved at one time or another, sometimes multiple times and unfortunately, you know, in many cases not enough. But we just see this as something that is rudimentary, basic, should be available. We know there is a various array of products and prices on the market so we think adding some consistency to the market will absolutely add a

benefit to and help the people like the Morrissey's that are fighting this. So, I'll keep my testimony simple and end it there. If's there's any questions, I'm happy to answer them. Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Any questions? Mike, I just want to commend you for you advocacy and for the conversations that you've started statewide, your leadership, always seeing your work locally but now statewide with awareness and with brining groups together that probably would never have come together if not for the guidance and the leadership that you've shown on this, so thank you for what you've done and continue to do.

MICHAEL BARBARO: Great, we are happy to do this, so thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you very much. Next up Chip Smith.

CHIP SMITH: Good afternoon, Mr. Chairman, Distinguished Members of the Committee, my name is Chip Smith, and I am the founder and CEO of American Testing and Inspection Services, which is the largest inspection and certification services for elevators, escalators, and other conveyances. ATIS was founded in 2012 on a Vision of having "A World With No Conveyance-Related Accidents," and we have grown to over 150 team members operating in more than 50 different jurisdictions and performing over 100,000 safety inspections each year.

Today I am here in support of Senate Bill 269. I appreciate the opportunity to discuss with you all and I appreciate you all raising the Bill.

Elevators and other conveyances move billions of passengers every year and fortunately, major

injuries are relatively uncommon. However, when elevators are not up to code and do fail, the result can be catastrophic and deadly. This is why the ASME A17.1 Safety Code for Elevators and Escalators recommends semi-annual safety inspections and annual safety tests.

Unfortunately, one does not have to look too hard nor too far to find instances of horrible tragedies caused by elevators that could and should have been prevented. Across the country, we have seen numerous instances where elevators are not being inspected and violations are not being corrected, in a timely manner. As Commissioner's filed testimony indicated, this is currently the situation in Connecticut. Put simply, state and local governments do not have enough resources to effectively tackle elevator safety; they are tasked with doing too much with too little.

In response to this common concern, we have seen programs very similar to the proposed Senate Bill 269 implemented in a supermajority of states. Senate Bill 269 would advance Connecticut's safety objectives and further protect Connecticut's riding public by making it possible for each and every one of the State's more than 15,000 elevators to be inspected on a timely and thorough basis.

Under the bill, Connecticut would be able to leverage the resources of a company like ours that has more than 130 highly qualified and trained inspectors, to more effectively enforce Connecticut's safety regulations. It obviously would be able to leverage other private inspection firms. In addition, Connecticut would be able to access systems and processes specifically designed

around inspections and gain critical transparency, including information on the status of inspections, frequency and type of violations, and timeliness of corrective actions on those violations. Currently this is not happening in most jurisdictions including here in Connecticut from what I understand.

I want to emphasize a point made by the commissioner, this is not a privatization or outsourcing of current State functions. What it is, is a significant augmentation of resources that will provide access to unparalleled systems, processes, people and expertise to get the job done right and protect the public. The DAS would have significant transparency and oversight and will be directing and auditing the work performed.

In conclusion, we believe this legislation will enhance public safety through more timely inspections and improved transparency and will advance our Vision of "A World With No Conveyance-Related Accidents." We appreciate your consideration and happy to answer any questions.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you, Chip for being here today and do you feel that with the augmentation whether it is your company or another company there would be any safety concerns?

CHIP SMITH: Quite the contrary. My opinion is the safety would be improved. Obviously it has to be executed correctly but I have no safety concerns with augmenting with a third party.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): And there were some issues that were brought up in previous testimony when the Representative from DAS was here delivering his remarks. Is there any comments that you heard when you were overhearing that, that you want to address based on possible concerns that were brought by some members around the table?

CHIP SMITH: Yeah, so my memory is not that great and I probably wasn't taking the best notes, but there were a few things that I think that were brought up. One was availability of labor and kinda the difference between private entities and the State of Connecticut. You know, the gentleman here that was on behalf of the DAS talked about their struggles trying to recruit and obtain labor, that's kinda what we do. The name of this game is QAI attraction, retention and training so I think that the labor concern is not one that I have. More importantly the staff, I think he said there are six or seven elevator inspectors right now, there is no way that a staff of that size can inspect 15,000 elevators. It is very possible for them to provide thorough oversight and they do that by the transparency and the visibility that adequate reporting and periodic spontaneous monitoring will provide. So that was on the labor issue. Let me think here. Does anybody happen to remember those questions?

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): That's okay, I appreciate you taking the time. No, it's fine. I don't even know if I wrote them down myself, just wanted to give you an opportunity to respond if you had 'em. That's all I had. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Representative Genga.

REP. GENGA (10TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your testimony this morning. We had testimony here from a few people who state that the State inspectors are better qualified and the outside inspectors wouldn't be. I'd like you to address a couple of things for me. The training for your people or people who are independent versus the training for the State employees, is there a difference?

CHIP SMITH: So I apologize, in all candor I'm not intimately familiar with the training that currently goes on in Connecticut. I can opine on the training for third party and what we as a company do and elaborate a little bit on the fact that even we as an organization, we train the industry including some of the mechanics and service people working in the State of Connecticut. I do not think we actively have been involved in training the inspectors here in Connecticut but we do train public inspectors throughout the country. So to becomes a licensed QAI outside the State of Connecticut, cause that's what I'm familiar with, you generally need four years of mechanical experiences with a maintenance company and one year experience as a qualified elevator inspector. Most of our inspectors have had 30 or 40 years in the elevator trade, then they usually apprentice as an inspector for another year or and then they can get certified through two certifying agencies NASA and Work Preservation.

REP. GENGA (10TH): Talk about profit versus non profit within the context and these are obviously are those within the system, we're lookin to solve a problem, first most important thing is find the problem, define it properly. So first I started with

the training. Is there a kind of license that is required to be an inspector for these types of equipment.

CHIP SMITH: Yes, sir. It's qualified elevator.

REP. GENGA (10TH): By the State of Connecticut?

CHIP SMITH: Yes, I don't know what it's called but there is a special licensing and a special program that state inspectors have to go through.

REP. GENGA (10TH): You don't have to have that license to have the job?

CHIP SMITH: Correct.

REP. GENGA (10TH): All right so whoever has, whoever your staff is has certain qualifications, say, you know anything that would enhance the inspections by the people that you are familiar with, the independent inspectors?

CHIP SMITH: Not from the licensing standpoint and again I apologize, I'm not intimately familiar with Connecticut's licensing but the licensing process for their party inspectors is extremely robust and we as a company and most others offer very rigorous training and education to make sure that inspectors are kept up on the code. I can't compare it to the training but in terms of technology and resources and processes, you know, third party inspection companies have one focus and it is safety of conveyances. They spend all of their resources, we have spent a million dollars or more in the last seven years since we've been founded just investing in technology and processes to bring visibility, transparency, inspection violation tracking and follow through, etc. My guess is that departments

like the DAS and other public entities cannot invest those kinds of resources because they are trying to do too much with too little.

REP. GENGA (10TH): Okay, thank you very much.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you. Representative Hayes.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Thank you for coming. I thank you, Mr. Chair. I just got a couple of real quick questions that I need you to help me out with because I don't understand. I think I have a pretty good grasp on the building inspector end of it and the municipality getting the permits and sending a building official out to do the inspection while the project is being built. I guess I don't know is that, our elevators a municipal responsibility or is that a State responsibility?

CHIP SMITH: I believe it is a combination of both here in Connecticut. And it kinda depends by state, but here in Connecticut I believe it is the State and certain local municipalities.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Both new and existing, so existing elevators are the responsibility of the municipality to make sure they're inspected.

CHIP SMITH: I believe so. Again, so in the United States, in 50 states there is over 240 jurisdictions and so how each jurisdiction handles the process is a little bit different and unique and since we haven't operated in Connecticut I'm not exactly sure how Connecticut operates. I just know that augmenting public resources with the significant amount of private resources that our out there has made the most sense in and out of every jurisdiction in the United States and it has been evident by the

trend as more and more states have started to privatize, not to outsource and get rid of the State program, but it's to take advantage and leverage the resources that are out there from private inspection companies.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay, thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Any other questions? Thank you, sir. Oh, oh, Representative Genga.

REP. GENGA (10TH): I found the question. In one of the testimonies submitted, it said the Bill would lower the qualifications required for inspections, we're talking about the elevators, in fact from license to certified.

CHIP SMITH: So my understanding in my reading of the Bill, and I'm not a legislator, is that is absolutely false. The way I read the Bill, and I don't know if I have it in front of me, it would be exactly equal or better licensing and qualification requirements. So again that's not for me to say but again I don't know what those licensing requirements are but I know that we will meet or exceed just like the Statue mentioned.

REP. GENGA (10TH): On last question. Obviously in the business you're in and you have liability insurance?

CHIP SMITH: Yes, sir.

REP. GENGA (10TH): What kind of professional track record could you describe for yourself?

CHIP SMITH: So we're a pretty young company, we started in January 2013. We've had pretty tremendous growth and the reason being, in my opinion, is we brought a significant amount of

innovation, transparency and investment to this space which it was lacking, knock on wood [tapping on desk] we've had very few, if any accidents on elevators that we have inspected, that is going to happen when you do 100,000 inspections in a year with the amount of volume and riders you have but the transparency and visibility that we brought to jurisdictions really some of the large national maintenance contractors as well, is disrupting the industry a little bit. And you guys are kinda in a pretty awesome spot where you're kinda startin to go through this process. Neighboring jurisdictions have started to see what is out there with third party. It's gotten a bad name in some degrees like New York City. You guys pick up New York City they will talk about the PVT being a disaster and it is a disaster and I'll tell you why it's a disaster, it's because there's three critical components if you are going to privatize it has to be: Number one, the qualification and licensing standpoint. Number two is the procurement. New York City put up a $6 million dollar year bid and it was a low price bid, in public safety, you don't want to have price be the sole driver on a procurement decision. And the last one and most importantly is enforcement and audit and there has been zero enforcement and zero audit of the New York City Department of Building's contract.

He's not here but I did remember one other thing that was brought up and that was the conflict of interest, but I don't need to address it I guess.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you, sir. Up next is Justin Perkins. Good Afternoon.

JUSTIN PERKINS: Good Afternoon. Thank you for allowing us to speak today. This is testimony in support of House Bill 5314 AN ACT CONCERNING BEST PRACTICES FOR WELLNESS CHECKS BY POLICE OFFICERS.

Co-Chairs Bradley and Verrengia, Vice Chairs Osten and Paolillo; Ranking Members Hwang and Sredzinski and distinguished members of the Public Safety and Security Committee. My name is Justin Perkins, my wife Dawn and I live in Southington with our two children and we are here today to testify in support of Raised House Bill 5314. Calls to police departments throughout our state requesting wellness checks are a reality, as is the diversity of the individuals, and situations surrounding these calls for help. We strongly believe this legislation is a necessary first step towards increasing awareness and developing best practices and protocols for identifying, prioritizing and responding to wellness checks in a manner that is consistent, effective, and best serves our communities and loved ones.

Jacob, our oldest son, now and forever twenty years old, struggled with depression, anxiety, and PTSD. Despite these difficult challenges, Jacob was able to move forward after high school. He got a job and an apartment in a nearby town and was working on getting a car. On the morning of September 30th, Jacob made a call to my wife, his mother, he said; "Mom, I love you goodbye". Dawn knew something was wrong, and despite repeated and desperate calls and texts to reach him, it would be the last time we would ever hear from our son. Can you read this please?

DAWN PERKINS: Okay, I immediately called 911 and I explained the situation to the dispatcher who was

from our town and then the call was transferred to the town where Jacob lived. She explained the current situation, provided his residence and employment addresses, and informed the dispatcher he was having a mental health emergency and was likely feeling suicidal. The dispatcher insisted the call needed to be handled by our town and refused to help, refusing to send a responding officer, and suggested we first fill out a missing person's report after the appropriate time, and transferred the call back to our town. Despite our repeated and desperate pleas, all our town could do was help us with the report, and that was Monday. Our son's town took notice of the MPR on Wednesday and on Thursday they assigned a Detective. On Friday we were informed our son Jacob’s body was found.

We struggle every day with the reality that had our town been the responding department it is possible our son would still be alive. We are not here to affix blame, but rather to do all that we can to prevent other senseless tragedies. A consistent, cohesive, and collaborative wellness check procedure will prevent response experiences like ours. There are times when people of physical and mental conditions need to be checked on, and those calls maybe from a family member in another town. Dispatchers should not only be skilled in the initial assessment of varying call types but be operating under appropriate response protocols set in policy and acknowledged by all police departments. Pursing common policy seems like a simple strategy, but it's one that we believe will save lives.

Thank you for your attention, and we ask that you please support this Bill.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you very much for sharing your story and working in memory of your son. Any questions? Representative Fusco.

REP. FUSCO (81ST): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for coming here today testifying. Very emotional, very difficult, I understand. Certainly since, in terms of grief, September may as well be yesterday. So for you to be here, off your tragedy and your experience in an effort to help others is something that should be noted by this Committee and we applaud you for that. One of the things that I sticks out to me most in the testimony is that there is some concern there's, on your part, that had your town been the responding town that this may have gone a lot different leading us to believe that, you know, departments aren't acting kind of unison with regards how to handle these calls. And you've also been here now, you've been here since one o'clock I think, right. Yeah this time of year, the price of having your voice is heard is patience and you have been very patient and I appreciate that. But I think you've heard testimony about the time constraints that are being looked at police departments and Chiefs and so forth. And I want to put some of that to rest as far as police don't have time to do this because, I'm aware the days following that you were out putting signs out on poles, pictures of your son trying to find him. If I'm not mistaken you came in contact with I would say, fair to say several officers during that time, right on different days at different times. And what was their reaction when you got a chance to talk with them?

DAWN PERKINS: Their reaction was that:
A: They hadn't heard that he was missing in the

town that he lives in and there was actually a Silver Alert posted for him in our town the day he went missing that was shared, you know, on the Connecticut Silver Alert posting and that they weren't aware of that, I was a little bit dumbfounded.

B: That they didn't have time to look for him which made me sick to my stomach because you're the police and I had an officer pointblank say to me, he didn't have time to look for him and he wasn't aware of it, and I'm like, and we had gone to the town that he was missing from and went to the police station and they said that they didn't have time to do welfare checks.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Well, you'll take some solace in knowing that I spoke with Chief Mello who is the President of the Connecticut Police Chiefs Association, he also chairs the Council for Police Officer Standard Trainings and I have also reached out to the Commissioner of our Public Safety and though he was not here today to testify, he did have testimony come in and I'm just gonna read you the first line of that testimony from his office and he has said, "This is a great concept and one that I fully support." So I hope you take some comfort in knowing that the key players are on notice and they are looking forward to working this Legislation forward and coming to a resolution. He's actually stated that he would like to see post and Chiefs and commissioner's office also get together and work collaboratively to come up with best practices for your son. Again, I'm sorry for your loss and thank you again for being here today to testify.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Representative Hayes.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Thank you both for being here, I know how hard that was for you and I know you hit home, both myself and my colleagues are previous police officers and responding to welfare checks are one of the toughest things a police officer could do and I am not going to place blame either but I will tell you that it is my experience that almost every police department handles them differently. And I'd like to think that we did it the right way where I came from but I don't know that and I think that you being here today has at least helped me, I think that it's time we look at this to and if nothing else start a discussion amongst the police chiefs and the State Police and maybe we can come up with a policy that works best for everyone, nothing is ever perfect. But maybe we can look at a policy that could prevent this from happening in the future. So, thank you for being here. I know it was emotional, it touched me too, so thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): I am so deeply sorry for your loss and, you know, as a retired policeman those are difficult calls, but when we received 'em, we would go check the residence and the place of work and we would make sure every officer knew because that, in rollcall would be distributed. So, a uniform way of handling I think would be appropriate, so I will support this. Thank you for having the strength to come here today.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Senator. Any other questions? We are very sorry for your loss. Thank you for the courage and the strength that you've shown here today in memory of your son.

DAWN PERKINS: We're just looking, we know we can't bring him back, but to save even just one life in the future, you know, that's all we hope. So thank you again.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you. Next up, Dave Glidden. I'm sorry, John DiSette and Kenneth Hadinoto. My apologies. Good Afternoon.

JOHN DI SETTE: Thank you to the Committee, is it all right if I have a few of the elevator inspectors here, if I can yield some of my time to them as well?

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): You may.

JOHN DI SETTE: So thank you, my name is John DiSette and I am the President of A&R Employees Union. I am here to speak, oppose SB 269. I have submitted written testimony, I was also here much earlier in the day when Director Joe Cassidy from DAS presented. The Committee fully understood the problems, the issues that we have with this. I also did hear the prior speaker. So I just want to just point out a couple of things.

Certainly through this Bill, there is language in here that allows these standards that we have no in place as far as licensures go for the certified licensing, to be lower than what it is now as it is performed by the elevator inspectors for DAS so that is certainly the potential that is here.

Secondly I also want to point out that the way this Bill is written it does allow entities to contract with inspection firms. There is obviously a silliness to expect that when you allow an entity to contract out with an inspecting firm that there is no way that this would ever end up in appropriate

inspection results. I do also want to point out that we have submitted a report of when this system was implemented in New York how that has turned out and the results of that, so we want to submit that for you as well. It is something that is a little eye opening.

Lastly I have the elevator inspectors here. They can tell you more about the licensing and the issues that have occurred in other states when this program has been implemented. They can also give you some background as well on this staffing that has come up at this Committee meeting. All right, so with that I'd like to yield the rest of time over.

KENNETH HADINOTO: Good Afternoon, my name is Kenneth Hadinoto. I am an elevator inspector. I've held an R2 License for the past 16 years, since 2004 and I've also been an elevator inspector for the past 10 years. So, in one word, safety. That one word can be the difference between going home to your family or never seeing your family again. That is the very thing that is in jeopardy, that's at jeopardy if SB 269 is passed.

The certification requirements for these proposed third party inspectors are not identical to those held by the current inspectors employed by the State. I was listening to the QEI Certification and I did a quick Google search on it, for a QEI certification all you need is, there are requirements for either four years dealing with elevators but there is also another requirement it says, "Or two years of a college degree pertaining to the elevator industry mechanical degree or one year inspecting" it can be under another inspector and one year as an elevator personnel which is

defined by the code, "is having a year's worth of experience inspecting an elevator." Not necessarily working on one but inspecting one.

So someone can basically do this for a year, two years take a four day class and get a QEI Certification but they wouldn't have a first clue on how to conduct a thorough elevator inspection safely and this would endanger the lives, their life and the lives of the general public. These third party inspectors would also be hired by building owners to inspect their elevators and this would be a perfect example of conflict of interest. If a violation was found, what would stop a third party inspector from letting this violation slide if it meant that they would be able to keep a lucrative contract with that building owner or management company. The State elevator inspectors adhere to the letter of the code and will shut down an elevator if there is a serious violation. I know I've shut plenty of elevators down for overdue tests, no questions asked. It's overdue, I shut it down. There is no bargaining, there is nothing like that.

The other point I'd like to make would be the that Bureau of Elevators is not behind on their new inspections, print reviews, modernizations or critical testing. You might have been misled to believe this but that is not the case. I can't speak for the entire building department as a whole, but I can assure you that the elevator division has been very timely with handling of all new print reviews, modernizations and critical testing.

Now, I've gone off of what I submitted for testimony but if you look at my testimony that I had submitted I have examples from New York, the audits taken from

New York as far as the program that they've adopted which is similar to what DAS is proposing and it hasn't worked out so great for them. They are finding out that when their inspectors, when the city inspectors do their inspections, they are finding violations. When the private inspectors come in to do an inspection they come up and say, oh wait everything is fine. But then the state goes back and find even more violations. So clearly it isn't working, plus in the past ten years New York has had approximately 22 deaths with elevators whereas in the past ten years in Connecticut we haven't had a single death. That I believe is because of our inspectors and how well-trained. We go through a vigorous four to five year, in the elevator industry, to acquire our state license. With schooling, with work hours, we are working around the equipment and we know the safety hazards. So when we do become inspectors we are well-versed in everything dealing with elevators and escalators. Thank you very much, if you have any questions.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you for your testimony. Are there any questions? Representative Sredzinski.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you for coming up to testify. One of the understandings that I [coughs], excuse me, that I have about the New York contract was that it was a low-bid contract. Do you think that plays into any of the issues that they've had there in New York City?

KENNETH HADINOTO: That could very well be. I just know that the inspectors in New York, they are not trained well enough so they might be able to demand a lower price for their services. But as far as

personal knowledge of it, I do not have personal knowledge of the New York inspectors.

JOHN DI SETTE: If I could, you don't mind more than one answer, I think the setup itself allows for the problems that are created whether it is low bid or higher bid I think the setup itself, the way we have it set-up in Connecticut these guys as elevator inspectors for the State, they don't owe anybody, they don't have to answer to anybody, they work for the State. So when they go and inspect they are beholdin to nobody other than getting this done for the public, for the mission of the agency. So the setup we have now, it's the strongest one you could want. They are autonomous, they are independent, they have no real stake in it. So when they go in, they're lookin to see if it's safe or not. They're not goin in wondering if they need to uphold a contract, if they need to cut this short so they can get to the next job. It's the system that they implement, that is the problem, low bid, high bid, doesn't matter. What we've got now works, its strong and its safe and proven that way.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): The how do you respond to the AS's comments about the fact that they're not able to get as many inspections done, therefore building approvals are falling behind schedule? Do you have any response to that in anyway, cause obviously I have to assume that these competing views on this but there's got to be a problem that we're looking to solve, is that correct?

KENNETH HADINOTO: So yes, if you look at the Bill, the first page of the Bill it doesn't even mention elevators. It just mentions building inspectors and building inspections and it's very misleading

because, like I said, I don't know the building inspector side of it, I don't know if they are behind, from what I hear they are but as far as elevator inspections go and the new print reviews, new inspections we are not behind. We are very timely with, the requests come in, they get scheduled out within the week, within two weeks they are scheduled. So it's not on our end that it's behind.

REP. SREDZINSKI (112TH): Thank you for your time. Appreciate it. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Representative Hayes.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Be patient with me because I'm starting to find out I'm a little slow when it comes to elevators apparently. You gentlemen are state employees?

KENNETH HADINOTO: Yes, that is correct.

REP. HAYES (51ST): How many State elevator inspectors are there?

KENNETH HADINOTO: We have six in the field and seven total though.

REP. HAYES (51ST): And you inspect for the entire State?

KENNETH HADINOTO: Ah, yes, yes we do.

REP. HAYES (51ST): So I come from a small town, Putnam, we probably have eight elevators in the entire town, nothing goes more than three stories. Do people in that town call you for inspections or are they automatically on a rotation where you go out and inspect those elevators?

KENNETH HADINOTO: They are automatically on a rotation. So every 18 months we have a list that is generated of elevators that we need to inspect.

REP. HAYES (51ST): I guess it can vary but how long does it take to inspect an elevator?

KENNETH HADINOTO: It can take up to about an hour for a three or four stop, but to an hour-and-a-half to two hours for anything that is in the cities like the 10, 15, 20 story buildings because we go through all the door locks, we go through the safety circuits, we check tests when they were done, we check the logbooks to make sure they are filled out and that they are actually there in the machine rooms, so a lot goes into it.

REP. HAYES (51ST): So somebody testified previously that there was approximately 15,000 elevators in Connecticut, is that?

KENNETH HADINOTO: That’s correct.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay and once again you’re claiming that you are not having a problem keeping up with those inspections?

KENNETH HADINOTO: No, I said that we are not having a problem keeping up with the new inspections, the modernizations, the critical testing. We are behind on our annual inspections.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Behind by a month, six months, a year?

KENNETH HADINOTO: What was the number 5,000 or 3,000, 3,000 behind. I have not looked at the list recently to see how far behind we are but. It is due to hiring, so.

JOHN DI SETTE: One of the keys to that is that they have cut the staff in half in a little less than a few years. So the staffing level has been cut in half in the last few years so when they tell 'ya its seven now, it was 14 just five years ago. So when you do that obviously you can't cut your staff in half and then wonder why you are falling behind.

REP. HAYES (51ST): And are you anticipating there is gonna be hires or are we at a flat level now and [cross talking].

KENNETH HADINOTO: You know, that's interesting obviously we don't get to make that decision. Do we think that, yeah if you're gonna put your energies anywhere.

JOHN DI SETTE: Look, the fellow that was here before and I apologize, I don't remember his name. He gave you the answer, right. He told you how expensive it is without telling you how expensive it is to switch models. He told you in his own testimony, what he told you was if you go look at New York what was the problem with New York, why are there so many problems with this model in New York, well because the state isn't doing enough auditing and oversight. Well those are bodies too. So if you're gonna have to get state oversight and people work to cover that so you don't have the problems that you have in New York, which he told you is the case, you're still gonna need to hire bodies. So if the State wants to keep the same method and they're gonna have to add more work anyway in the form of whether it be auditors, you might as well stick with putting more effort into the elevator inspectors. What they're tellin ya here is they've dropped from 14 to seven. If you just add a few more of them

back that should help you get on your way to getting back to where we need to be rather than going out, switching the entire system that we clearly have seen isn't working and then have to hire more auditors and follow through people to ensure that the system doesn't fall apart. So if you're gonna put an effort anywhere, put it in here, keep the system safe. They told 'ya we haven't had an incident or an accident in at least a decade. Clearly if you are going to make an investment, we don't get to make that, you guys know the appropriations is done out of this building, the policies of who they are going to hire. We don't get to do that but we are encouraging that absolutely.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Is there a public safety issue because you are behind in the annual inspections?

KENNETH HADINOTO: Well the thing is the elevator companies are required to maintain. Well okay, so by code elevators have to be maintained to a certain standard. The building owners, the elevator companies they get together and they make sure that their elevators are maintained to the proper standards, proper codes. We come in to make sure that they are following those codes. So kind of we are an oversight right now, we oversee all the elevators in the State. We make sure that they are confirming to the code. So, we adopted a new code in 2018 that requires all elevators to have what is called an MCP, maintenance controlled program located in the machine room and in that is supposed to be a log of everything that is done on that elevator or escalator and that is a code that so basically you can track how many visits its had,

what company, who has done work on it and what work has been done on it.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): I'm trying to fall along too. Thank you for coming today. So is this a handwritten thing the MCP?

KENNETH HADINOTO: Ah, yes. It's a handwritten thing in each and every machine room. When a mechanic comes on-site to do work they are supposed to fill this out and it stays in that machine room and they are supposed to keep the records for the previous five years.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Okay. Is there at a point with the new elevators being installed that somehow this can be electronic thing that goes out to you guys?

KENNETH HADINOTO: So they tried to do the electronic thing. What happens is a lot of companies that keep their electronic records, they've tried to say well we have electronic records on file. Our question to them was what happens when you lose a contract? How easy is it going to be to get those electronic files from you once you've lost the contract. So that's why we required them to have paper copies in each machine room.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Right, so our elevator broke in our library and we had to call in a company, it's a different type of elevator I guess. So we had to call in a certain repair company, they came and repaired it. Now do you go and inspect

that before we turn it back on or did they [cross-talking].

KENNETH HADINOTO: It depends on what was fixed. If it was something as simple as a door lock or something like that, they would be able to come there, fix it, put it back in service, they would write down what they fixed in the MCP and then go on their way. If for a hydraulic elevator, for hydraulic elevator if they break the line, if they take the hydraulic off anywhere between the valve and the cylinder, then they would have to contact the State say, we did this repair, they send in a scope of work saying this is the repair we did and we are scheduling a test and then we would send an inspector out there to witness the test.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): And you are not behind in any of that?

KENNETH HADINOTO: No. Those are critical testing so those we are on time with. The calls come in, they send us in a written copy and it gets scheduled that day.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): So basically you are behind but the elevator companies are still taking care of those elevators?

KENNETH HADINOTO: Correct.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): And when you get there, you know, you'll see the MCP to make sure?

KENNETH HADINOTO: Yeah.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): All right and the training that you guys go through is a standardized training?

KENNETH HADINOTO: So a lot of us came in through the elevator industry and through the apprenticeship program. So it's a very rigorous apprenticeship program. It is usually about four to five years of schooling and work hours in the trade as an apprentice. So we come in through the trade usually through construction, modernization repair and maintenance. And we learn everything there is to know about elevators, working with a mechanic that has been a mechanic usually for many years. And in that we go through that training, we take a test to get our mechanics license and from there we take a state test to get our 2 Journeyperson's license. So we've had extensive training, extensive work hours in the industry so we know what the hazards are, we know what to look for as far as when it comes to inspections. And like I said with the QEI training they may train with another QEI inspector for a year and that counts as elevator personnel which to me you can't really count that as elevator personnel because what do they actually know about an elevator, beside they can look in a book, at a code and say, okay this is what the code is and anyone can do that. It's knowing the industry, knowing the actual mechanicals of the elevator.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Learn something new every day. Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Representative Genga.

REP. GENGA (10TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your testimony. In the testimony you submitted and others I see that the State has gone from 14 to seven inspectors in just a few short years. However there is no backlog of new inspections?

KENNETH HADINOTO: No. No, sir there is not.

REP. GENGA (10TH): So it's getting around to do the annual inspections that are needed within the communities in the State. In one of the documents submitted by somebody, they define the problem as inadequate staffing and not having enough inspectors to do the normal. Simple answer, common sense, is that what you would say also?

KENNETH HADINOTO: Yes.

REP. GENGA (10TH): Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Representative Morin.

REP. MORIN (28TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Guy's thanks for coming and testifying. Representative Hayes and much to many of our surprise that I really think along the same lines, so I appreciate the questions he asked. I think you did answer most everything but I guess what I would like to get a little bit deeper, the staffing levels are concerning. But again the difference between being licensed, the things that you have to go though being able to do your job versus being certified. Can you just help me out with that?

KENNETH HADINOTO: Sure. So in order to be licensed in the State of Connecticut you have to go through a program that is equal or above the current apprenticeship program that is in Connecticut which it's like five years in the trade, schooling, a certain number of hours of work per year and with all that training that's how we learn about the elevators. With the certification it's pretty much a four day class that you can go to, at the end of it you can take a test and you can be QEI Certified. I was looking at the QEI Certification they ask for

either four years' experience or two years of college which doesn't give you any experience with elevators or one year as elevator personnel meaning you can train under an inspector, another QEI inspector that might not be qualified and then have one additional year as an inspector. So two years as an inspector, not really knowing what an elevator is or how dangerous it can be and how to properly do an elevator inspection. So to me a license is, it holds a lot more weight than a certification.

REP. MORIN (28TH): Thank you and truly this is a public safety matter for all of us.

KENNETH HADINOTO: Absolutely.

REP. MORIN (28TH): I understand my colleagues get that and you know, the problem I'm seeing is like many things I've heard, in this building, is I don't know how to say it properly without getting people mad at me but public sector employees are under fire all of the time. Staffing levels have gone down, the workload either stays the same or increases but everybody is expected to do the same with less and it's a problem. And often times when we do things with outside interest whether you're talking about what happened in New York or we talk about what happened on I-84 in Waterbury, be careful what you ask for you just might get it. Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you. Any other questions? Thank you for your testimony.

KENNETH HADINOTO: Thank you very much.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Now I can call Dave Glidden. Thank you, sorry about that before.

DAVE GLIDDEN: No problem at all. I don't know if we passed the line into evening. So I'll say Good Evening, Representative Verrengia and members of the Public Safety and Security Committee, my name is David Glidden, and I am the Executive Director of CSEA SEIU Local 2001, which is a labor union representing over 25,000 members across our State. I come before you today in opposition to Senate Bill 269, the one we've been hearing about most recently, AN ACT CONCERNING CERTIFICATION OF INDEPENDENT INSPECTORS AND INSPECTION FIRMS TO PERFORM ELEVATOR, ESCALATOR AND STATE BUILDING CODE INSPECTIONS.

Among CSEA's membership are the state's building inspectors. Within DAS, it is a small staff that has big responsibility. A cross the construction industry, the reputation of this group of building code experts is impeccable. In short, they are professional, they are experienced, and they are extremely good at what they do. Every day, each member executes a high volume of inspection and code review work. Routinely, they catch problems that, if not discovered would undermine the quality and safety of buildings being constructed across the State. The managerial leadership of DAS, who lead the charge for this bill, would be the first to tell you that this staff is made up of the best, most skilled code experts in our State.

But I think that the Office of the State Building Inspector staff would tell you that, while they are excellent at what they do, they aren't getting any younger. In fact, a significant portion of the staff is eligible or close to being eligible to retire. It appears that this Bill is aimed at addressing that issue at least in part by allowing the State to replace departing state inspectors with

an ad hoc approach to building inspection. The idea is to allow the state to assign inspection work to private individuals of varying degrees of experience and skill. This path would undoubtedly lead to the practice of "inspector shopping", which would greatly undermine the quality of the work. I submit to you that that is a wrongheaded way of dealing with this critical state safety function. The current resource of institutional knowledge and skill will be disappearing shortly. Instead of embracing a privatization scheme, the state should look to hire new, younger inspectors so that they can learn from the vast expertise that exists now.

In the DAS submission to OPM proposing this privatization idea, they reference third-party inspections in Washington, D.C. and New York City. In Washington, D.C., delays in permitting and inspections have gotten worse with the use of third-party firms because they are not familiar with the City's specific codes and regulations. DAS's proposal states, "From discussions with individuals familiar with each jurisdiction the programs have been successful and the outcomes have been, overall, positive." This assertion is contrary to the record. Specifically, an audit by New York State Comptroller Thomas P. DiNapoli's office notes, "private elevator inspectors in New York City are missing hazardous violations and allowing unsafe conditions to go unrepaired." This is just the tip of the iceberg when it comes to the failures of for profit, third-party private firms attempting to conduct building and elevator inspections.

In short, the choice now is to either maintain the current strong, effective safety net or to replace it with a net that is riddled with holes. The first

path protects the public while the second puts the public at risk. Building inspection is a function our State does extremely well, with cost-effective in-house state employees who work in the public's interest and not for profits. Let’s not change that. Please reject Senate Bill 269. Thank you

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Dave. Any questions? Seeing none, thank you for your testimony. Up next Kathy Flaherty.

KATHY FLAHERTY: Good Evening, Members of the Public Safety and Security Committee, my name is Kathy Flaherty and I’m the Executive Director of Connecticut Legal Rights Project also here on behalf of the Keep the Promise Coalition and the Cross Disability Lifespan Alliance. I have submitted written testimony on three Bills, 263, 1585 and 5314. But I really want to focus my testimony here on 263 which is AN ACT ALLOWING AN EMERGENCY CONTACT ACCESS TO A DWELLING UNIT WITHOUT THE TENANT'S CONSENT UNDER CERTAIN CIRCUMSTANCES.

I have been a housing lawyer at Legal Services for more than 20 years, not entirely convinced the Bill is actually really necessary because they already allow for emergency access by a landlord if there truly is an emergency. But I do understand the purpose of the Bill and it does seem that if a tenant designates an emergency contact, as long as the tenant knows that the emergency contact might also be let into their apartment.

The way I sort of think of it is if I had an emergency I wouldn’t have a problem with somebody calling my mom but I’m not sure I want my mom coming into my house without me knowing that she is coming so I can get the house ready for her to be in it.

So I think it's just something to be aware of. Certainly understand the purpose of the Bill and I thank the Committee for raising it. At this point I'd be happy to answer any questions anybody has.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you for your testimony. Any questions? Representative Fusco.

REP. FUSCO (81ST): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. You mentioned that you had some comments perhaps on 5314?

KATHY FLAHERTY: Yes.

REP. FUSCO (81ST): I'd like to hear them if you don't mind.

KATHY FLAHERTY: I'm in favor of the Bill. I do think that when police are called to do wellness checks they either can go well and resultant people getting help that they need, they can also spectacularly badly and we heard one example of something that happened today but there are other ways that things could go not well. I represent people with mental health conditions and a lot of our folks frankly don't have good encounters with law enforcement, they just don't. And so if there are best practices out there that have been worked through by law enforcement and people can learn from their peers and collect those best practices and share them I think that would be a very helpful thing.

REP. FUSCO (81ST): I thank you for that. Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Representative. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): Thank you, Mr. Chair. Welcome to Public Safety. Ms. Flaherty and I have quite a few interactions in the Housing Committee. Thank you for your tireless work. I just want to take a moment and thank you for your work in this building and your advocacy for those that are struggling and don't always have a voice and I thank you for being their voice. And I also want to acknowledge Rafie, you too make a pretty good team at Connecticut Legal Services so again thank you very much for your good work.

KATHY FLAHERTY: Thank you, I appreciate that very much. It's been a pleasure to be able to work with such great colleagues at other programs and to now be leading Connecticut Legal Aid Project, so thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Senator. Any other questions? Thank you for your testimony.

KATHY FLAHERTY: Thanks, we'll see you next week.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): We'll be here. Next up Mike Muszynski. Not seeing Mike, Kevin Saunders.

KEVIN SAUNDERS: Good Evening distinguished members of the Public Safety and Security Committee. My name is Kevin Saunders and I'd like to thank you for allowing me to testify in support of Senate Bill 261. I am one of nine police officers in the Department of Revenue Services. I am assigned to the Criminal Investigation Division where I am accountable for performing complex investigations of civil and criminal violations of the Connecticut Tax Statutes.

While we are POST certified police officers with powers of arrest, under the current definition of

"peace officer" under Connecticut General Statute section 53a-3 fails to incorporate our designation as "special police officers." under Connecticut General Statute section 29-18b.

It is common that the phrase "peace officer" and "police officer" are used interchangeably in State statute. This sometimes results in the inadvertent exclusion of our entire job classification from important law enforcement statutes where "peace officer" is used.

For example, a large component of our job requires us to perform surveillance to gather evidence against non-compliers. It is not uncommon for us to search warrants, to place tracking devices on vehicles as a means of investigation. This action often requires us to use department issued handheld mobile phones and two way state issued police radios while we are driving. The use of these devices is prohibited under Connecticut General Statute section 14-296aa. While this Statute affords an exemption to peace officers, as defined in Connecticut General Statute 53a-3 it does not extend to police officers as defined in Connecticut General Statute section 29-18b.

This problem is further compounded each time "peace officer" is used in the introduction of new legislation or in the amendment of existing statutes. Last year, this committee raised the exact same issue for the Motor Vehicle Inspectors within the Department of Motor Vehicles. House Bill 6376 "AN ACT CONCERNING MOTOR VEHICLE INSPECTORS AS PEACE OFFICERS" was successfully passed out of the Public Safety and Security Committee and unanimously

passed by the General Assembly and signed by the Governor in Public Act 19-108.

Senate Bill 261 will correct the issue for Department of Revenue Services police. It is also important to note that the passage of this legislation will not result in the need for additional training or additional certifications, nor will this change or increase our police powers of arrest or expand our job responsibilities. I ask for your support in the passage of Senate Bill Number 261 and thank you for your continued support to the law enforcement community.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you for your service. Questions? Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Hello and thank you for coming today. So at the end of your statement you were talking that this doesn't change anything about your job right now. Do you get any type of stipend, extra pay with this classification?

KEVIN SAUNDERS: No, so what's recently has come up I some of our officers have been stopped by local and State Police officers and we were told that we do not qualify to use our handheld phones or our two-way state issued police radio while we are working. And we can't do our job if we are not able to do that. So it's kind of imperative for us to have that if we want to be able to maintain that level of service.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): So you said you do investigations. Do you make arrests?

KEVIN SAUNDERS: Yes, we have full State Police powers as far as arrests. We are all POST certified, we have all been to the police academy.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Write tickets.

KEVIN SAUNDERS: Yes.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): So in every other form you are a police officer except by name.

KEVIN SAUNDERS: Yes. So if you go to Statute 53a-3 which has the definition of "peace officer" it lists who is eligible under that it spells out 29-18, 29-18(a) and 29-19. It actually just skips 29-18(b) where we get out police authority.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Who else is in there, is anybody else in 29-(b).

KEVIN SAUNDERS: 29-18(b) is just us.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Just you guys?

KEVIN SAUNDERS: Just us.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH): Okay, all right. Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Representative Hayes.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Hi, thanks for comin. How many officers does this include?

KEVIN SAUNDERS: Right now there is nine, when I started there was I believe 14.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Okay and you said POST certified recertification, everything that's standard?

KEVIN SAUNDERS: I have a State issued police car with lights and sirens, I have a state issued radio, phone and electronic devices that the State gave us that we need our hands to use while we're driving.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Is your job classification right now hazardous duty?

KEVIN SAUNDERS: Yes.

REP. HAYES (51ST): Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Any other questions? Thank you. Arthur House.

ARTHUR HOUSE: Thank you very much. Sorry, I don't have a written statement. I've been working overseas for the U.S. State Department on Cyber Issues and I just got back to the country and got a phone call this morning asking if I could come here today. So I did not have time to write a statement, I hope this will be from the heart as some of your other speakers have said. And I am testifying in support of Raised Bill Number 235 which is AN ACT ESTABLISHING A CYBERSECURITY TASK FORCE.

I have just three points. One is threat facing Connecticut. Second is the background of our work in Connecticut on cybersecurity and third point is what we need.

Connecticut has been attacking cybersecurity on two fronts. One is critical infrastructure by which we mean our public utilities, electricity, natural gas and water all of which are threatened for compromise and for shutdown.

The second is a State Cybersecurity Strategy and Action Plan across the board. State government, municipal government, private business, law enforcement, higher education. Connecticut has been a national leader in both and recently we've just been falling back, I don't know another way to say it other than that bluntly. We have been relatively

inactive on both. I think this is a good initiative and I'm sorry it's necessary.

We've had a strategy and an action plan and we should proceed with them but not doing that perhaps we have to fall back and it will take a while to catch back up to where we were to study them, and therefore I think this is good initiative and may shed light, nothing static, you know, it can always be improved and I think this Bill offers a vehicle to do that. The threat facing Connecticut, our municipalities face ransomware. Some of them have paid it, have been shut down. State agencies face the same threat.

In Connecticut unfortunately each commissioner is in charge of his or her own cybersecurity, that's ridiculous. That's weak. Some of our commissions are very, very strong, revenue services obviously, it has to be. Some of them are quite open to compromise and have very minimal ineffective defenses. But we have no statewide policy. No one overlooks them and says they're adequate or inadequate. Each commissioner does what he or she sees fit.

The municipalities are looking for help. Very few municipalities have a cybersecurity officer, they can't afford it. We need a regional system to help defend them.

Businesses, one-half of all businesses in Connecticut have never done a risk assessment of any kind, at all. Never mind cybersecurity. The large businesses ask that we set this up so that we can help all businesses. It would give Connecticut business a competitive edge and that is what they

want and that is organized businesses ask for CBIA and the Metropolitan Council as well.

Law enforcement, we're beginning to make progress. The State Police now does have investigative authorities. Higher education there have been 3,000 to 4,000 jobs in Connecticut which have been lacking, this has been going on for five years.

Disaster recovery we have practiced but we have not done a sheer and pure cyber exercise. So I can talk about what we need and the background work we've done.

Governor Malloy asked for a strategy and an action plan, we completed it and the current administration has decided not to proceed with it so it's been set aside. It could be picked up, it could be used in the future but right now it is in abeyance. As far as critical infrastructure is concerned we received national publicity for our pioneering work in having annual reviews. I've conducted three of them, I don't know if that program still exists today or not. It should have started last month. I have notified PURA that we're getting national and international credit. I've been in Europe and I've heard praise for the Connecticut model. I don't know if that still exists today.

So there are several things we need to do, but I'm over time so I'll let that go and pleased to respond to your questions.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): Thank you and Art, thank you very much for staying such long hours and immediately upon your return from high demand, worldwide, for your tremendous work. And before I

ask a question I think I want to take a moment to acknowledge your incredible service to this State and this Country in the area of intelligence gathering and recent history in regards to cybersecurity. We are very, very lucky to have you.

Now, talking about the plan that has been kind of been shelved. I think first, it is important to note that the United States Government itself does not have a comprehensive national program and I think you very effectively raised the alarm that Representative Dan Coats, see you have taught me well, had shared the fact that we don't have a centralized U.S. plan and therefore the importance of the Connecticut initiative that you lead for many years is critical. Could you explain a little bit about why it is so critical for Connecticut to have an initiative in this area and not fall behind?

ARTHUR HOUSE: Thank you, Senator. Three, I'd say my background, I got into this, I was Director of Congressional Relations and Communications for the Director of National Intelligence in the Obama Administration. And so I did some work in intelligence matters including cybersecurity which is how I learned about this. Now Director Coats a year ago in his Annual World Threat Assessment presentation to Congress signified that and noted that foreign powers had penetrated our critical infrastructure, meaning gas, water and national security.

Six months before that the Secretary of the Department of Homeland Security did the same thing and said we are at risk here. The former Deputy Director of the National Security Agency has said that it is ramped that there are penetrations at all

levels of generation transmission and distribution. Now I've worked with a number of these people and I called them. I recently did an article that appeared in the *Hurst Newspapers* in Connecticut and I called them and said, what's going on because Connecticut has been out front. We negotiated voluntarily to the credit frankly of Connecticut's utilities, annual inspection in great detail and we look at top to bottom, what are they doing, what is their culture, what is there defense mechanism, what is there software and they find nothing. I believe that the difference is the penetration that these high intelligence officials refer to is done at a very sophisticated level by nation states at a level at which they are not interested in telling the utilities where the implantations and compromises are that have taken place because they will then lose their sensitive sources and methods.

Now who is in charge of overseeing the distribution of critical infrastructure in the United States. It's the states. Like the insurance industry it is not governed by the Federal Government, the distribution of critical infrastructure is not governed by the Federal Government it is governed by the states. It is not just software, hardware perimeter defense, its not just technology. It is also all of the things that go into making a company safe. That is what my concern is about the State of Connecticut and what the current administration is doing. This solution in putting aside Governor Malloy's action plan and strategy is to say we're going to bring in a chief information security officer perimeter defenses, IT kinds of things. It's far more than that. It is the culture surrounding it.

Let me just tell you what one Connecticut utility does. Every single meeting, I can tell you who they are, they are Avon Grid which belongs to formally called UI. Every single meeting they have, if it is to talk about the United Way Drive, the summer softball league or the United Way or whatever it happens to be, every meeting begins with a cybersecurity tip. So if we're here together to talk about cafeteria hours, John over here, Susan would you please start this meeting with your personal cybersecurity habit that you find is most effective. When you know that the CEO cares, you know, know that your boss cares and you know that you are expected to report and you have anti-phishing drills and education programs all the time it becomes part of your culture. And that is why I believe having a culture of cybersecurity defense is absolutely critical and something that we need to advance here in the State of Connecticut.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): And again I want to repeat, thank you for your time here today, it's been a long day but then explain perhaps why when we spent days and hours debating, tolls, gambling and all the other nuances that are critical to our State we just don't seem to find the same level of gravity of worry and concern about greater public safety and security in the State of Connecticut in all aspects and all of our lives as we depend on digital technology. Why don't we care more about it?

ARTHUR HOUSE: Well there's several schools of thought on that, Senator. One, it's gonna take a 9/11. The United States is very good at reacting to major crises. After Pearl Harbor we rallied, after 9/11 we rallied. Everyone knows that cybersecurity is a serious threat to our businesses, to our

municipal governments, to our state governments but it will happen to someone else. When I go out and I do a lot of public talks, and businesses all say, I know but they won't come after me, they'll go after someone else and my answer to them is that may be so but you don't get to decide that, they will decide that. Small towns and unprotected businesses aren't lucrative but they are easy hits. It is a very, very easy way to make several tens of thousands of dollars.

I don't think that this is, there is a lack of concern about this in the current administration I just think it's not a high priority. I mean, that's all. In this building there are a lot of major issues, a lot of things on people's plates. I happen to put it as a high priority because I've worked in this field and I can see the devastation. I know what the United States can do to other countries and I've seen what other countries have tried to do to us. In some of our utilities there are thousands of attempted attacks every hour and sometimes over a million a day against our utilities. If they were to get through and shutdown the devastation to this State would be something we have never seen.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): Can you repeat those numbers again and I think it is very hard for us to really quantify for us as policymakers that aren't as savvy to it. These are remarkable numbers.

ARTHUR HOUSE: Well they are, about 40 percent of all attempts to connect to State utilities are blocked by our outer perimeter. When the Russian interference in elections in 2016 took place, we were asked was there an attack on Connecticut and we

said not that we know of but we will go find out. We found out in fact there was. But our perimeter defense had caught it, screened it out, defensed it so it never came to anybody's attention. So, the State is constantly under attack. We've had towns that are under attack. What we need to do is proactively get out ahead of that, establish a culture. I mean I could, it's an easy list. It's an easy list.

It starts with need for leadership, people who are about it. Backup your data, it's a simple thing to do. Have a professional review your firewalls and your perimeter defense. See that your patches are up-to-date, use two factor authentication for major transactions. Use creative passwords and change them frequently. When in doubt do not click. Do penetration testing. What would it take, every penetration test that goes against a state agency or a company gets through. The question is not can you get through or not, of course you can. Everything has been penetrated including the CIA, the Defense Department and the White House if you put the resources in it. So how did you get through. You ask the company, what was the easiest method cause they will come and try a whole range. They find out that you're okay here, this is where you're leaving the door open and that's what you want to know so that you can put a defense on there. We are all vulnerable, Senator the only question is are we taking reasonable steps to defend ourselves. One of the consequences of a cybersecurity blackout in Connecticut would be things that we've never know or practiced before. We are pretty good, we like to think that we are resilient Yankees and, you know,

we can go for a week in the wintertime without electricity and so on.

A cyber-attack were to knockout gas pipelines coming into New England would take months to repair. In New England we get 50 percent of our electricity generated by natural gas. After about week three we would no longer be able to purify our drinking water and deal with our sewage. The drinking water you have to cut it off. The sewage would have to go into lakes and streams and simply be released. Now the projections I get from my colleagues in Washington is after about three weeks there would be between 600,000 and 900,000 residents of Connecticut that would have to leave, would leave. You can put a blanket on at night, you can open another can of soup but if you don't have drinking water you die. And you go to where drinking water is.

So here is a strategic question. We have an exercise, what would we do? Would we open our highways and have the State Police direct people and say this is where you can go to find drinking water or would we have a prepared plan and bring drinking water into concentrated populations? Would we do some of both? I mean these are just some of the very many questions that could easily be visited upon us that we have not planned for and you not only have to plan for it but rehearse it. As any police or military official and some of you have that experience in emergency management know, every military official will say two things, one is don't just tell me what's you're gonna do, do it, rehearse it, plan it. And the second thing is, Eisenhower's favorite quote, or famous quote that "Every plan is quite useful until first contact with the enemy

after which you have to improvise because things go in ways you never would have imagined."

And I think that we have a competent emergency management capacity in Connecticut but we need to drill against this kind of challenge because I believe it is imminent.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): I think it is important to note the catastrophic potential infrastructure compromises we may have as a result of cybersecurity attacks but then there are also ransomware to our municipalities and what is interesting in perhaps you and I have talked often is there are many Connecticut municipalities that have been subjected to ransomware.

ARTHUR HOUSE: That's correct.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): And our Statutes do not require for them to disclose but if you talk with the Joint Task Force with the FBI as well as various other enforcement agencies it is often and it is going to continue. So I think again a sense of urgency that I have and sleepless nights on that. But the third aspect is from an intelligence gathering. I think you raise a point that, you know, the embedding into a compromised system where you don't know they have already penetrated your system. They planted box and their surveilling and the best point of intelligence gathering is to be unnoticed, to be unknown and how many of our systems are currently compromised that we are subject to somebody else knowing what we're doing?

ARTHUR HOUSE: Large question, excellent question, several questions. Some advisories have been especially interested in stealing intellectual

property and industrial secrets. The plans for the F-35 Joint Strike Fighter have been stolen, we make the engine for that right here in Connecticut. The plans for the Black Hawk Helicopter have been stolen, the plans for the Egis Antimissile, Antiship Missile System have been stolen just to take some on the military side. Others are interested in the National Security Shutdown scenario. Now we know that Russian and China have penetrated our systems, there has been testimony to this affect, it has taken place, it is there. Right now there is little indication that either Russia or China wants to go to war against the United States for all sorts of reasons which we need not get into. It is not in their interest to have an out-and-out war with the United States right now. However, China has done a study, it was highly classified and now it is available. What would it take for China to prevail against the United States in a conventional war. It was done by two Colonels at the People's Liberation Army War College in 1999 and they decided back then that the United States would win a conventional meaning a nonnuclear war expect that China could win if it were to strike our public utilities because we would be pinned down at home.

Since then two things have happened. The conventional forces of the Chinese have advanced massively and secondly their ability to penetrate us at home have advance massively. I'm not worried so much about those two because right now they don't have the will to create a war. What I am very much worried about are others who are gaining that capacity such as North Korea, Iran, there are three major international crime syndicates that can do that and then there are the cyber mercenaries, a lot

of them are in Eastern and Central Europe who are available guns for hire and they have been used. People say do I think this already happened, there have already been six cyber attacks and counterattacks between the United States and Iran. It's not, might this ever happen, it already has. We have attacked them three times and they have attacked us three times that are on the record, I'm not getting into things that are classified but, so yes cyberwarfare is taking place right now and what I'm worried about is somebody other than China or Russia having the power to take very serious steps against the United States with little to lose in deciding to do it.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): And ultimately the key is, and thank you for the indulgence, Mr. Chair is the State of Connecticut has an opportunity to take a leadership role and take control of this versus the Federal Government right now because that is the way the structure is. So as I said, and I appreciate your insight and knowledge and leadership in this area and a task force would be a way to bring this into greater awareness, to utilize the existing talent that we have in this State from our insurance, financial services, military, utilities these are resources that we should really leverage.

But also I am going to leave on a final note and thank you for again for the indulgence and late hours is this. You talk to any university, any university in this country, the faster curriculum major and highest in demand are IT cybersecurity graduates. Seems like everybody else knows it's a huge problem and Connecticut as an institution in higher education has realized that as the University of New Haven has testified, UConn has expertise on

cybersecurity center but perhaps the legislature should understand as well and leverage the assets that we have and not fall too far behind and become a victim. So thank you.

ARTHUR HOUSE: Your first point, I totally agree that I've heard independently from, everybody wants leadership on this, they want to move ahead and I think it is the kind of thing that would respond on positive leadership cause that's what they told me.

Secondary regarding higher education, businesses cannot find cybersecurity professionals today. They can't. As I mentioned in my testimony between 3,000 and 4,000 jobs in Connecticut alone unfilled and they have been for years. There are about 350,000 across the country. These are good jobs, I've never heard of one starting out paying less than $60,000 dollars and some of them will go well into the six figures and this is right at the start of their career. Now businesses will tell you they can't hire people. How do you get a cybersecurity professional today, you steal one from someone else. And so it's very lucrative. What about the supply chain.

Businesses will say, I don't want a four year electrical engineer. Why not? Because curricula take three or four years to develop than then you go though college for four years and you get out what you've learned is about seven years old probably. And we don't need all that. We urgently need someone with basic cybersecurity skill and we will teach him or her what we need in this business. Give me a two year community college cybersecurity graduate. Now when I was working at this as Chief Cybersecurity Risk Officer, spoke to our higher

education so forth and so on, we have been producing for years in our Connecticut community colleges, not the university in New Haven but just our own community college and some of them were Nagatuck, Manchester Community College and others have programs, between 15 and 40 graduates per year and that has not changed. Well, you don't produce 40 graduates year and hope to fill that gap of 4,000 very attractive jobs still lacking in Connecticut. You can't make that up unless you basically change your education infrastructure. So I am agreeing with you, Senator this needs an approach across the board with a lot of people involved and that's why I support the Bill that you've proposed.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): Thank you and thank you for the indulgence, Mr. Chair but I also would be remiss if I didn't acknowledge the leadership of this Committee along with the Ranking Members who have supported this idea and this strategy and raising awareness. Maybe their not as much of a nerd head as I am about this whole thing but I want to acknowledge my appreciation for the leadership of this Committee in raising this Bill and the support of this Bill down the road and I really appreciate your time. It's been a very long day and thank you for the indulgence of the entire Committee and leadership. Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Any other questions? Mr. House, thank you. Thank you for the conversation. Thank you for the information and for bringing this forward to, Senator. Next up, Rafie Podolsky.

RAFIE PODOISKY: Good Evening, I feel like I've missed something important. Thank you very much for the opportunity to testify today. My name is Rafie

Podolsky, I am a lawyer with Connecticut Legal Services. I am here on behalf of Legal Aid Programs in Connecticut in regard to Senate Bill Number 263.

I want to say to you sitting in the audience you may thought I was not listening but this has been a very fascinating Public Hearing to listen to from the perspective of someone who really knows nothing about the subject most of the other witnesses were talking about but it was really very interesting.

I am just going to summarize what is in my written testimony. Senate Bill 63 is about providing emergency access to a dwelling unit for the purpose of a well-being check on the occupant of the unit. We understand, we definitely understand that the importance of being able to have such checks take place. Our initial reaction is still my reaction now, is you don't need the Bill. The existing law that deals when access can be made to a unit adequately addresses the issue of emergency situations. And we are a little bit nervous about changes quite frankly because of the danger of it being used inappropriately of putting at risk the privacy of tenants, of being used in sort of a manipulative way of getting into an apartment when you are not supposed to be able to get in without consent. So, it make us cautious. It doesn't make us against the Bill, it makes us cautious.

Having said we don't think it's necessary, if the Committee is, however gonna adopt a Bill of this sort, then there are three things we think should be modified in the language to make sure these things are clear and those things: Number one, are to make clear that a tenant is not required to have an emergency consent, emergency contact. Something

that could be asked for by any landlord under existing law but there is no mandate that says that you can't get an apartment if you can't give an emergency contact.

Second to try to make sure this is used in accordance with what seems to be the intent of the Bill there really needs to be a substantial reason to believe that the tenant is in danger. It's got to be some reason, you just can't go in just to check with no real basis. And third that the Bill has a limited purpose of a well-being check, it is not that someone can do a general inspection of the property. And so if you look at my written testimony we've tried to take those three aspects and make sure that they are adequately drafted into the language that is contained in the Bill. I can read it if you want or you can just look at the written testimony. So that context is basically our position on the Bill, we don't think it's really necessary but if you're gonna do it, please make sure you do it in a cautious way so it doesn't end up having unintended consequence for residents. Be happy to answer any questions I can.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH): Very quickly , Rafie thank you for your great work. It's appreciated, thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108TH): Thank you for your testimony. So I am a landlord myself and I tend to agree with you, it seems to me that it may not be a necessary Bill although you know there might be circumstances where sometimes we've met a parent of a prospective

tenant has come through and seen the apartment and, you know, you can see good relations between the prospective tenant and the parent or, you know, a sibling or whomever, another family member and so there might, we might encounter situations where because of that sort of introduction and maybe you see that person on a regular basis where without having their name officially on a list, you know, it might be tempting and this has never happened, thankfully, for a landlord if they are familiar with the person to say, oh yeah, I haven't seen them for a few days too, yeah, maybe we should go check. That should never happen anyway I think is what you're saying.

RAFIE PODOLSKY: What you're describing what doesn't sound like an emergency situation. I mean the kind of situation where someone says, I suspicious, my child is on drugs and has been seriously engaging in some serious behaviors and now he's disappeared. We can't find him. He's not answering the phone, we need to find out if he is in the apartment. One approach would be to call the police. But there are lots of circumstances where you would just as soon not bring the police into the situation, you'd rather be able to do it in a private nonpublic kind of way. It seems to me if you articulate those sorts of things that would fit into the existing statute. [Cross talking] couldn't find an emergency situation.

REP. SMITH (108TH): I guess I'm going to agree with you because I think in that kind of situation I would enter into the apartment and check as a landlord if someone came to me with that.

RAFIE PODOLSKY: And the flipside is if mom or dad said, hey I'd like to see what's going on in my son's apartment, landlord would you please open up the door and let me in, you're gonna say no, I can't do that, that's not legal. So we're trying to maintain that distinction and our worry is there could be circumstances, we just want to avoid a circumstance where we start slipping over into the other side or maybe the landlord himself is kinda suspicious would like to see what's going on inside and this gives a reason. So again that's why we're looking at it from the perspective of saying do you really need something more or is existing statute really adequate to accomplish that. And our view is it's adequate but if you do something please make sure you do it in a limited way.

REP. SMITH (108TH): Okay, the example was helpful Thank you.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you, Representative. Any other questions? Rafie thank you for your testimony. Thank you for your time and hanging in tonight. Next up Paul Farnsworth. Good Evening.

PAUL FARNSWORTH: Good Evening, based upon the late hour I will shorten my written remarks and offer the *Readers' Digest* abridged version.

Distinguished members of the Public Safety and Security Committee, my name is Paul Farnsworth, of North Branford, Connecticut. I am writing to voice my opposition to Raised Bill No. 269.

I am a fourth generation Elevator Contractor. And I have been licensed in Connecticut for more than 40 years as an R2 Elevator Journeyperson and as an R1 Elevator Contractor.

I am currently a Contractor Member of the Elevator Installation, Repair and Maintenance Work Examining Board, for the State of Connecticut. As a Member of the "Elevator Board" I have strongly supported the efforts of the State of Connecticut, to promote the protection of the health, safety and welfare of the general public through the current licensing laws, regulations and enforcement. The Connecticut laws and regulations require that those persons who perform elevator and escalator inspections must meet certain minimum standards that have been developed over many decades.

Most importantly the Connecticut Elevator Inspection system through the Connecticut Bureau of Elevators has achieved an extraordinary record of elevator and escalator safety. Raised Bill Number 269 as written, would compromise the current minimum safety standards of the Elevator and Escalator Inspections, by allowing potentially less qualified independent inspectors and independent inspection firms to perform Acceptance Inspections, Periodic Inspections and Plan Review of new Elevator installations. If less qualified independent inspectors and independent inspection firms are allowed to perform Elevator Inspections for which they are not qualified, they will be in danger of personal injury to themselves and others.

In short, if Raised Bill Number 269 as it is currently configured is approved into law, the health, safety and welfare of the general public will be jeopardized. I am available for further discussions regarding this matter if anyone wishes to do so. Thank you for the opportunity to present my views today and I appreciate you time and attention.

REP. PAOLILLO (97TH): Thank you for hanging in tonight. Thank you for staying that day. Questions from colleagues. We appreciate your testimony. Good night. Next up we have Mike Pickard. Mike Pickard? Anyone else? Make one last call for anyone wanting to offer testimony today. Seeing no one here, and no one else on the sheet. Appreciate colleagues hanging in. Thank you, have a great night.