

Government Administration and Elections Committee

MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, March 31, 2021

1:00 PM in Zoom and YouTube Live

The meeting was called to order at 1:00 PM by Chairman, Rep. Fox D. 148.

The following committee members were present:

Senators: Flexer M. S29; Haskell W. S26; McCrory D. S02; Sampson R. S16;
Slap D. S05

Representatives: Blumenthal M. 147; Carpino C. 032; Fishbein C. 090; Fox D. 148;
France M. 042; Haddad G. 054; Labriola D. 131; Mastrofrancesco
G. 080; McCarthy Vahey C. 133; Morrin Bello A. 028; Palm C. 036;
Rosario C. 128; Santiago H. 084; Thomas S. 143

Absent were:

Senators:

Representatives:

Rep. Fox convened the meeting at 1:00 PM.

Rep. Fox moved to Section III of the agenda, Bills for Final Action.

Rep. Fox asked for a JF motion on item 5 listed under Section III of the agenda:

5. S.B. No. 883 An Act Concerning the Recommendations of the Governor's
Council on Women and Girls.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Santiago.

Sen. Sampson identified this bill as being identical to SB 761, An Act Permitting the Use of Citizens' Election Program Grant Funds to Offset a Participating Candidate's Child Care Costs. He stated that the bill establishes child care costs as a legitimate expenditure for the Citizens' Election Fund. Sen. Sampson asked whether the bill incorporated any provisions that limit candidates from utilizing more funding than they initially raised in order to qualify for the Citizens' Election Fund.

Rep. Fox responded and cited sections 1 through 4, which mirror the language used in SB 761. Rep. Fox noted that lines 18 through 25 use the same thresholds, which attempt to prevent a candidate from utilizing more funding than they initially raised in order to cover childcare costs.

Sen. Sampson expressed his intent to not support the bill. He expressed his sympathy towards single parents who decide to run for office, but still believes that funding child care costs is an inappropriate use of the Citizens' Election Fund. Sen. Sampson identified another provision in the bill which calls upon the Executive Branch to make a good faith effort to appoint gender and racially diverse members of the public to state boards and commissions. Sen. Sampson believes that identifying individuals based solely on gender and race will only lead to dangerous policy in the future. He also sought clarification on what the term "good faith" since it is not defined in the bill.

Rep. Thomas stated her support for the bill. She echoed the sentiments expressed by Sen. Sampson in reference to line 180, which uses the term "good faith" and agreed that the term is not adequately specific.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco mirrored the comments of Sen. Sampson, particularly in regards to the Citizens' Election Fund not being intended to cover child care costs. Rep. Mastrofrancesco announced that she would vote no on this bill.

Rep. Fox requested a roll call vote on S.B. No. 883 An Act Concerning the Recommendations of the Governor's Council on Women and Girls.

Total voting = 19. Those voting yea = 13, those voting nay = 6, absent = 0.

Rep. Fox asked for a JFS motion on item 7 listed under Section III of the agenda:

7. S.B. No. 1015 An Act Concerning the Department of Administrative Services and Modernizing Real Estate and Construction Management.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Santiago.

Rep. Fox addressed the JFS changes in LCO # 6280, where sections 6, 7 and 8 of the current bill were deleted. In addition, the substitute language changes delete the section regarding the Department of Administrative Services interaction with the State Property Review Board. Ultimately, Rep. Fox described the bill as a means to increase the efficiency of the Department of Administrative Services and make improvements to the current processes.

Sen. Sampson stated that the JFS language changes have helped to alleviate some of the concerns he had for the bill. In particular, he cites the now-deleted section 8, which would have narrowed the scope of the State Property Review Board. Sen. Sampson expressed his intent to support the current modified version of the bill.

Sen. Sampson recommended that the committee establish a consent calendar, and item 7 be added to the consent calendar.

Seeing no objections, item 7 was added to the consent calendar.

Rep. Fox asked for a JFS motion on item 8 listed under Section III of the agenda:

8. S.B. No. 1071 An Act Implementing the Recommendations of the Auditors of Public Accounts.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Thomas.

Rep. Fox addressed the JFS changes in LCO # 6285 which included simple language changes.

Sen. Sampson stated that he agreed with many of the provisions in the bill. He expressed his intent to support the bill.

Sen. Sampson recommended that item 8 be added to the consent calendar.

Seeing no objections, item 8 was added to the consent calendar.

Rep. Fox asked for a JF motion on item 9 listed under Section III of the agenda:

9. S.B. No. 1073 An Act Concerning Equity and Opportunity in State Government.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Morrin Bello.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco asked for an overview of the bill as well as the bill's intended purpose.

Rep. Fox described the bill as a means for various entities in state government to assess whether or not their policies create or exacerbate barriers to all fully eligible individuals. The bill allows for a study to be conducted with the intent to make future policy recommendations.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco asked if this bill infers that state agencies currently have policies in place that create or exacerbate barriers. She expressed her concerns over the applicability of the bill, based on her belief that state agencies do not currently have policies that impose barriers on people. Additionally, Rep. Mastrofrancesco believes that this bill opens the door to discrimination based on race, gender, income, disability, sexual orientation or religion, since she believes that it categorizes people. Rep. Mastrofrancesco expressed her intent not to support the bill.

Sen. Flexer sought to address the concerns expressed by Rep. Mastrofrancesco. As an example, Sen. Flexer stated that this bill would allow for agencies to assess the religious diversity of an agency, which could be pertinent in terms of determining what religious holidays should be observed by the agency. Additionally, Sen. Flexer identified this bill as a way for agencies to increase accessibility based on differing levels of access among various segments of the population.

Sen. Sampson believes that age should be included in the protected classifications list. In addition, Sen. Sampson expressed concern over the lack of a definition for the term “assessing equity.” Sen. Sampson sought answers over the method that the bill would use to make assessments.

Rep. Fox referred to lines 18 through 21, which highlights underserved communities and the systemic barriers that their members may face in terms of accessing benefits and opportunities pursuant to an agency’s policies and programs.

Sen. Sampson stated that he would vote no on the bill, citing the lack of age as a protected class and the failure of the bill to utilize an effective system of assessment for ensuring consistent equity. Sen. Sampson emphasized his commitment to eliminating inequities and injustices, but he believes that solely measuring outward qualities like race or gender only furthers the problems society faces today.

Rep. Palm made clear that she is in support of the bill. Rep. Palm stated that self-assessment is the only way to increase harmony and productivity in a workplace, and this bill seeks to do just that. Rep. Palm acknowledged the presence of unconscious barriers that are not easily discernible. Rep. Palm agreed with Sen. Sampson’s point about age being included in the protected classifications list.

Rep. Thomas echoed many of the sentiments expressed by Rep. Palm. Rep. Thomas views the bill as an important measure to allow for self-assessment to ensure that inequities do not exist in government policies or programs.

Rep. France cited lines 50 through 58, which mandates that upon the conclusion of their assessment, the state agency send the subsequent report to the clerks of the House and Senate of the General Assembly. Rep. France questioned why the report wouldn’t be sent to the Government Administration and Elections Committee, which is the committee of cognizance in this case.

Rep. Fox noted that he did not currently have an answer but would seek to follow up on the matter.

Sen. McCrory stated that he views the bill as an opportunity for Connecticut to understand what is being done right and what can be improved. Sen. McCrory emphasized the need for the bill so that Connecticut can make effective and informed policy changes that better serve the communities.

Rep. Fox requested a roll call vote on S.B. No. 1073 An Act Concerning Equity and Opportunity in State Government.

Total voting = 19. Those voting yea = 13, those voting nay = 6, absent = 0.

Rep. Fox asked for a JFS motion on item 18 listed under Section III of the agenda:

18. H.B. No. 6211 An Act Concerning Gender and Racial Diversity on Certain State Appointive Boards, Commissions, Committees and Councils and an Online System for Consideration of Appointments within the Legislative Department.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Santiago.

Rep. Fox addressed relatively minor JFS changes in LCO # 6299, including lines 16 and 17, where the source of information on gender and racial diversity statistics is changed.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco respects the efforts to address gender and racial diversity. However, Rep. Mastrofrancesco believes that the current bill seeks to view people solely based on external factors like race, gender and religion, rather than considering internal qualities like character and merit. For those reasons, Rep. Mastrofrancesco noted that she will not support the bill.

Rep. Palm stated that noticing and acknowledging our differences is not the same as judging them. In noticing and acknowledging our differences, Rep. Palm believes that a conscious effort is being made to expand inclusivity. Rep. Palm added that diversifying our boards and commissions only helps to strengthen them.

Rep. Thomas associated her comments with those of Rep. Palm. Rep. Thomas highlighted the four-year timeline allotted in this bill, stating that she finds it to be far too long, although she expressed her intent to support the bill.

Sen. Sampson emphasized his view that the committee was delving into culture issues that should be excluded from government and policy debates. Sen. Sampson believes that this bill promotes systemic racism, finding that the bill seeks to discriminate against certain classifications of people.

Rep. France identified lines 51 through 57, where the Secretary of the State will publish a report on the composition of each state appointive board, commission, committee or council every four years. Rep. Fox asked why the report would be published every four years rather than annually.

Rep. Fox referred to section 1(B)(1), which requires data reporting every two years, and 1(B)(2), requiring data reporting every five years. Rep. Fox stated that the aim is for the reports to be published in accordance with all reporting requirements.

Rep. France emphasized his belief that data reporting should be published annually in order for the committee to be up-to-date each legislative session in terms of the efforts of the bill.

Sen. Sampson emphasized his view that this bill breaks down individuals solely based on their race and gender. By ignoring life experiences and internal qualities, Sen. Sampson believes that this bill sets a dangerous precedent. Additionally, he cites the use of the term "good faith efforts" in this bill. As stated previously, Sen. Sampson believes that this term is inherently vague and does not belong in the bill.

Rep. Fox requested a roll call vote on H.B. No. 6211 An Act Concerning Gender and Racial Diversity on Certain State Appointive Boards, Commissions, Committees and Councils and an Online System for Consideration of Appointments within the Legislative Department.

Total voting = 19. Those voting yea = 14, those voting nay = 5, absent = 0.

Rep. Fox asked for a JF motion on item 10 listed under Section III of the agenda:

10. S.B. No. 1074 An Act Concerning Various Provisions Related to Government Administration and COVID-19.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Thomas.

Rep. Fox noted that this bill is still a work in progress, as committee chairs and ranking members are still looking at ways to make improvements and changes.

Sen. Sampson expressed his appreciation regarding the bipartisan effort of the committee, but still maintained concerns regarding provisions in the bill. Sen. Sampson recognized the benefits of holding Zoom meetings throughout the pandemic but identified a provision in the bill which would allow for virtual meetings to replace in-person public meetings. He emphasized the value of in-person meetings where the public can interact with their elected officials. Sen. Sampson also expressed concerns with section 7 of the bill, which he believes gives broad and unchecked power to executive branch department heads.

Rep. Fox acknowledged that there is in fact a difference between interacting with a constituent in-person versus online. Rep. Fox agreed with Sen. Sampson that section 7 of the bill is overly broad and needs to be more narrowly tailored.

Sen. Sampson stated that he would support the bill today but noted that he wouldn't support it on the Senate floor unless a provision is added which maintains in-person meetings for elected bodies.

Rep. Carpino echoed similar concerns as Sen. Sampson regarding section 7 of the bill, finding it far too broad for any department head to circumvent the regulations review process. Rep. Carpino expressed her intent to support the bill today.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco stated that she would be voting no on this bill. While she expressed hope that she might be able to vote in favor of the bill once it comes to the floor, Rep. Mastrofrancesco expressed concerns about the provisions that would allow for public meetings to be held virtually for an indefinite period.

Sen. Flexer asked Rep. Carpino a series of questions regarding the Regulations Review Committee of which she is a member. In particular, she asked how the committee has functioned over the past year and how the existing executive orders have impacted regulations review.

Rep. Carpino stated that the Regulations Review Committee has functioned very well, meeting on a monthly basis and making use of Zoom since the early days of the pandemic.

Rep. Fox requested a roll call vote on S.B. No. 1074 An Act Concerning Various Provisions Related to Government Administration and COVID-19.

Total voting = 19. Those voting yea = 17, those voting nay = 2, absent = 0.

Rep. Fox asked for a JF motion on item 27 listed under Section III of the agenda:

27. H.B. No. 6651 An Act Responding to Issues Related to COVID-19 and Government Administration.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Santiago.

Rep. Fox premised the conversation by acknowledging that this bill is identical to SB 1074.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco expressed her hope that her concerns with this bill will be alleviated by the time the bill comes to a vote in the House. Rep. Mastrofrancesco stated that she will vote no on the bill today.

Rep. Fox requested a roll call vote on H.B. No. 6651 An Act Responding to Issues Related to COVID-19 and Government Administration.

Total voting = 19. Those voting yea = 16, those voting nay = 3, absent = 0.

Rep. Fox asked for a JFS motion on item 13 listed under Section III of the agenda:

13. H.B. No. 5654 An Act Concerning the Updating of State Forms, Applications and Methods of Identification to Include a Nonbinary Gender Option.

Rep. Thomas made the motion and it was seconded by Sen. Flexer.

Rep. Fox explained the JFS language changes in LCO # 6312, which includes a change to the effective date of the bill and adjustments to the process by which state agencies return reports to the committee.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco expressed her view that this bill eliminates gender from being included as a question on state forms, applications or methods of identification. Rep. Mastrofrancesco asked how agencies that are seeking to diversify would be able to consider gender statistics if the form omits any questions that allow for an applicant to denote their gender. She stated her intent to vote no on the bill.

Rep. Fox responded by stating his interpretation of the bill, which is that the forms would not omit a gender question, but simply include a third option for nonbinary people to select. Rep. Fox highlighted the fact that the bill is not binding for state agencies to make this change, but rather seeks to get their input in terms of whether or not such a change would be plausible and implementable.

Sen. Sampson acknowledged that the bill is a study but expressed concerns over the implementation of the proposal. Sen. Sampson stated that the best resolution to this issue would be to completely eliminate a question about gender on all forms and applications. Sen. Sampson expressed his intent to vote no on the bill.

Rep. Thomas stated that a study would help resolve some of the questions and concerns expressed during the meeting. Rep. Thomas stated that she would vote yes for the bill.

Rep. Fox requested a roll call vote on H.B. No. 5654 An Act Concerning the Updating of State Forms, Applications and Methods of Identification to Include a Nonbinary Gender Option.

Total voting = 19. Those voting yea = 15, those voting nay = 4, absent = 0.

Rep. Fox asked for a JFS motion on item 15 listed under Section III of the agenda:

15. H.B. No. 5879 An Act Exempting Certain Contact Information from Disclosure Under the Freedom of Information Act.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Santiago.

Rep. Fox addressed the JFS language changes in LCO # 6156, which includes the deletion of lines 10 through 12.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco raised concerns about this bill. She sought clarification from Rep. Fox regarding what the bill was trying to protect from being accessed via a Freedom of Information Act request.

Rep. Fox explained that the bill does not seek to protect the material content of an email from being accessed via FOIA, but instead intends to protect the email addresses of constituents or anyone in contact with a legislator.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco cited the testimony of the Freedom of Information Commission, which detailed the fact that there was a pending case before the commission that prevented them from offering a clear stance on this bill. Until they settle the case, Rep. Mastrofrancesco does not believe that the committee should pass bills regarding this matter. Rep. Mastrofrancesco noted that she will vote no on the bill.

Rep. Fox requested a roll call vote on H.B. No. 5879 An Act Exempting Certain Contact Information from Disclosure Under the Freedom of Information Act.

Total voting = 19. Those voting yea = 13, those voting nay = 6, absent = 0.

Rep. Fox asked for a JFS motion on item 23 listed under Section III of the agenda:

23. H.B. No. 6577 An Act Concerning the State Properties Review Board.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Morrin Bello.

Rep. Fox addressed the JFS language changes in LCO # 6273. Following the testimony of the community farmers, the committee made changes to the language with the intent of alleviating the community farmers' concerns.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco recommended that item 23 be added to the consent calendar.

Seeing no objections, item 23 was added to the consent calendar.

Rep. Fox asked for a JF motion on item 22 listed under Section III of the agenda:

22. H.B. No. 6576 An Act Concerning the Nondisclosure of Residential Addresses of Certain Employees Under the Freedom of Information Act.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Thomas.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco expressed the need for transparency in government. She understands the reasoning as to why some employees at the Attorney General's office might want their addresses to be suppressed but believes that doing so would open the door to all government employees being exempted from the Freedom of Information Act. Rep. Mastrofrancesco stated that she would vote no on the bill.

Rep. Fox requested a roll call vote on H.B. No. 6576 An Act Concerning the Nondisclosure of Residential Addresses of Certain Employees Under the Freedom of Information Act.

Total voting = 19. Those voting yea = 16, those voting nay = 3, absent = 0.

Rep. Fox asked for a JFS motion on item 20 listed under Section III of the agenda:

20. H.B. No. 6444 An Act Concerning the Modernization of State Services.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Santiago.

Rep. Fox addressed the JFS language in LCO # 6287. After the Jewish Federation of Connecticut sought clarification of the wording in section 3, the Department of Administrative Services made a few minor word changes.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco expressed concern with section 8 of the bill, where the definition of small business is altered to mandate that any small business must be certified by the Small Business Administration.

Rep. Fox responded to Rep. Mastrofrancesco by acknowledging that this designation is designed to bring more uniformity to the rules governing small business.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco noted that many small businesses exist but might not be certified by the Small Business Administration (SBA). She expressed her intent to vote no based on deep concern over the implications this definition would have on small businesses.

Rep. France stated that SBA certification is intended to help businesses access federal programs, not programs provided at the state level. Rep. France advised that the bill be revised to utilize the definition of a small business as provided by the SBA but exclude any requirement for an SBA certification. Rep. France stated his intent to vote no on this bill, finding that an SBA certification should not be a prerequisite for a small business to access state programs or funding.

Rep. Fox requested a roll call vote on H.B. No. 6444 An Act Concerning the Modernization of State Services.

Total voting = 19. Those voting yea = 13, those voting nay = 6, absent = 0.

Rep. Fox asked for a JFS motion on item 28 listed under Section III of the agenda:

28. H.B. No. 6652 An Act Designating Various Days, Weeks and Months.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Thomas.

Rep. Fox addressed JFS changes in LCO # 6251. Lines 30 through 34 now incorporate language that designates March as the Peace Corps recognition month.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco recommended that item 28 be added to the consent calendar.

Seeing no objections, item 28 was added to the consent calendar.

Rep. Fox asked for a JF motion on item 29 listed under Section III of the agenda:

29. H.B. No. 6664 An Act Concerning Quasi-Public Agency Transparency.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Morrin Bello.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco recommended that item 29 be added to the consent calendar.

Seeing no objections, item 29 was added to the consent calendar.

Rep. Fox asked for a JF motion on item 17 listed under Section III of the agenda:

17. H.B. No. 6194 An Act Concerning the Competitive Bidding and Oversight of QuasiPublic Agency Contracts.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Morrin Bello.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco recommended that item 17 be added to the consent calendar.

Seeing no objections, item 17 was added to the consent calendar.

Rep. Fox asked for a JF motion on item 16 listed under Section III of the agenda:

16. H.B. No. 6193 An Act Subjecting Certain Nonstate Entities That Serve a Governmental Function to the Freedom of Information Act and the Codes of Ethics.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Palm.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco introduced a friendly amendment to HB 6193. Rep. Mastrofrancesco described the amendment as a way to ensure that quasi-public agencies outline their functions. Essentially, this amendment defines what constitutes a government function.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Carpino.

Rep. Fox urged his colleagues to accept the amendment offered by Rep. Mastrofrancesco as a friendly amendment.

Rep. Fox requested a voice vote.

Rep. Fox noted that the ayes have it. The amendment was adopted.

Sen. Sampson recommended that item 16, as amended, be added to the consent calendar.

Seeing no objections, item 16 as amended was added to the consent calendar.

Rep. Fox asked for a JFS motion on item 19 listed under Section III of the agenda:

19. H.B. No. 6325 An Act Concerning the Secretary of the State, Absentee Ballots and Election Audits.

Sen. Sampson made the motion and it was seconded by Sen. Flexer.

Rep. Fox addressed JFS changes in LCO # 6301. The language retains the task force for risk-limiting audit and the changes made to minor party filing deadlines.

Sen. Sampson expressed his appreciation to the committee chairs for adding Republican bills to the meeting agenda. Sen. Sampson described HB 6325 as a means for upholding the integrity of elections. Sen. Sampson stated that he was disappointed with the substitute language of the bill, which removed a lot of language that the minority members of the committee initially supported, specifically the removal of signature verification.

Sen. Sampson introduced Amendment 4 to HB 6325. Sen. Sampson described his amendment as an attempt to restore the signature verification requirement that was in the original bill.

Sen. Sampson motioned for the adoption of his amendment and requested a roll call vote.

Sen. Flexer expressed hope that the committee would look at the provisions set forth in the amendment and urged her colleagues to reject the amendment in its current form at this time.

Rep. Thomas asked the proponent of the amendment whether it had a fiscal note attachment.

Sen. Sampson stated that there was no fiscal note attached to the amendment, but he assumed that there would be some cost. Since the amendment calls for a pilot program that will randomly select five different municipalities to partake, Sen. Sampson stated that some sort of cost would be incurred. Sen. Sampson stated that he was not sure whether the Secretary of the State's office would have the fiscal means within their budget to conduct the pilot program.

Rep. Santiago noted that much of the funding put towards municipal elections came from the municipal budget, not the state or federal government. Considering that there is no fiscal note attached to the amendment, Rep. Santiago believes that it is unknown how much of the cost will fall on the burden of a municipality.

Sen. Sampson acknowledged that any bill coming before the committee has some sort of incurred cost associated. Additionally, Sen. Sampson highlighted the need for signature verification in order to ensure election integrity, especially in the event that the constitutional amendments are passed, and voting is expanded in Connecticut.

Rep. Fox asked for a roll call vote on Amendment 4 to H.B. No. 6325 An Act Concerning the Secretary of the State, Absentee Ballots and Election Audits.

Total voting = 17. Those voting yea = 5, those voting nay = 12, absent = 2.

Sen. Sampson expressed his disappointment over the fact that the committee could not agree to put signature verification in place. Sen. Sampson urged adoption of the remaining elements of the bill but maintained his disappointment.

Rep. Fox requested a roll call vote on H.B. No. 6325 An Act Concerning the Secretary of the State, Absentee Ballots and Election Audits.

Total voting = 19. Those voting yea = 18, those voting nay = 1, absent = 0.

Rep. Fox asked for a JF motion on item 21 listed under Section III of the agenda:

21. H.B. No. 6575 An Act Concerning Risk-Limiting Audits for Election Results.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Thomas.

Rep. Mastrofrancesco recommended that item 21 be added to the consent calendar.

Seeing no objections, item 21 was added to the consent calendar.

Rep. Fox asked for a JF motion on item 14 listed under Section III of the agenda:

14. H.B. No. 5656 An Act Designating Pizza as the State Food.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and was seconded by Rep. Santiago.

Rep. Santiago stated that Meriden has great pizza.

Rep. Thomas, a New Jersey native, explained that a vote in favor of this bill does not denote that she believes Connecticut pizza is superior to New Jersey pizza.

Rep. Fishbein expressed his wish for donuts to be designated as the state food. He noted that he was very conflicted about how to vote because he does not see any particular benefit related to the passage of the bill.

Sen. Flexer added that donuts could be designated as the state dessert or breakfast food, since Connecticut does not currently have designated foods for those categories.

Rep. Fox requested a roll call vote on H.B. No. 5656 An Act Designating Pizza as the State Food.

Total voting = 19. Those voting yea = 19, those voting nay = 0, absent = 0.

Rep. Fox announced that the ranking members have requested that item 16 come off the consent calendar.

16. H.B. No. 6193 An Act Subjecting Certain Nonstate Entities That Serve a Governmental Function to the Freedom of Information Act and the Codes of Ethics.

Sen. Flexer made the motion and it was seconded by Rep. Haddad.

Rep. Fox requested a roll call vote on H.B. No. 6193 An Act Subjecting Certain Nonstate Entities That Serve a Governmental Function to the Freedom of Information Act and the Codes of Ethics, as amended.

Total voting = 19. Those voting yea = 18, those voting nay = 1, absent = 0.

Rep. Fox moved to a vote on the consent calendar, which included items 7, 8, 17, 21, 23, 28 and 29.

Rep. Fox requested a roll call vote on the consent calendar.

Total voting = 19. Those voting yea = 19, those voting nay = 0, absent = 0.

Rep. Fox announced that the committee will be holding another meeting on Monday, April 5, 2021 at 2:00 PM.

A motion was duly made and seconded to adjourn the meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 PM.

Val Mehmeti

Administrator

Committee Clerk