

THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, March 4, 2020

(The House of Representatives was called to order at 1:00 o'clock p.m., Representative Aresimowicz of the 30th District in the Chair.)

DEPUTY CHAPLAN REVERAND CHARLES E. JACOBS:

Let us pray. Blessed are you Lord, God of all creation - as your Legislators gather for nominations and a contract, grant them wisdom as they continue to work on behalf, and, for Your people. Amen.

REP. ARORA (151ST):

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

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

We'll have those referred to the Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.

THE CLERK:

List of bills No. 19 dated March 4, 2020 and
last is the daily calendar.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The list of bills.

CLERK:

No. 19 dated March 4, 2020.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The esteemed majority of the first district,
sir.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Mr. Speaker, I move that we waive the reading
of the list of the bills and the bills be referred
to the Committees indicated.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Without objection, so ordered. [gavel]

CLERK:

And now the daily calendar.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Clerk. Are there any
announcements or introductions? Representative
Ritter of the 1st District, sir, you have the floor.

REP. RITTER (1ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just had two quick announcements, one more fun than the other. Today is Representative Kate Rotella's birthday. She's not in here but if we could give her a nice round of applause. [Applause] Kate said she'd like nothing more than to spend the whole day with everybody in this Chamber today which is very sweet. [Laughter] The second thing, I would ask for a moment of silence in the Chamber, please. Today, many of us, particularly from the Hartford delegation were in Windsor for the wake and funeral of the father of State Senator Doug McCrory. As many of you know, before moving up to the Senator, Doug was a member of the House and a good friend to many of us and so I would ask for a moment of silence for Doug and his family please on the passing of his father. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Ladies and gentleman, if we could please rise. We're going to do a moment of silence for Representative McCrory's father. [gavel] That was a

Freudian slip. We mean Senator McCrory. Are there any announcements or introductions? Representative Gresco of the 121st, sir, you have the floor.

REP. GRESCO (121ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purposes of an introduction?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. GRESCO (121ST):

On behalf of Representative Young, Representative McGorty, Representative Sredzinski, Representative Steinberg, and of course, Representative Klarides, I'd like to introduce the individuals who are responsible for the lunch in our caucus room today. This is the third time they have provided us with a lunch in three sessions, Gaetano's Deli was recently named [applause] the best deli in the State of Connecticut by the Food Network. Now, naturally they started in Stratford but they've expanded to Westport, Monroe, soon to be Shelton as well. We have Milano from Westport, a guy from Shelton, and of course the famous Angelo

from Stratford. A round of applause please for a great business for Connecticut. [Applause]

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much for coming up and I personally recommend the chicken cutlet sandwich. It was very good. Thank you. Representative Meskers of the 150th District, you have the floor, sir.

REP. MESKERS (150TH):

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to take a moment to congratulate my legislative aide on making it through another year and celebrating his birthday. I will be celebrating on Saturday and I will accept all the condolences necessary. [Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you, Representative. Representative, I'm not sure who your legislative aide is but being congratulated for making it another year is more for people our age. I don't know who your aide is.

REP. MESKERS (150TH):

Mr. Speaker, I want to congratulate *Ciro Zelaya* [phonetic] on the completion of his birthday.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

All right. There you go. Thank you very much. Representative O'Dea of the 125th. You have the floor, sir.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Just briefly want to rise for an announcement if I may.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Our staff attorney, Brian Wrestler has a birthday today as well. His birthday is, he's much younger than you and I, Mr. Speaker, but nonetheless I would like to wish him a happy birthday. I think he's in the back working as [crosstalk].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

He should be.

REP. O'DEA (125TH):

Yes, exactly. But in any event, Happy Birthday, Brian Wrestler, and thank you for all your help on this side of the aisle. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, Representative O'Dea, and Happy Birthday to Brian. [Applause]. Are there any other announcements or introductions?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 21?

CLERK:

On page 1, House Calendar No. 21, Senate Joint Resolution No. 16, RESOLUTION REAPPOINTING ROBERT J. KANE OF WATERTOWN AN AUDITOR OF PUBLIC ACCOUNTS. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The esteemed Chairman of the Exec and Legislative Nominations, Representative Vargas.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Chairman. It's good to see my neighbor, Representative Russ Morin up there as Speaker. I move acceptance of the Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is on

acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Senate resolution.

Representative Vargas, you have the floor, sir.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. This is Senate Joint Resolution No. 16 and it's for the purpose of confirming the nomination of Robert Kane of Watertown to be an auditor of public accounts. The individual came before our Committee and I've got to say on a personal note that I've known Mr. Kane as a former colleague in the Senate. Senator Bob Kane served on my Committee, the Executive and Legislative Nominations Committee. We have a very good relationship and he has gone on to serve three years in the position of State Auditor as the Republican auditor and he's done an excellent job. He served three years under the Malloy administration and now he's been reappointed by Governor Ned Lamont so this is a renomination. He served for three years. This would be a full four-year term. Bob Kane has a bachelor's degree from Central Connecticut State University and a Master's

in business administration from the University of New Haven. As I mentioned before, he's a former state senator from the 32nd District. His nomination passed unanimously in our Committee and I urge my colleagues to adopt the resolution.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you very much, Representative. Will you remark further? [Gavel]. The ranking member of the Committee, Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I echo my colleague's comments in regard to Rob Kane, former Senator Rob Kane. Many of us had the opportunity to work with Rob when he was in the Senate, especially on the Appropriations Committee and we can testify to the tremendous job he did when he was here, and it's good to see a gentleman who works so well with the other side of the aisle and how he works with together and I would urge adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Perillo. Will you remark further? Representative Winkler of the 56th?

No? Technical difficulties? Will you remark further? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of the resolution, please signify by saying aye. [Ayes voiced]. All those opposed nay? The ayes have it [gavel] and the resolution is adopted. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 22?

CLERK:

On page 1, House Calendar No. 22, Senate Joint Resolution No. 17, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF GRANT W. WESTERSON OF OLD SAYBROOK TO BE REAPPOINTED A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF DIRECTORS OF THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Vargas.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is on

acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the resolution. Representative Vargas, you have the floor.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Grant Westerson of Old Saybrook came before our Committee for the purposes of being reappointed to be a member of the Board of Directors of the Connecticut Port Authority and he demonstrated keen knowledge of the authority, had very creative ideas, answered our questions thoroughly. As we all know, this is a part-time unpaid position and this is a reappointment so I'm happy he's being reappointed again because I believe he adds a lot to the port authority. He studied at UConn and at Quinnipiac and throughout his career, he's had a 55-year career in State, Regional, and National recreation, marine industry groups, yacht sales and services. He has been a harbor master, a marine surveyor, a consultant. He's eminently qualified for this position and he brings a unique aspect. He brings the point of view of the people who like to go sailing and boating for recreational

purposes so I think he brings an important point of view to the Connecticut Port Authority and I urge my colleagues to vote favorably on his confirmation.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark further? Care to remark further on the resolution before us? Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As was stated, Mr. Westerson is eminently qualified and I will say this, we all know that the Port Authority has had some challenges in recent times, but it was very good to hear Mr. Westerson recognize that and to hear how focused he is on addressing those issues as a member of the Board of the Authority. I was happy to hear that and I know other members of the Executive and Legislative Nominations Committee were happy as well and I would urge adoption of the resolution.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, sir. Would you care to remark

further? Would you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. [Ayes voiced]. All those opposed nay? The ayes have it [gavel] and the resolution is adopted. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 23?

CLERK:

On page 2, House Calendar No. 23, House Joint Resolution No. 18 RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE MAUREEN D. DENNIS OF SOUTHPORT TO BE A MEMBER OF THE JUDICIAL REVIEW COUNCIL. Favorable Report of the Joint Standing Committee on Executive and Legislative Nominations.
DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Vargas.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report

and adoption of the resolution. Representative Vargas, you have the floor.

REP. VARGAS (6TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Judge Maureen D. Dennis of Southport has been a Superior Court Judge and she's gotten quite a bit of publicity because she was the jurist that presided over the nationally publicized Michael Skakel case. She's been serving during the interim and will serve until November 2023. Her Norwalk Juvenile Court served as an early model for the TV show Judging Amy. Throughout her career, she has lectured for attorneys regarding juvenile court, has served in many capacities regarding mental health, judicial ethics, rules, judicial evaluation, the Judges Association and the Bar Association, so Judge Maureen D. Dennis of Southport is eminently qualified to continue serving. She served on an interim basis as I mentioned. She'll do a great job in a permanent appointment to the Judicial Review Council so I urge everyone to vote in favor of the adoption of the resolution. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Vargas. Will you remark further? Representative Perillo?

REP. PERILLO (113TH):

Thank you again, Mr. Speaker. Judge Dennis will bring tremendous experience and knowledge and thoughtfulness to the Council and I would urge adoption of the resolution and support for the judge.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Perillo. Will you remark further? Would you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye. [Ayes voiced]. All those opposed nay? The ayes have it [gavel] and the resolution is adopted. Will the Clerk please call Calendar No. 24?

CLERK:

On page 2, House Calendar No. 24, House Resolution No. 3, RESOLUTION PROPOSING APPROVAL OF AN INTEREST ARBITRATION AWARD BETWEEN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT AND LOCAL 3419 OF COUNCIL 4, AMERICAN

FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES,
AFL-CIO. Favorable Report of the House Standing
Committee on Appropriations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The fine Representative from the 91st District,
Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance
of the House Committee's Favorable Report and
adoption of the resolution.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

The question before the Chamber is on
acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report
and adoption of the resolution. Representative
D'Agostino, you have the floor, sir.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As the title
indicates, this is an interest arbitration award
with about 100 program supervisors in the Department
of Children and Families. With your permission, Mr.
Speaker, I'd like to just summarize briefly what's
in the award and then urge our members to adopt it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

I would appreciate it if you did, sir. Thank you and briefly, Mr. Speaker, again, these are 100 program supervisors at the Department of Children and Families. If you think about the Department of Children and Families, obviously the backbone of that department are the frontline social workers who are out there meeting with families, interacting with the Judiciary Department, the schools, our doctors, etc and these program supervisors are in effect the platoon leaders of those frontline social workers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

[Gavel] Could we please keep it down a little bit. I'm trying to listen to Representative D'Agostino so please keep the noise down. Thank you.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Again, these are the platoon leaders if you will of those frontline social workers. They are spread out through various regional offices in the State of Connecticut. They

have about five or so for the most part department social work supervisors reporting to them who then underneath them, you have the frontline social workers again interacting with the families on a daily basis so each of these program supervisors might have anywhere from you know 25, 30 people reporting to them and are in charge of dozens of cases. They are also the frontline workers who make the most difficult decisions and I preface what I'm about to say, Mr. Speaker, by saying that it is not certainly my intent to weigh the relative merits of our state workers. I, as you know, think that they are all valuable, provide incredible services to the people of the State of Connecticut, you know, whether you're a technical high school teacher or you know an engineer working on the roads, but at least with those other jobs, I can intellectually and emotionally understand what goes into that. I cannot for the life of me fathom what it is like to make the decision to rip apart a family because that family itself has ripped itself apart such that the health, safety, and welfare of a child is in danger.

I can't even conceive of doing that once much less doing that on a day-to-day basis as my job, and that's what these 100 program supervisors at DCF do. Nevertheless, despite having those kinds of massive responsibilities, none of them have received a salary increase since 2014 and in many respects, in many instances, they make less than the people who report to them so they previously were managers, classified as managers and as you know, whether you're a manager or not actually depends on statutory criteria. They looked at that and felt like they did not meet that criteria and could be classified employees and unionized. The State agreed. The State Board of Labor Relations agreed. That triggered of course the negotiation provisions in our State Statutes. The State and this group have met for the last year or so. They've worked out maybe 95 percent of the issues, part arbitration because frankly, they were state employees. They were subject to various policies set forth by DAS anyway. This is just a codification if you will in the agreement of those policies like vacation time,

like sick time, etc. They disagreed, the State and this group, on salary. That went to arbitration and some other elements which we'll talk about I'm sure, and that led to the arbitrated award that we have before us now which yields a very reasonable cost to the state of about \$650,000 dollars in year one, Fiscal Year 2020, and \$1.1 million dollars or so in Fiscal Year 2022 with, of course, the hard zeros in the prior year's still remaining unchanged. And I should that those amounts, because we knew these negotiations were going on, are in the reserve for salary account, well taken care as part of the budget, so because this is budgeted, because it's really just a codification of existing terms, and because it's the right thing to do, I urge adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you very much, Representative D'Agostino. Will you remark further? Would you care to remark further? From the 143rd District, Representative Lavielle. Good morning.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. Thank you very

much. We are indeed voting on an arbitration award and if I may, through you, Mr. Speaker, say to the good Representative, here we are again because we did 12 of these in the last session which no one should forget and I understand there about six or seven more of these to do in this session. Before I say anything or ask any questions, I want to make one thing very clear. We are talking about people who have very important jobs and very sensitive jobs and jobs that are sometimes tough to do because they involve making decisions about children and families and this demands a great deal of commitment and a great deal of stamina and emotional sensitivity. I also want to remark at the beginning so no one mentions this later as they sometimes do, that these people are indeed taxpayers just like everyone else in Connecticut who works. So I just want to set those forth as baseline because they are fundamental to our discussion. I want to thank the Representative for delineation of some of the features of the contract and the arbitration award that goes with it that we're voting on. As I

understand it, the 99 or 100 people who are subject to this arbitration award were managers. They were managers for a long time and they then decided to collectively bargain and so the first line of questioning, Mr. Speaker, that I would like to pursue is how exactly that happens. By what authority can a group of people who are managers working for the State of Connecticut become eligible for collective bargaining because, Mr. Speaker, through you, managers are, or are they not, eligible for collective bargaining?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Just to answer that question briefly, that is correct. Managers are not eligible for collective bargaining. To answer the underlying question, whether or not you are a manager is not simply a function of title and the Representative is correct; these program supervisors were previously called program managers but the touchstone of whether you are able to collective

bargain has nothing to do with the simple label. There are statutory criteria set forth and I think it's 5270, subsection g, which delineates whether or not a group of employees are managers or not. Do you meet and there's in particular four subsets of criteria as to whether you are a manager, I can go over them, they're in the statute but there are these four criteria and in this case and in other cases, the question always is, do the job functions meet at least two of those criteria? If the job functions of the class we're talking about meet at least two, you are a manager and therefore not eligible to unionize. I should note that the criteria that we've embedded in our statute in 5270g, we did not invent that from whole cloth. Those are well settled standards from labor law that we've adopted that are applicable across the country. In this case, the program supervisors, previously called managers, don't even meet, I think there's a very good argument, any of those four criteria. Maybe they meet one, some of them meet one but certainly not the threshold level of 2.

Now, that's been the case frankly since they've existed so that's the technical answer as to whether or not you can bargain or not. As to the underlying question of why not do it sooner, that's hard for me to answer. I can't speak for them. I think simply to say that sometimes people don't know what their rights are and in this case, we actually had examples of that where the program supervisors didn't know for example that they could take comp time. I'm sure we'll talk about that as well. So that's the mechanism in statute by which you become, you can collectively bargain or not and in his case, they didn't even come close to meeting the threshold of the two criteria.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you and that's actually interesting because we did talk about that in the Appropriations Committee somewhat and I came away personally with a rather unclear idea of what it meant to meet two of those criteria. I'm actually looking at the statute

which I won't read either because I'm sure that the Representative has a copy of this as well. But what I also have with me is a job description of a DCF program supervisor. Are the people who are now because they have already conducted the necessary steps to become a union for the purposes of collective bargaining, are their jobs exactly the same as they were when they were called managers?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

They are.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Okay. So would the Representative happen to have a job description for them?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I do and so I can say looking at some of these criteria, you know there are sort of general descriptions about you know overseeing work of staff, you know determining priorities and plans of the office, establishing office procedures, etc, recommendations on the development of policies and standards, things like that. That is in my view and I think in the view of the state and in the view of the State Board of Labor Relations, sort of a far cry from the statutory criteria which delineates for example in contrast to that description, responsibility for a facility, a major division of an agency. Arguably here they may have responsibility for a sub-unit which is one of the criteria but then other things like development, implementation and evaluation of goals and objectives of the agency. That's of course done at a much higher level, not by these program supervisors and again, statutory criteria like the participation and the formulation of agency policy, while they may help implement that and make recommendations, they do not develop agency policy

and then the last criteria in the statute for example, a major role in the administration of the collective bargaining agreements or other major personnel decisions, that's not obviously part of their job description. So I can appreciate that there's overlap generally in the job description when you look at the actual functions of what these folks do. Maybe they come close to meeting, some of them, one but certainly not the two.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. As I look at the job description in the statute myself, I see for example number two in the statute criteria for being a manager, development, implementation and evaluation of goals and objectives consistent with agency mission and policy, and number three, participation in the formulation of agency policy and then in the job description I see identifies and develops new programs and funding sources, develops or makes

recommendations on development of policies and standards. Those sound awfully similar to me. I'm just wondering, I mean can we definitively establish that they're not and who does determine that?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Look, it's a great question as we're delving into the standard here. I think we can definitively say that they do not because gain, developing or making recommendations on development of policies or standards. Okay, that's in the job description. The statutory criteria are development, implementation and evaluation of goals and objectives collectively, not one of those three things independently so while the program supervisors are sort of a piece in that puzzle of putting together developing, implementing, and evaluating goals and standards for the agencies, they are not responsible for all three of those things and so I think the state and the State Board

of Labor Relations would agree that they don't come close to doing that. Even though they may have a piece of it under the statute and under labor law, that's not good enough and to answer the Representative's corollary question, who makes that determination? Well in this case it was so black and white that the state agreed and did not challenge the classification or the fact that these folks were not managers. If there ever is a disagreement, that question goes to the State Board of Labor Relations, an independent, quasi-judicial body with members appointed by the Governor under staggered six-year terms and they make those decisions with respect to classification. This did not reach that level because again, I appreciate despite maybe the overlap of some words, the actual functions don't come close to meeting the statutory criteria and therefore, it was not even challenged at the State Board of Labor Relations.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, sir. Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

That is an interesting point. I'd like to know exactly how that happens, Mr. Speaker. If a group of people not previously eligible for collective bargaining wants to constitute an entity that would be eligible, what exactly is the process that it must follow?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So that's laid out also in our general statutes 31-101, etc. There's an entire process through which you go from the starting point of seeking the designation all the way through to what we have in our arbitrated award. So in the first instance, the group is going to organize and contact not the State Board of Labor Relations but our Labor Department and say we think that we're not, in this case for example, not managers and here's our argument and they did that here and then of course, we've got some very good

people in the Labor Department in the State of Connecticut, some very smart attorneys who are very familiar with labor law and obviously familiar with the implementation of these statutes and in this case, there was agreement that they don't meet this criteria. If there's disagreement, both sides will brief that to the State Board of Labor Relations and they'll be a decision handed down there. I believe that decision can be appealed. They rarely are again because usually you don't have that kind of fine level of closeness with respect to the criteria. Very often as in the case here, I think you had people just assuming they were managers because they were called managers but when folks actually looked at the criteria, in this case both on what is eventually the union side and the state side, there was a determination made that they didn't meet the threshold level of two but 31-101, etc lays out the entire process from the beginnings of organization all the way through arbitration. There's regulations attached that lay out a very detailed process with the Labor Department for going

through ultimately challenging the classification and then ultimately arbitration if you get there.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you. Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. So this can happen basically at any time, with any group, perhaps even if they are not sure of their status? We can see this happen with any group within state government?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

So a couple of the contracts we dealt with last year touched on this very issue, in particular the associate attorney generals, you know, were they managerial or not? You've got a very smart group of lawyers with the AAG's and a very smart group of lawyers on the state side and that took a while to walk through you know but ultimately, there's usually agreement on a number of the criteria but

any of our non-classified staff, the current groups that are managers can challenge their designation as such through these criteria. These criteria really haven't changed in quite some time. So yes, that could happen. It's usually worked out as it was in this case or it was last year with the AAG's.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. So just a final one on that line of questioning, when these folks were hired, their expectation was they were being hired as managers, they understood the conditions attached to that title, what advantages they would have, what advantages they would not have, and they accepted their employment under those terms; is that correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, I'm sure that's correct. I'm sure

that when they accepted their employment they were not anticipating that they would not receive a wage increase in six years and I would imagine, again, I can't speak for them or other groups that have done this but usually there's probably a precipitating event or a straw that breaks the camel's back that leads a group of people to look at their designation and here, that may have been the case but certainly prior to this designation yes, they were managers and they knew they would be governed by the extensive managerial policies that govern the managerial employees in the State of Connecticut.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you. Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

I think just one final thing on that line of questioning. Are there public documents that are available to chronical the exchanges that took place in this process of changing their status?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding is that everything that happens before the State Board of Labor Relations is subject to FOIA, is open, public and notorious. I'm sure we could also FOIA you know negotiations back and forth. The only thing that probably is not subject to FOIA are the internal legal discussions and analysis that for example the state may be doing to determine its legal position with respect to the union. That probably is not subject to FOIA but everything else from decision-making process to the negotiations, that's an open book.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you. Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

And who in the state has the authority to sign off on all that?

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

So in the first instance, the Labor Department. You know they will make the determination, the commissioner, and his or her staff and the unit charged with dealing with the State Employee Bargaining Units will make the determinations to whether they agree or not and then of course ultimately, if there is disagreement and frankly even if there isn't disagreement, the agreed upon, the agreement that they have, everything is eventually presented to the State Board of Labor Relations and they have to bless it.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. I'd like to move along to the terms of the contract and would the good Representative just remind us of when exactly this particular contract and award began and when does it expire?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So this is technically a retroactive agreement. It covers the four-year term, Fiscal Years 18, 19, 20, and 21 so it does go if you will back in time, again, still with the hard zeros that the other CEBAC Units agreed to and it does expire June 30, 2021 which is consistent with the bulk of the wage and hour agreements with the other bargaining unit that are part of the overall CBAC umbrella.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you. Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. And so consistent with those other, those many other contracts that we all discussed last year, if I understand properly, there were no increases in 18 and 19. In 20 and 21 each, every employee will receive a 3.5 percent general wage increase and also in 20 and 21 each, every employee receives an annual increment of 2 percent unless

they're already at the maximum step in which case they have a different arrangement, and everyone gets a one-time payment of \$2000 dollars. Is this correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino. I think you've said that already but please comment.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you. Well summarized by the Representative.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. So we're back at the range of something more than 7 percent in a two-year time frame. You could stretch that over eight or ten years if you will but that's the way it's budgeted for us. As for the total cost, as I understand it if the Representative could just corroborate, the cost of these increases and other things attendant on the arbitration award and contract, the

additional cost in 2020 is about \$653,000 dollars, the additional cost in 2021 is about \$1.13 million dollars, and from there on out, this amounts to an annual cost of about \$1.2 million dollars provided nothing increases. Is that correct?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, those are the OFA numbers for this contract and again, I would just bookend that by saying that because these negotiations began back in 2017, this was part of the budget that we passed last year to be at least taken care of through the Reserve for Salary Account which has about \$70 million dollars in it, more than enough to cover this as well as the other contracts that we passed last year.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you. The contracts to which, I should say the arbitration awards to which the one we're discussing today are similar, were, there were 12 and I wondered if the Representative had before him the total cost over the period of 2019, 2020, and 2021, the total cost of those 12 arbitration awards?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I always plead with the Representative not to ask me too much math and then she always does it. [Laughs]. She knows it's my weakness. I do not have the totals for all those contracts except to say I'm confident that they are still below what's in the RSA.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you. Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Mr. Speaker, the Representative is such a master of legal language and the conditions of these

contracts that I know he can do simple addition. I have faith in him [laughter] but the figure that we have from OFA is about \$90 million dollars when you add up the cost of all of those contracts over the past, the last 12 agreements. How about the annualized cost going forward every year that were added by those 12 contracts?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Well I'm not sure it's pertinent to this discussion but I'm sure Representative D'Agostino would love to answer.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Again, I don't have an exact number. I guess I would couch the discussion with the following two points. One, of course, all the wage and hour contracts, 99 percent of them are up in 2021 so whatever the projection is, the assumption there is that there's no change and there may be and of course when we're talking about projecting these costs, I would caution and urge the members to keep in mind that when you joint CBAC, you get all the

pros and cons of that as the union members and there are tremendous savings to the State of Connecticut embedded in that agreement that we've done particularly on the health and pension side which I'm sure are not embedded in the good Representative's discrete salary figure. So when you talk about these contracts generally, this one and the others, I would urge all members to look at them globally, think about them in terms of the entire CBAC architecture which saved the State of Connecticut \$20 billion dollars over 25 years and hundreds of millions of dollars more on the health side. But the short answer to the question is I don't have an annualized cost but whatever it is, because I'm confident in the entire CBAC structure, it's a savings ultimately to the State of Connecticut and the people and taxpayers of Connecticut.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Lavielle.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Well the figure that I have for the annualized cost is \$44 million dollars so that's per year going forward. The contract we happen to be looking at, what we have from OFA is \$1.2 million dollars and the Representative corroborated this. The annualized cost for this contract is about \$1.2 million dollars. These are all kind of figures floating out there with no other reference and I think, I believe I am through with my questions and just have some comments so I can put the Representative to rest in terms of having to do any more math. But there's some very important things to say here. When we hear about the importance and the quality of the jobs that these good people do and they do them well, there's a few other things that we have to think about. There's always an arbitrage between what we are paying if you want to call it in overhead and what kind of services can we as a state provide to the residents who live here, many of whom are in great need. The services that we provide of that type include not only placing and evaluating and serving abused and

neglected children but also the elderly, the elderly whom we want to try our best to keep in their communities, people with intellectual and developmental disabilities whom we want to help stay in the communities in group homes and so on or just work with a local provider, after school programs, all things of that sort and many, many, many human services programs. If we look at some of the programs that the Governor has proposed cutting in the current budget revision, we see the neighborhood youth centers, the commissioner's network for schools, the American School for the Deaf, after school programs, all of that coming to \$1.12 million dollars, about the same amount as the increase on these contracts. Other programs, the Writing Project, the Parent Trust Fund Program, Bridges to Success, Connecticut's Youth Employment Program, and then in the OPM budget, there is a cut of \$6 million dollars for what is to be given to private providers who provide these services in the community. Six million dollars that at least in this first budget proposal we've seen, it is supposed that we don't

have the resources to pay. According to the Connecticut Alliance of Nonprofits, the members of which we spent some very long hours at night in the Appropriations Committee hearing about their need for funds, the Connecticut Alliance of Nonprofits has done a lot of calculations to compare the rise and the cost of living to what they are able to afford to keep their services running and to pay the people who work there, and they've asked for something around in the vicinity of \$450 million dollars going forward for the next five years to keep up. As for the people who work for those private providers, which perform services that I would dare to say are just as sensitive and just as difficult and just as important and emotional and personal as what our fine employees at DCF perform, those people have received since 2008 two 1 percent COLA increases, 1 percent in Fiscal Year 2013 and 1 percent in Fiscal Year 2019. That's it. That's all they got for what they do. Now, I am the first to say that well, some people have more luck than others. Some people get better condition than

others. That is life. However, I might get better conditions better than the person next to me, but the person next to me doesn't have to pay the cost of my getting them. But in this case, we are asking all the people of Connecticut including those people who work for private providers to pay for this. We talk about fairness in this building all the time. Is that fair? Not only do you not do anywhere near, anywhere near as well as the people who work for the state, but you have to pay for them to be able to do that well and that's going on in this event. Now, the reason I kept bringing up the 12 arbitration awards from last year is to show that it's not just a question of the people in this unit that we're discussing today. It has nothing to do with them as individuals. I would never want to cast dispersions on them. It has absolutely nothing to do with them, but this is something we tend to do again and again and again and over again in this General Assembly is to look at one group and say yes, the job cannot be done if they don't get more advantages and the rest, well we can't afford it this year. Don't worry.

For these people, the money is the Reserve for Salary Account. It's always there. Well what if we were to empty that account. Well, you know what else we do in this building? That's fine. We'll just pay them out of the Special Transportation Fund. I know we've never done that with the RSA but it's essentially the same mentality.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Lavielle? Representative Lavielle? Would you please stay on the point of this bill?

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

I'm not going into the Special Transportation Fund.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Well, you kind of are so please.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Don't worry.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you.

REP. LAVIELLE (143RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There seems to be

sacrosanct about paying attention to one side of the equation and it is hurting the people who need services and it is hurting the people not employed by the state who provide them to those people who need services. The folks we're talking about at the time of the negotiation of this contract had an annual salary of \$99,000 dollars. At the end of four years of this contract they'll have on average a salary of \$110,000 dollars. There is nothing wrong with that. God, I wish they all had \$500,000 dollars and so did we and so did everybody but I just want to make it clear that it's not a question of short-changing the job they do or anything else. It's the way that we structure, the way that we do things in this building and the way that we have structured our budget and our priorities, and I wish that instead of looking at one group and always putting the priority on them, that we would put the priority on the residents of this state instead and particularly the neediest among us. Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Lavielle. Will you remark further? From the 63rd District, Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Good afternoon.

REP. CASE (63RD):

It's good to see you up there. So we're back again and I know Representative D'Agostino and I have gone back and forth on other contracts and Representative Lavielle has done a good job picking out and talking about what we're here about. So a few questions to the good Representative. So basically, within this contract, one of the clauses that we really haven't discussed a lot about is the comp time and I understand that these are employees who do a very tough job within the State of Connecticut and it's something that I followed along very vigorously with our previous Commissioner when we were at the point of you know almost over \$9 million dollars in overtime and we were able to

defray that down. This Commissioner is really doing a good job on watching overtime but now we have comp time. Could the good Representative please explain to me how the comp time works within this contract?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So let's just start out with a baseline for everyone. I think most people know this but it's just worth stating clearly that comp time is not overtime. Overtime of course if the employee works typically 40 hours, additional time over 40 hours, the state cuts a check to that employee, here's your overtime for working more than the 40-hour work week. These program supervisors get comp time, not overtime. Comp time and if you look at obviously the OFA report here, there's no cost associated with comp time. The state is not writing a check. This does not add to, I'm not sure what happened to the sun there, this does not add to the overtime cost of the department. Now typically,

managers across the State of Connecticut pursuant to DAS policy get comp time after 40 hours. You work your 40-hour week and then you earn comp time, an additional hour say hour 41, you've got that hour of comp time. Eventually, you build that up to be able to take a day, a day off that is technically paid. You paid for it as the employee because you worked those hours. So that's what comp time is. It's like an additional day that you can take for having worked above and beyond the 40-hour work week. The interesting thing here in this agreement is that typically, managers get comp time after 40 hours a week. You work your 40-hour week, you're giving extra time to the State of Connecticut, you earn comp time. Here, the arbitrator awarded the state its last best offer which was you only get comp time if you're a program supervisor after 50 hours of work. So just think about that for a second. Your salary is based on your 40-hour work week. That's all you have to work, 40 hours, that's your salary. That's what you get. If you work more than that and several of these, many of these program supervisors

work more than that because of the issues associated with their job, you are given another 10 hours of time effectively free to the State of Connecticut before you start earning comp time. So at hour 51, you earn an hour of comp time. If you work a 60-hour week, you get 10 hours. You can take those 10 hours later in the year. With comp time with respect to this agreement, the comp time must be used in a year; it's use it or lose it. There is no cap on the comp time you can earn except of course physical exhaustion because I don't think we want people working 60, 70, 80 hours a week straight through and just building up comp time. That does not happen and probably the most important element of comp time that people need to keep in mind is that it must be approved to be taken so I've earned comp time, I want to take a day off because I've earned my comp time as a program supervisor. You can't just do that. You can't just leave a case. You must get preapproval to use that comp time from in this case the program directors or other higher ups above the program supervisors and they can say

no. We talked about this last year with the AAG's and the PD's in terms of you can't just leave a case. It's the same with the program supervisors. You can't just take off. Typically, I'm sure the program supervisors will arrange for coverage amongst themselves, that you can't bump that down to somebody lower so that it impacts overtime. So that's structurally what we're talking about here with respect to comp time in this agreement and it has, except for the 50 hours, I would note that all the features of it are exactly the same as in the managerial policies that we have for comp time for managers, non-unionized managers in the State of Connecticut. The difference here, of course, is that the arbitrator went with the state's last best offer and bumped it up to a 50-hour work week before you earn that comp time so no cost to the state, the state won its last best offer and before you even use it, you have to get approval to use it.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And please, for a point of clarification to the good Representative, so when we were in Appropriations talking about this bill, comp time was to be preapproved before you could accrue it; is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker, not so you can use it but before you could actually early it?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. My understanding has always been off the just, if you give me a second to look through the contract terms, that it's preapproval to use it certainly because the question is how is that going to impact your, the schedule and what you're working on. If it's indeed that it's also preapproval to earn it, you know that's a different issue. I'm not sure how you would actually do that as a practical matter because these folks are in the field but even assuming it's

preapproval to use it, now of course that's subject to again, the process, you contact your supervisor whether or not you're going to earn comp time and if there's a disagreement, of course that can now be grieved but my understanding of comp time, the fundamental issue on approval is always before you can use it, you can't just take off and use your case. You've got to actual get preapproval to use it because that impacts schedule, it impacts what's going on in the office. I will check the language on preapproval to earn it as well but if that's the case, then it's another layer of protection for the state quite frankly on comp time.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker because there was a lot of discussion with the undersecretary regarding this contract that it does require preapproval once you reach the 50 hours and we questioned how an employee would get preapproval if they're out at 10:00 at

night and they can't reach a manager to get preapproval, her answer was they wouldn't be authorized to get that comp time and that's, could the good Representative answer that? If not, we can look at it further.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, the Representative is correct so there's sort of two prophylaxes there for the state. It's preapproval to earn it and preapproval to use it so again, contrast that you know typically with overtime you know where you earn it, you're gonna get that paid. Here, there's no guarantee that the program supervisors are going to be approved to earn it and even if they earn it, they've gotta get then approval to use it so the state I think really did protect itself well here with respect to the comp time. Of course, again, as I mentioned, a lot of this was already embedded in managerial policy so

this is really a codification of what previously existed except with the change from 40-50, through you. But thank you for the clarification from the Representative on use and earning.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. You know it was a big topic because I guess there have been times in the past where people hadn't been approved for it so I guess the state wanted to make sure that they were getting approval before they do it and I take a little different approach to comp time because it's not free to the state because somebody has to cover those duties while that comp time is being taken so I look at it as a little bit of a way around overtime. Yes, people are getting time off but those duties that they do which are so necessary for the State of Connecticut and our DCF are still gonna have to be done and I have to say, you know our DCF office has really turned around and some good things are happening. There's just a lot of concerns with

this contract that have come forward. So through you, Mr. Speaker, and I know Representative Lavielle touched on it real quickly and I've touched on it with the previous contracts that we've done, I just want to ask four things and you know maybe you could answer yes or no. So here we have basically an 11 percent raise, and I think we won the part of the contract where it is the nine weeks paid time off. They wanted more but the state didn't give them that. They wanted an extra day for every year of service and if you look at the giving's and what the state won, the undersecretary did a good job on that. So 11 percent raise which is going to be an annual cost to the State of Connecticut about \$1.2 million dollars once this is codified; is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Representative D'Agostino.

REP. D'AGOSTINO (91ST):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Well I guess, I hate to say it but I quibble with the math because it's a

four-year contract and there's hard zeros in years one and two so really for the contract, it's not an 11 percent raise whatever that math works out to be, you know under 3 net over the course of the contract so you know, 11 percent if you're just counting the last two years but it's a four-year contract so I would I guess disagree with you know how you frame it. The numbers are the numbers obviously. The cost to the state is reflected in the OFA sheet and what we've talked about with Representative Lavielle. You know those are the costs in Fiscal Year 20 and 21 but I do think you have to look at it globally. Of course, you know I can go even further with the math, right? If I want to factor in all the years of hard zeros that these folks have had back to 14, it's much more miniscule than that.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you. Representative Case.

REP. CASE (63RD):

So yes, and through the OFA filing and what has been done, once you get to Fiscal Year 21, the

annualization cost actually turns into \$1,208,297 dollars per year so that's gonna keep accruing through our budget numbers and if we look at the last contracts that we did, we're approaching the \$100 million dollar of accrual number, kind of scary. So comments if the good gentleman wants to take a break. I just have some comments and I thank him for his answers. We've done this many times. We have about six more of these to go so we were told in Appropriations by the undersecretary. I have grave concerns. I understand our employees deserve what they deserve to do their job. Here we are approving a contract for some workers that those same type of workers in the nonprofits really aren't getting a fair buck. We talk about it in this Chamber day in, day out. We talk about it in the IDD caucus about our nonprofits. Where is their raise? And I know we're here for this contract but our nonprofits are really getting the short end of the stick and for somebody who's approaching the six-figure and the nonprofits are well three-quarters below that, we have other things to think

about. It's the benefits cliff. People are going to be falling off the benefits cliff in the nonprofit. They're gonna be losing benefits but we have contracts where we can give 11 percent. We have things, a meeting that I'll be going to tonight in the Torrington area. You know, we're gonna start taxing parking meters and it's gonna affect the middle class, those people who use those things, those people who need a step up. Yes, this group of managers, now supervisors haven't had an "increase" for six years. Over the past ten years, I believe the nonprofits have been a 1 percent COLA twice over ten years. A 1 percent COLA, but we do 11 percent here today for this group. People we gotta start thinking about the most vulnerable people in our state. We got six more contracts. This one is \$1.2 million dollars annualized cost. When does it give? I understand the workers signed up for a job, they interviewed for a job, they took a job as an exempt employee, they had the opportunity in 2017 to petition to be a part of the union. That's all fair, that's all fine, but when we have those tough

discussions in Appropriations about where we're putting dollars, take a look at your districts and your nonprofits and your most vulnerable people. You have disability people who are losing programs left and right in this state. You have elderly people who we can't even keep in their homes or we can't even give them an extra \$10 dollars in their expenditures so they can go get a haircut or do something while they're living in the nursing home but yet 11 percent raise for I believe 90 employees. I guess our priorities are different. My priority is to take care of the most vulnerable people in this state and I understand DCF does take care of some of our most vulnerable people in this state but darn it, let's equalize it out. Let's make it fair game. Let's make so those people don't fall off the benefit cliff. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MORIN (28TH):

Thank you, Representative Case. Would you care to remark further? Would you care to remark further on the resolution before us? If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House? Will

the members please take your seats? The machine will be open. [Ringing]

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Members to the Chamber.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

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

CLERK:

House Resolution No. 3.

Total Number of Voting	149
Necessary for Passage	75
Those Voting Yea	91
Those Voting Nay	58
Those absent and not voting	2

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The Resolution is adopted. [Gavel] Are there any announcements or introductions? Announcements or introductions? Representative Kokaruda of the 101st, madam, you now have the floor.

REP. KOKARUDA (101ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'm proud to introduce a constituent --

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

[Gavel] Ladies and gentleman, we are opening the floor to announcements or introductions. The Representative from the 101st District is introducing a friend. Can we please keep the chamber noise down? Representative?

REP. KOKARUDA (101ST):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to introduce someone who does the work of the things we talk about up here every day. This is Dan Osborne. He actually lives in Bolton, not in my district, but he is the CEO of Gilead Community Services who do incredible work with mental health, with addiction issues, things that our constituents

talk to us about all the time. Gilead Community Services has been around for 51 years. They service over 1700 people a year. We're so fortunate. This is a man in the field doing the work that we hear about, that our constituents need help so I wanted to introduce him today and I wanted to ask you all to please give him a kind welcome. Thank you.

[Applause].

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much for your work, sir.
Representative Gibson of the 15th District, sir, you now have the floor.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

How are you today?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

I'm doing well. How are you, Representative?

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

I'm nearly perfect, sir.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Good. [Laughter]

REP. GIBSON (15TH):

Sir, I rise today and I would like my colleagues to recognize Ms. Gail Nolan. She is the chairwoman for the Alliance for Bloomfield's Children and the director for Bloomfield's Resource Center. This happens to be the third time that we have held the annual diaper drive and we together would like to thank you for everyone who has donated diapers and made monetary contributions. We'll be here still until 3:00. If you haven't had a chance to get any diapers, you can drop them off to me tomorrow or you can make a final contribution. You'd be surprised how many diapers a family goes through in the course of a youngster's life so thank everyone again for participating. We really thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much for introducing her and thank you for your hard work, madam. [Applause]. Representative Tercyak of the 26th District, sir,

you have the floor.

REP. TERCYAK (26TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just wanted to remind people and to apologize if somebody didn't already get three emails that tonight's event is still on for a previous speaker, \$40 dollars, Black-Eyed Sally's. Everybody's welcome, you know who I'm talking about. Thank you very much.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The quiet Representative Tercyak mentioned that there's a retirement party tonight at Black-Eyed Susie's or Black-Eyed something. You can talk to him afterwards. [Laughter]. Representative Betts of the 78th.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For purpose of journal notation?

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Please proceed.

REP. BETTS (78TH):

Representative D'Amelio is out of state on legislative business, and Representative Devlin is

out of the Chamber in District on legislative business. Thank you very much.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

Thank you very much, sir. Are there any other announcements or introductions? Announcements or introductions? Representative Curry of the 11th District, sir, you have the floor.

REP. CURRY (11TH):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I move that we suspend the rules to immediately transmit House Joint Resolution 18 to the Senate.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question is on suspension of our rules for immediate transmittal. Is there objection? Is there objection? Hearing none, so ordered.
[Gavel]. Got any more great hits, Representative Curry?

REP. CURRY (11TH):

You know me, I always do. There being no further business on the Clerk's desk, I move that we adjourn subject to the Call of the Chair.

SPEAKER ARESIMOWICZ (30TH):

The question before the Chamber is adjourning subject to the Call of the Chair. Without objection, we are adjourned. [Gavel]

(On motion of Representative Curry of the 11th District, the House adjourned at 2:25 o'clock p.m., sine die.)

CERTIFICATE

I hereby certify that the foregoing 69 pages is a complete and accurate transcription of a digital sound recording of the House Proceedings on Wednesday, March 4, 2020.

I further certify that the digital sound recording was transcribed by the word processing department employees of Alphatranscription, under my direction.

Alpha Transcription
3244 Ridge View Ct 104
Lake Ridge VA 22192