

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

Monday, March 1, 2021

The Senate was called to order at 11:36 a.m., the President in the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Will the Senate please come to order? Members and guests please arise and direct your attention to our Chaplain. And I would like to invite Kathy Zabel of Burlington to come forward for our prayer.

ACTING CHAPLAIN KATHLEEN ZABEL:

Thank you. We ask help that we may bring renewal to all those who live in pain, as we hold fast to the knowledge that the sun will rise again, and all life will reawaken.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Kathy Zabel, our Chaplain. And now I would like to invite Senator Berthel to please lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance. Good morning, Senator.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

(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. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator, thank you so much. And before we begin, I would like to make a historic announcement and that

is that Senator Anwar has informed the Chair that pursuant to Senate Rule 24, he will be voting from outside the Chamber. And so, that is the first time we've had to invoke that Senate Rule. And with that, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President and good morning. Good morning to the Chamber as well. Madam President, is there any business on the Clerk's desk?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Good morning. The Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda No. 1, dated Monday, March 1st, 2021.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move all items on Senate Agenda No. 1 dated Monday, March 1st, 2021 to be acted upon as indicated and the Agenda be incorporated by reference into the Senate Journal and the Senate Transcript.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing no objections, so ordered. Senator Duff.

INTRODUCTION OF SENATE JOINT RESOLUTION:

SJ NO. 32 RESOLUTION EXPRESSING SYMPATHY ON THE DEATH OF STATE AUDITOR AND FORMER STATE SENATOR ROBERT J. KANE.

REPORT(S) RECEIVED - to be referred to committee(s) indicated.

Report - Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection - Division of Statewide Emergency Telecommunications - Annual Report Concerning Enhanced 911 Emergency Telephone Service for Calendar Year Ended December 31, 2020 (Pursuant to Section 28-29(b) of the Connecticut General Statutes) Date received: March 1, 2021

Referred to the Committees on Appropriations and Public Safety

INTRODUCTION OF SENATE AND HOUSE LIST OF BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS (LIST NO. 28) - to be waived and bills and resolutions to be referred to committee(s) indicated.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I ask for a suspension of the Rules in order to take up the Resolution from Senate Agenda No. 1.

THE CHAIR:

Hearing no objections, so ordered. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to yield to Senator Berthel.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Berthel, good morning.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Good morning, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Duff. Would the Clerk please call the Joint Resolution on Senate Agenda No. 1?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Senate Joint Resolution No. 32, RESOLUTION
EXPRESSING SYMPATHY ON THE DEATH OF STATE AUDITOR
AND FORMER STATE SENATOR ROBERT J. KANE.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Madam President, I would ask that the Clerk please
read the Resolution at this time.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Senate Joint Resolution No. 32., RESOLUTION
EXPRESSING SYMPATHY ON THE DEATH OF STATE AUDITOR
AND FORMER STATE SENATOR ROBERT J. KANE.

Resolved by this Assembly,

WHEREAS on Friday, February 5th, 2021, the State of
Connecticut lost an admired and dedicated order to
public accounts and former State Senator with the
passing of Robert J. Kane at the age of 53;

AND WHEREAS he represented the 32nd Senatorial
District with distinction for more than nine years,
from 2008 through 2017;

AND WHEREAS he served as an auditor of public
accounts from 2017 until the time of his passing;

AND WHEREAS he was born on April 30th, 1967 in Waterbury, Connecticut, son of the late James J. and Deana LoRusso Kane Sr.;

AND WHEREAS he was the proud father of his two children, Aidan and Deana Kane;

AND WHEREAS he was a graduate of Sacred Heart High School in Waterbury, Central Connecticut State University, and the University of New Haven;

AND WHEREAS he was a successful entrepreneur who opened one of the first cell phone stores in Connecticut, KarTele Cellular Communications in 1994;

AND WHEREAS he was the past Chairperson of the Watertown Town Council and served as Chairperson of its Finance Subcommittee and founding Chairperson of its Business Development Subcommittee;

AND WHEREAS he was first elected to serve the 32nd Senatorial District in a special election on January 15th, 2008, representing the towns of Bethlehem, Bridgewater, Middlebury, Oxford, Roxbury, Seymour, Southbury, Washington, Watertown and Woodbury;

AND WHEREAS he served for four terms as a State Senator and served as the Ranking Member of the Appropriations Committee, Human Services Committee and the Executive and Legislative Nominations Committee, and also served on the Public Health Committee;

AND WHEREAS he was the Deputy Minority Leader, Pro Tempore Caucus Chairman, and served as Assistant Minority Leader and Minority Whip in the Connecticut State Senate;

AND WHEREAS he served as Chairperson of the of the Wolcott Street Lakewood Road Business Association, President of the Professional Networking Partners Of Waterbury, Connecticut, Corporator of the Valley

United Way, a member of the board of directors of the Waterbury Regional Chamber of Commerce;

AND WHEREAS he was a former board member of United Way of the Waterbury ARC and of the Regional Workforce Investment Board;

AND WHEREAS he was a recipient of Waterbury Regional Chamber, Malcolm Baldrige Award for volunteerism and a recipient of the Waterbury Regional Chamber, Harold Webster Smith Small Business Award;

AND WHEREAS he received the 2016 Radiological Society of Connecticut Award for his leadership in advocating for preventive health care services for women and access to services by all patients;

AND WHEREAS besides his beloved children, Aidan and Deana, he is survived by his siblings, Maria Kane Slavin and her husband John Cheryl A. Kane, and John Tarascio, James J. Kane Jr., and Diane S. Kane all of Waterbury and Christopher M. Kane of Wolcott and several nieces and nephews.

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Connecticut General Assembly expresses its sincere sympathy and heartfelt condolences on the passing of one of its honorable former members Robert J. Kane, whose death is a profound loss to the office of the Auditors of Public Accounts, the State Senate, his family and friends, the residents of the ten towns of the 32nd Senatorial District and the entire state of Connecticut.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of the House of Representatives and the Senate cause a copy of this Resolution to be sent to the family of Robert J. Kane as an expression of the high esteem and affection in which he is held.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Will you remark further, Senator Berthel?

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Mr. Clerk for reading the Resolution. Before I begin my remarks, I'd like to acknowledge the presence of the former Minority Leader, Senator Fasano in the Chamber with us this morning. Thank you, Senator, for being here.

Senator Kane's family could not be here with us today. His children, Aidan and Deana, who were frequent visitors to the circle, this Chamber, and this seat, were not yet ready to come back here. But they are listening and watching us this morning, I would ask that we keep them in our thoughts and prayers. I met Rob Kane for the first time when I decided to run for the Watertown Board of Education a decade ago. I had, of course, known of him as our former Town Council Chair in Watertown and as my then State Senator.

As many of you know, who worked with him, he had a passion for politics and for winning, that was enviable. And at that first meeting, he pledged his support to me. He knocked the doors with me all over Watertown. He had introduced me to hundreds of people. And for the first time of many times, he introduced me to one of his favorite sayings, more like a philosophy, which was ABC, which was always be closing, a famous line from the 1992 movie, Glengarry Glen Ross. For Rob and for campaigns, ABC actually meant to say hello, to introduce yourself, to explain your platform and to ask for the vote.

Rob was known to say many times that his favorite season was campaign season. And in every election, since then with any candidate, with whom he interacted, the ABC strategy was deployed and it was obligatory in that first campaign meeting to watch the clip from the movie where ABC is referenced. Rob

was fond of the many friendships that came from his love of politics as well.

In 2014, Rob was an integral part of my campaign for the 68th District seat in the state house. He assured me it would be a tough race with an open seat up for grabs and for nearly six months, right up until election day, he never allowed me to become complacent or confident about winning or to relax or to take my foot off the gas, pushing me the entire time. That was his mindset when it came to politics.

At around 7:15 PM that evening on election night, he sent me a text that I still have on my phone to this day that said, simply read, I think you got this buddy. And I won that election and that began the time that Rob and I would begin working together here in the Legislature. On opening day in January, 2015 in a sophomore kind of way with a grin on his face, right outside these doors, Rob pointed out to me that my District No. 68, plus his District No. 32 equal to perfect 100. And that the people knew this. They absolutely knew this. And so, we truly had to do a great job together, perhaps a bit silly, but that was just one example of the ways that he would seek to inspire me and many, many others along the way to make us think a little bit about silly things that perhaps, actually had some relevance.

And upon my arrival here in this historic place, Rob took me under his wing. He showed me around. He introduced me to staff and influencers in the building. He shared with me who to look out for and well quite honestly, who to watch out for. He also taught me the real value and importance of relationships. He reminded me always to stand your ground, to be honest, be firm, be respectful, and that your word is your bond, and how those relationships afforded him many opportunities to get things done here. Rob, never cease to amaze me with how many people on both sides of the aisle in all branches of the government respected him as a leader in this building, despite their differences in

politics, despite whether or not they agreed or disagreed with him. And I think this spoke volumes to his character.

Unlike many of my colleagues in the circle, Rob and I never worked together in this Chamber because of course, I succeeded him in the 32nd Senate seat. In late 2016, when Rob confidentially told me about the once in a lifetime opportunity for him to possibly move into the storied role of State Auditor. He asked me if I was ready to climb the stairs to join the circle to work in the upper Chamber. I told him, I wasn't sure, to be perfectly honest at that first meeting, but he, once again, pledged his support to help me get elected, reminded me about his ABC philosophy, made me watch the clip again, and having himself won a special election to this seat in 2008, assured me that a special election would be the hardest one yet.

We were very fortunate that we had built a great group of friends, allies, and supporters. And we work together to accomplish the goal. On the evening of that February day, actually four years ago, yesterday, after a hard fought special election, after the votes were counted and we had secured a victory, Rob pulled me aside and congratulated me and said, Listen, Senator, Senator elect, you worked hard and have a great deal to be proud of. You've earned your win. But now the hard work really begins. And in a way that was typical of Rob of his wittiness, he said to me, You are now my protégé, so don't mess it up. And Rob never stopped believing in me and always stood by my side.

As Rob transitioned into his new role as state auditor, a role in which he took tremendous pride, he became an even more important and valuable mentor to me and others. In normal times before the pandemic, any day that I was in the legislative office building or the Capitol, I would begin with a stop in his office. He would share a corny joke, asked me about a piece of legislation or more

important to him if I had read the latest report from the auditors, or sometimes we would just talk about being dads and about our kids.

Rob was always available to me by text, by phone or even in-person back in Watertown as he lived one street over from me. He would regularly offer unsolicited advice for better or worse on any issue. And assuredly, I have already felt the painful loss of my go-to guy since his passing and the loss of my good friend. And I know that many of my colleagues here in the circle and downstairs in the hall of the house share that same sense of lost. Rob was a statesman, a mentor, a friend. He was a son, a brother, and a dad. I will assuredly miss his regular jokes about politics, his wittiness, and his great advice.

And my debt of gratitude to him is large and mostly unpaid. Rob exemplified public service and what it meant to be the voice of the people. And we, the people are forever grateful for his commitment, his caring, his sacrifices, and for standing up for what he truly believed was right. His love of family, his brothers, his sisters, and especially his children Aidan and Deana was enviable and always a priority over everything else. Rob constantly reminded us all that family came before everything else. Thank you, Rob Kane for your service to the people of the 32nd District in the State of Connecticut. We are all better for having known you. You left your Mark on this place, and that is a good thing. May he rest in peace in the loving arms of God. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Berthel. Will you remark further on the Resolution that is before the Chamber? Good afternoon, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I rise in support of the Resolution and like my good friend from Watertown wanted to just share a few thoughts about Rob Kane. I'm not sure when we first met. I can say that I know I served with him in the Appropriations Committee. And one of the things that I enjoyed most about serving with him was you never really knew what he was going to ask. So not only did the Chairman of the committee not know what he was going to ask, we didn't know what he was going to ask. And more often than not, you didn't know where he was going with this question, but it was always a fun trip.

And usually at the root of it, the taxpayer was the one that he was watching out for. It may not have been clear at the beginning, but usually by the end through his wit and his tenacity, he would drill down on the question until he got the answer that he wanted. I'm pretty sure it's probably a good thing he wasn't an attorney.

Rob and I always shared what I would call friendly conversation about family. It's one of the things that I enjoyed most about him, because while you may not have thought that he knew much about you, he always knew what your kids had been up to, or always knew what they were interested in. And it may have been because someone else had shared the thought, the conversation at one point in time, but he made you honestly separate from whatever it was that you were thinking about that may have been grading on you for a period of the day and brought you back to a place of comfort.

Even when he left this Chamber and became the auditor, I would see him in the cafeteria and there was always a conversation about kids and friends and restaurants, some politics, but mostly he would kind of bring you to a different place that was more human, more like our constituents more, less involved in the process. And frankly, I found that as a respite, for me it was good times when I be on

the Labor Committee and you would really be tangling over some issues, he would take you to a place where you were perfectly at ease.

He enjoyed hockey, I enjoyed hockey. And one day he walked into my office with a hockey tie. I don't know if he bought it thinking it was a golf tie and then realized the golf balls aren't black. But nonetheless, I got a tie. And every day I wear this tie, I think about Rob Kane, and I always have. He had a certain genuineness to him having done business with him, I got remote car starter for my wife and it worked flawlessly. But my point is that he really did represent the average Connecticut citizen. He was just your neighbor. And he kind of approached things that way. We enjoyed watching Quinnipiac Hockey together, usually separated by about two or 300 feet, but no matter where he was in the arena, he would spot you, and before too long, you either get a text message or a visit. And it was just something very, very refreshing about Rob.

He spoke passionately about Aidan and Deana. as I said in the onset, there was no doubt about his love for his children, his love for his family. it was second to none. And there isn't really a time when I don't think when I think about Rob at this point, when I don't think about them and how devastating it must be in life and how much they're going to require the support and friendship of all of us and of all of those that have known that family. So I'm pleased to be here today to say a few words about Rob, and as devastated as we all were about the news, as devastated as we all have been about similar news usually reserved for people older than we are. It is a day to be able to reflect on his life, his friendship, his love of the process and his love of his family. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you. Madam President. I also rise in support of the Resolution and was really shocked to hear of the news of Rob Kane's passing. He came up in a special election, like I did, to the Senate, like I did to the House, and certainly knew what it was like to kind of come in the middle of things happening. But that didn't stop Rob from jumping right in both feet and working on the best interest of his constituents. Rob was somebody who immediately could make lots of friends. And one of the things I remember about Rob, most of all is that while we probably didn't agree on very much, I don't know that he ever made anything personal. And he was one who you could argue with politically from a policy perspective and we argued and when I was on the Appropriations Committee quite a bit, but at the end he was one where you could stand up, shake hands, pat each other on the back and move on and talk about your kids the very next minute.

He was somebody I know who loved his kids very, very much. And he was very proud of them and watching them grow. I know that Rob took this job seriously, but I don't know that he ever took himself too seriously, 'cause he was always somebody who had a quick wit, could tell a joke or tell a good story, even in the middle of debating, something that he thought was very, very important. I had forgotten actually that he was a hockey fan. And I think that was something that he and I probably talked about over time with his kids playing and myself playing hockey in the past also and some of the rinks that we knew and, and getting up in early in the morning, or how much money you have to spend to play in that sport. But again, he was always somebody who really valued and cherished his family and valued his and cherished his children so much that he would always be willing to talk about whatever they were up to.

And so, Madam President, it was just really devastating to hear the news. When Rob Kane went to -- became the auditor, it was -- we had -- we shared a funny story because you know, most of us have other jobs outside the Capitol and myself as a realtor, who's an independent contractor. He owned his own business. and you know, even as legislators, these aren't nine to five jobs.

And so, when he had to be -- when he became the auditor and had a nine to five job, he had a -- it was a reckoning, I think for him to say, wait a minute, I have to be in one place for eight hours from nine to five, when, you know, for all of us who were in the political world, especially we're used to being in 10 different places over the course of 10 hours and never being in one place at one time or for that long a time.

And so, I knew he -- so we joked about that, but I know that over that transition from politics to auditor, how much he really took seriously that position and how much he grew to love being the auditor and actually how much he would actually be in touch with many of us on various issues that came up, always be in a very respectful way and collegial way as well.

So, Madam President, I just want to extend my sympathies to his family, especially his children, to Senator Berthel who succeeded Senator Kane and to his constituents in his district. And to again, say it was such a shocking loss to lose somebody so young and will remember his contributions here in the circle. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further on the Resolution? Senator Looney, good afternoon.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. On this sad occasion, I just wanted to speak briefly on the Resolution. Senator Rob Kane was someone who you always knew cherished and relished his service here. He was someone who came at the job with great enthusiasm, had a real sense that he was representing his district. He always came out. He was in many ways, sort of the embodiment of the happy warrior.

He loved political combat, loved political debate. But he always did it in a way that was a sense of celebration of the political process. And as previous speakers have said he would at the same time ask about one's family or have a joke or discuss something about sports. He always had that high-spirited way about it, but you always knew that he never took for granted the fact that he had a special obligation conferred upon him by the people of his district. And I think that's something that all who do a good job here on whichever side, whichever party, all share.

Then when he became the State Auditor, I think he did a superb job, working closely and collaboratively and in a bipartisan way with John Geragosian for the last four years in that position, carefully looking into things, applying his business background, being highly conscientious in looking for the practices or waste that the auditor's office could identify and point to better ways of doing things. So it is a terrible loss for someone as young as he was, and as vital as he was, to be taken at such an early age. As others have said he did -- he always -- you could tell how devoted he was to his children, how his thoughts of them permeated everything that he did every day and the pride and joy that he took being a parent was just a wonderful sense of what he was as a human being. So again, Madam President, this Resolution conveys to his family, our joining with them in their sense of loss. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Good afternoon, Madam President and thank you. I would also like to start by thanking first Senator Looney for the courtesy of the yield to end this conversation and also like to recognize our former leader Senator Len Fasano, who is also with us today in the circle. If ever there was an example of the phrase, "But for the grace of God go I.", this is it.

Rob Kane was here one moment, gone in the next. We had the fortune to share the Town of Seymour. And the first time I met him was at a very big family event. We always -- the kids would always love to go to the Seymour Pumpkin Festival. And in that first election in 2010, I had the opportunity to meet then Senator Kane and he showed me around and let me visit with a lot of the local folks in Seymour. And I got to find that he was a person of just great insight and knowledge and he was very personable. And from there it just grew. He would constantly talk, constantly have comments, always quick-witted and always, if there was one issue that he always harangued, and I know I'm not the only one, there are many people here today, I'm sure would remember conversations about the Oxford Airport. He wouldn't give up on that until it happened. But that's the type of person he was.

I can remember one evening where we were, it was a CRRA Bill and we wanted to get out there and talk about the bill. And I ran an amendment on the Garbage Museum in Stratford, and I can still see Rob standing there as he was reeling me on the amendment and questioning me with a huge smile ear to ear. But that was Rob. Rob knew how to live life and he did

to the fullest, but he also did so much for his district. He did so much for so many in his district, in his community for the Valley. Rob was always there just like he was always for his family. Like me, he was a hockey dad. Anytime he was in Shelton, he called and conversely, when I was in Watertown, I returned the favor and right up until the end, he kept calling and talking.

No one had a better sense of humor, perspective or insight. You always know when Rob Kane walked into the caucus room or the circle, his presence was always known. And in a good way, Rob Kane, you will be missed, my friend. In closing, may the road rise up to meet you, may the wind be at your back, may the sun shine warm upon your face and rains fall soft upon your fields. And until we meet again, may God hold you in the palm of his hand.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. If there are no further remarks, I'd like to ask that the Chamber, please observe a moment of silence in honor of Rob Kane's passing.

Resolution is adopted. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, for the purposes of marking, please?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Before I begin, I just also wanted to take a moment for a point of personal privilege as I welcome back Senator Fasano into the Chamber. Former Republican leader, and it's been about a year since I've marked the Calendar, I think

and having him back in here, I thought for a second, I was a little bit of a time warp. It's been a while and hopefully, with vaccines coming in, we can get our lives back normal, so very soon. So, we'll start to on the Senate Calendar. Start the markings please.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar Page 1, Calendar No. 27, go. Calendar 28, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered on both.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar 29 on Calendar Page 2, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar 30, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar 31, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar 32, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar 33, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar Page 3, Calendar 34, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar 35, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar Page 36, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar Page 37, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar Page 38, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And Calendar Page 4, Calendar Page 39, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar Page 40, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Can we stand at ease for a moment?

THE CHAIR:

And the Senate can stand at ease.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam, President.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Which was the last one I marked? 40.

THE CHAIR:

40.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you. Calendar Page 4, Calendar 41, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

42, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

43, go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar 40 on top of Page Calendar 5, Calendar 44,
go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And four items on our Consent Calendar, Calendar Page 5, Calendar 16, like to mark that item for our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar 17, like to mark that item for our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 5 Calendar 18, like to mark that item on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar Page 6, Calendar 19, like to mark that item for our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 6, Calendar 20, like to mark that item on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar 21 for Consent.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar 24 for Consent.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar 25 for consent.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And Calendar 26 for Consent.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 7, Calendar 22, like to mark that
item as PR.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And Calendar Page 7 Calendar 23, like the mark that item PR.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Emergency Certified Bills, on Calendar Page 8, top of Page 8, like to mark this as our first item.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar 47, House Bill 6516. And then back to Calendar Page 7, is there a second item. Calendar 45, House Bill 6514. Like to mark that item go as a second item.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And Calendar Page 7, Calendar 46, House Bill 6515, like to mark that item go as our third item.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And then back to Calendar Page 8, Calendar 15,
Senate Resolution No. 5, like to mark that item PR.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. That [inaudible] our
markings and will the Senate stand at ease for a
moment please?

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you. Will the Clerk please call the calendar
please?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 8, Calendar No. 47, House Bill No. 6516.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Let me just clarify what I said earlier. The House Bills will be at the end of the Judicial Resolutions. Those are just the order for the Bills. Yep. So, we'll start with Calendar Page 1, Calendar 27 please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 1, Calendar No. 27 House Joint Resolution No. 57, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF DEBORAH SMITH PALMIERI OF GUILFORD TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF PARDONS AND PAROLES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield. And we will get the microphone working for you, Senator.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you. Good morning. I don't know what time is.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Good to see you. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Before us is Deborah Smith Palmieri of Guilford who came before the Judiciary Committee, she received a Favorable Report out of the Judiciary Committee. She is very much qualified. She has a Bachelor's of Science in Special Education from Southern Connecticut State University. She's been a consultant in the past on Probation Officer's role in Drug Courts. She's qualified and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Legislation that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further? If not --

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

If there's no objection, I'd ask this item be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, sir, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 1, Calendar No. 28, House Joint Resolution No. 60, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF SCOTT A.

BARTON OF SEYMOUR TO BE A WORKERS' COMPENSATION
COMMISSIONER.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance
of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and
adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption, will you remark
further?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Before us is Scott
A. Barton of Seymour, Connecticut to be a Workers'
Compensation Commissioner. He comes to us, have a
positive vote out of the Judiciary Committee. He has
a Bachelor's of Science from the University of New
Haven. A Juris Doctor from the University of the
Pacific. He has a lot of experience in government.
He had a Favorable Report and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further
on the Resolution before us? Will you remark
further, Senator Winfield?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there is no
objection, I'd ask this item also be placed on
Consent.

THE CHAIR:

And seeing no objection, so ordered. Senator Winfield. Oh, Mr. Clerk, I do apologize. We don't want to skip you.

CLERK:

Page 2 Calendar No. 29. House Joint Resolution No. 17, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE ROBYN STEWART JOHNSON OF GLASTONBURY TO BE A JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you. Before us is the honorable Robyn Stewart Johnson -- is Robyn Stewart Johnson. She is currently assigned to criminal matters at Hartford. She was first appointed in a year, 2013. She's a graduate of the Western New England Law School. She comes to us on a Favorable Report out of the Judiciary Committee and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Resolution? Will you remark further on the Resolution? Or if there --

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam --

THE CHAIR:

Yeah, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

If there is no objection, I'd ask this item be placed on Consent as well.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 2 Calendar No. 30 House Joint Resolution No. 18, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE JASON M. LOBO OF SUFFIELD TO BE A JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Madam President. Before us is Jason Michael Lobo who comes to us on a Favorable Report out of the Judiciary Committee. He's been assigned to the Juvenile Court in New Britain. He was first

appointed to the bench in 2013, since first reappointment. He is a graduate of the University of Connecticut Law School. He also holds a degree out of Dartmouth College. He finds himself here on a favorable vote and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Resolution? Good afternoon, Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I don't have a lot of judges in my district, but this gentleman is one of them. He has a great reputation. I'm happy to stand in strong support of his renomination. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the Resolution, Senator Winfield?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there is no objection, I'd ask this item be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 2 Calendar No. 31, House Joint Resolution No. 19, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE ANDREW W. RORABACK OF LITCHFIELD TO BE A JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Before us is Andrew W. Roraback who comes to us on a -- Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution. I got a little ahead of myself.

THE CHAIR:

Yes. And the question is indeed on adoption of the Resolution, will you remark further?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Madam President. Now, before us is the honorable Andrew W. Roraback first appointed in a year 2013. He currently is assigned to the Waterbury JD. He is a graduate of the University of Virginia Law School. He also has a degree from Yale College. The honorable Andrew W. Roraback who comes to us on a Favorable Report out of the Committee and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I'm sure many of us remember serving with former Senator Roraback. I can't believe it's already been eight years and he's getting renominated. That was a fast eight years. But he had an excellent, excellent reputation as a Senator. And to my understanding, he has continued with an excellent reputation as a juror. And so, with great affection, I stand in strong support of his renomination and wishing him very, very best. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further?
Senator Winfield. Oh, I do apologize. Senator
Looney. Good afternoon, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Speaking in support of the Resolution as our Chairman, Senator Winfield and Ranking Member, Senator Kissel pointed out, Andrew Roraback served with great distinction in this Chamber prior to his appointment to the bench in 2013. So, anyone who served here through 2012 had the benefit of being his colleague. He was an extraordinary legislator. He was someone who was thoughtful, pleasant, very respectful of the process. He was a wonderfully collegial Senator, very thoughtful in terms of public policy, excellent in floor debate in a way that was always enlightening and never mean spirited, but he was a scholarly legislator. He is a scholarly judge, and is truly one of the bright lights of the Superior Court in the State of Connecticut. So that, like Senator Kissel, I can't believe it's eight years already, that he's already gone through one full eight year term. He is somebody who truly is -- he comes from a distinguished family, both in politics and advocacy. The Roraback name for generations has been synonymous with public service in Connecticut and he carries on that distinction, carries on that credentialed with great distinction. He is someone that -- I think that the fact that he is young enough to serve many more years on the bench, is going to be a great resource and a great benefit to the State of Connecticut, for many years to come. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. There is no objection, I'd ask this item be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 2 Calendar No. 32, House Joint Resolution No. 20, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE HOPE C. SEELEY OF COVENTRY TO BE A JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption, will you remark further?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Yes. Thank you again, Madam President. Before us is the honorable Hope C. Seeley, she currently sits in the Tolland Judicial District. She was first appointed in 2013. She's a graduate of the University of Connecticut Law School. She also holds an undergraduate degree from the University of Connecticut. She comes to us on a Favorable Report out of the Judiciary Committee and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. And if there is no objection, I'd ask this item be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

And seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 2 Calendar No. 33 House Joint Resolution No. 21, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE CYNTHIA K. SWIENTON OF CHESTER TO BE A SENIOR JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption, will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Before us is the honorable Cynthia K. Swienton first appointed in July of 1997. She currently serves in the New London Judicial District. She is a graduate of the Western New England College. And she also comes to us with a

Favorable Report out of the Judiciary Committee and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Resolution, Senator Winfield?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I would ask that if there is no objection, this item be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 3, Calendar No. 34, House Joint Resolution No. 22, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE JAMES G. KENEFICK, JR. OF GUILFORD TO BE A STATE REFEREE.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption, will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Before us is the honorable James G. Kenefick Jr., he's currently

assigned to the Family Division. He was first appointed to the bench in 1997. He is a graduate of the University of Connecticut Law School. He also has his bachelor's degree from Trinity College. He has served us honorably, comes to us on a Favorable Report out of the Judiciary Committee. And I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Resolution? Good afternoon, Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Good afternoon. Madam President. My relationship with George Kenefick is through his son who worked for me as a police officer, who is a retired Lieutenant in the State Police. And I continue to hear stories about how amazing this man services through this past year when he hasn't gone into the court, he has continued to work at no charge to the state, collected no compensation. He has 15 grandchildren, and he still finds time to write opinions all weekend long. So, I like to support his nomination. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Needleman. Will you remark further on the Resolution that is before us? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. If there is no objection, I'd ask this item be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 3, Calendar No. 35, House Joint Resolution No. 23, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE SHEILA A. HUDDLESTON OF WEST HARTFORD TO BE A JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Before us is the honorable Sheila A. Huddleston, she was first appointed in 2013. She currently sits on a juvenile Madison in the New Britain Judicial District. She's a graduate of the Yale School of Law, and she's also a graduate of Yale College. She comes to us on a Favorable Report out of the Judiciary Committee. I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Resolution? Will you remark further, Senator Winfield?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I would ask that if there's no objection, this item be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

And seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 3, Calendar No. 36, House Joint Resolution No. 24, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE JON C. BLUE OF HAMDEN TO BE A STATE REFEREE.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption, will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, before us is the honorable Jon C. Blue, who was first appointed in 1989. He sits in a New Haven. Judicial District. He is a graduate of the Stanford School of Law and he has a bachelor's from Carleton College. He's a long time -- he served the state for a long time. He served honorably and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Resolution that is before us? Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Speaking in support of the Resolution. Madam President, I've known judge Blue for a long time. As Senator Winfield said, he'd been appointed going back to 1989. He served for many years as a handling major criminal trials in Part A in the New Haven Superior Court. He was someone who was also a legal historian of note. He has published articles about celebrated criminal cases in Connecticut's history, was always

extraordinarily scholarly in his approach to his job.

He was somebody who helped educate attorneys who appeared before him as well as I think as his colleagues on the judiciary in a very creative and inquiring mind. And we are very fortunate to continue to have his service as a State Referee because he has been a great resource to our judiciary for many years and fortunate to have him willing to continue. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. If there is no objection, I'd ask this item be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 3, Calendar No. 37, House Resolution No. 25,
RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE
HONORABLE KAREN A. GOODROW OF CHESTER TO BE A JUDGE
OF THE SUPERIOR COURT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption, will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Before us is the honorable Karen A. Goodrow. She's currently presiding a family judge in New Haven Judicial District. She was first appointed in 2013. She is a graduate of the Western New England School of Law. She also holds a bachelor's from Southern Connecticut State University. I will say that in my role down in House before I got to the Senate, she was very helpful in thinking about issues of post-conviction, a place where she is a specialist and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Resolution, Senator Winfield?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there is not objection, I'd ask this item be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing none, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 3, Calendar No. 38, House Joint Resolution No. 26, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE HENRY S. COHN OF WEST HARTFORD TO BE A STATE REFEREE.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption, will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Before us is the honorable Henry S. Cohn first appointed in 1997. He's currently assigned to a Tax and Administrative Appeals Docket. He has a good -- he's a graduate of the University of Connecticut School of Law. He's also a graduate, with his undergraduate degree from Johns Hopkins University. He served the state honorably for quite a while now. He comes to us on a Favorable Report out of the Judiciary Committee. And I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Resolution before us, Senator Winfield?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Madam President. And if there is not an objection, I'd ask this item to be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing none, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 4, Calendar No. 39, House Joint Resolution No. 27, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE

HONORABLE ANTHONY D. TRUGLIA, JR. OF STAMFORD TO BE
A JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, indeed. And I do think that is Anthony Truglia.

CLERK:

Truglia.

THE CHAIR:

Truglia, yes, indeed. Senator Winfield, will you
remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint
Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the
Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption, will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Certainly, Madam President. Before us is the
honorable Anthony D. Truglia Jr. He is currently
assigned to the Danbury Superior Court. He was first
appointed in 2013, a graduate of the University of
California, also a graduate of the University of
Virginia. He comes to us on a Favorable Report out
of the Judiciary Committee and I would urge
adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further, Senator
Kissel?

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just to point out that the Truglia family is very highly respected down in the Stamford area. And I've been here long enough to remember serving Christel Truglia and this particular juror has an extremely excellent reputation as well. [inaudible]. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further?
Good afternoon, Senator Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Thank you very much. Pleasure to see you all here again in this wonderful Chamber. A few questions through you, Madam President, Senator, regarding some issues that were brought up during the renomination of process, are you aware of some controversial issues that have been associated to this nominee, associated with his spouse?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

To the Senator, I'm not sure what he's referring to. I have a lot of files, as you may know, if you point something out, I will tell you if I know about it.

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

Most certainly.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

Thank you, Madam President. Are you familiar with a meeting that occurred in the Black and Puerto Rican Caucus, where members of our state's Attorney General's office, along with a former Commissioner for the State of Connecticut came and presented issues regarding Mr. Truglia's wife who was a Commissioner here in the State of Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you to Senator Bradley, I know that a meeting happened. I was not actually present at the meeting. So, I cannot talk about what happened at the meeting nor was I subsequently engaged about the meeting that happened, through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

If I may indulge the Senator in form of some of the facts that we were made aware of during that process, we were made aware that the Commissioner's spouse, who's a commissioner currently in the State of Connecticut deny a Workers' Comp Benefits on the basis of his immigration status here in the United States.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and through you to Senator Bradley, I do recall, now that you point out

the issue that I believe you during the hearing brought this up. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

And through that process, some colleagues took offense of the fact that I brought up issues concerning the judge's wife's conduct, as it pertains to her duties as a Commissioner here in the State of Connecticut. Do you recall that?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President, I do believe and correct me if I'm wrong that some colleagues took offense because they believe that you are relating to the work that the wife had done and not the person before us. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

And that type of commentary that I've brought up and that I'm bringing up here now, there's nothing new in the sun and politics. I think we can remember at times, not too long ago, statements that were made about our former First Lady, Michelle Obama. Is that correct? Do you -- are you aware of both similar commentaries being made about the First Lady?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. Not to be flipped, but I think I'd have to be under a rock, not to be aware of those things.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

Statements like, if the Madam President would indulge me, statements like how unbecoming it is that Chicago Tribune wrote when she did her first photo Op as a First Lady, how long becoming it is for First Lady to appear in public with a sleeveless dress. Are you familiar with a statement made like that about our former First Lady?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Unfortunately, I am aware of those.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

Statements like made by ABC News who said how unbecoming it is that the First Lady would appear in public wearing sneakers.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Again, yes, I am aware.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

And when President Barack Obama was running for the first time seeking the presidency of United States, there were statements associated with him that were made by a third person, his pastor, Reverend Wright at the time who made very controversial statements who said in public, not God bless America. And I'll quote him, "God damn America." And those statements that Reverend Wright said taken out of context were associated with President Barack Obama. Are you familiar with that controversy?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, intimately so.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

All those statements made in most times most recent. And we can go way back when, during the presidency of Andrew Jackson, when his wife and himself were married, and prior to that his wife was married to a third person and they associated the divorce of that spouse to President Andrew Jackson, as he sought the

presidency and said that his wife was his mistress and an unbecoming woman and unbecoming for her to be the First Lady. Are you familiar with some of those historical contexts of statements made about third persons or people's spouse?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. I wouldn't say I'm familiar with every instance, but yes, I'm certainly aware of some of those. And I know where that continues to go on. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

All those controversies, one thing they had in common, the spouses and those third persons. We're not seeking higher office. We're not charged as commissioners or judges or senators or presidents or anybody running or force or who are supposed to enforce the law of this state or any other state. In this particular case, we have a person who has been charged by this Senate, by this government, by this state as a Commissioner, to make sure that she upholds the law.

And we, as a legislator have said, if someone is undocumented in this country, it is not grounds to deny them of benefits, but this particular Commissioner said, "I don't care what the law says. I'm going to do what I feel is right. And I'm going to deny this person Workers' Compensation rights." Even though, the Attorney General's office has conceded. Even though a former Commissioner has said, "No, that's wrong," and is representing this

person. She said, "I don't care about any of those things. I'm going to do what I see fit. And I will deny this person the rights."

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I'm not sure there was a question embedded in it.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

I guess it wasn't really articulated as a question, more or less a statement. And this is where I take issue. This particular person is the spouse of the person that we see here today. And when given the opportunity to say, you know what, what my spouse did was wrong? You know what that analysis of the law is incorrect. I would not apply the similar analysis. You said to recuse, to correct, to back away from those statements, instead nothing was said of the sort and we're supposed to now as a Legislature, be blind to the fact that we have a husband and wife, both attorneys, both one judge, one Commissioner have gone through this political process, have risen to this political process where now they're in positions of not just honor and trust, but prestige. And we're supposed to say, "Well, what his wife did doesn't really matter. That has nothing to do with this judge. That has nothing to do with this circumstances." Is that the position we're being asked as Senators to take?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

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

CLERK:

Check, check, check.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to yield back to Senator Bradley.

THE CHAIR:

I'm sorry, Senator Duff. You'd like to yield to who? I didn't - I couldn't hear it.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I'm sorry. I'd like to yield to Senator Bradley, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Bradley. Do you accept the yield, sir?

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

Yes.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed. We are going to make sure that people can hear you Senator, just give us one minute. All right. Senator Bradley.

SENATOR BRADLEY (23RD):

Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate it. Thank you very much for your assistance. So, I say all of that just to give summations and say, I will not be voting for this judge to have his reconfirmation or reappointment to the Bench and I'll give the rest of my time. And I thank you the good Senator for indulging my questions and for the process. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Bradley. Will you remark further on the Resolution that is before us?

CLERK:

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Bradley's point noted, I'd ask that when this vote is taken it be taken by roll.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much. Will you remark further on the Resolution that is before us? Will you remark further? If not -- if not, we will ask that the Clerk call the roll, but before we do that, I do want to note that Senator Flexer will also be invoking the use of Senate Rule 24. And because we've been informed that pursuant to that Rule, she will be voting from outside the Chamber, and that she's present at the LOB or the State Capitol and will remain present for each vote cast. And now Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the roll and the machine will be opened.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Joint Resolution No. 27. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Joint Resolution No. 27. Immediate

roll call vote in the Senate on House Joint Resolution No. 27. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly -- Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted?

(Gavel)

Will the Chamber please come to order? I will ask again, if all the Senators in the Chamber have voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be closed. And the Chair will announce that I am in possession of written statements signed by Senator Anwar, who votes in the affirmative and by Senator Flexer who votes in the affirmative. So, if we could have those votes tallied. And Mr. Clerk, if you could announce the roll. And the Clerk does need to record the votes from outside the Chamber as indicated both Anwar and Flexer are in the affirmative. Yes. Please read the tally.

CLERK:

House Joint Resolution No. 27.

Total number voting	35
Those voting Yea	34
Those voting Nay	1
Absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

All right. So, Mr. Clerk, if you would reflect those votes on the tally and then we will lock the machine. All right. Mr. Clerk, could you please announce the tally now that we have it fully recorded.

CLERK:

House Joint Resolution No. 27.

Total number voting	35
Those voting Yea	34
Those voting Nay	1
Absent and not voting	0

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

And the Resolution is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 4, Calendar No. 40, House Joint Resolution No. 28, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE THOMAS G. MOUKAWSHER OF GROTON TO BE A JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption, will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Before us is the honorable Thomas G. Moukawsher. Was first placed on a bench in 2013. He is a graduate of the University of Connecticut Law School. He also has an undergraduate degree from the Citadel. He deals with

complex litigation in Hartford. He comes to us on a Favorable Report out of the Judiciary Committee, and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The question is on adoption, will you remark further on the Resolution that is before us? Will you remark further, Senator Winfield?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there is not objection, I'd ask this item be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

And seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 4, Calendar No. 41, House Joint Resolution No. 29, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE MICHAEL P. KAMP OF HAMDEN TO BE A JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption, will you remark further?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Before us is the honorable Michael P. Kamp, who was first placed on a bench in 2013. He is a graduate of the Emory University School of Law. He also holds an undergraduate degree from the Boston College. He currently serves in the Judicial District in New Haven. He deals with civil matters. He comes to us with a Favorable Report out of the Judiciary Committee, and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further on the Resolution? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there is no objection, I'd ask that this item be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

And seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 4, Calendar No. 42, House Joint Resolution No. 30, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE MICHAEL A. ALBIS OF EAST HAVEN TO BE A JUDGE OF THE SUPERIOR COURT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption, will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Before us is the honorable Michael A. Albis who was appointed in 2013. He's a graduate of the University of Connecticut School of Law. He also holds an undergraduate degree from Yale University. He's dealt with family matters. He's actually been helpful in many ways to some of us here in the General Assembly on those issues. He comes with a Favorable Report out of the Judiciary Committee, and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Resolution? Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It is with great pleasure that I speak in support of the Resolution for the reappointment of Judge Albis. Judge Albis served for many years as probate judge in the district of East Haven before being appointed to the Superior Court eight years ago. During that time, he was known as a very compassionate judge, someone who really knew the heart and soul of the New Haven community and was extraordinarily gifted with a great, great sense of human sensibility in dealing with the difficult family situations that arise in the probate court.

He was also very active in the New Haven Regional Children's Probate Court. During the years that he was as well as serving as a probate judge in East Haven and with his appointment to the Superior Court, again, the family court has become a specialty. He's also now the administrative judge

and the whole system for family has been, as Senator Winfield said, a key.

As an advisor, he's testified before the Judiciary Committee a number of times in terms of the policy of the Judicial Branch on areas related to family law and issues related to domestic violence and protective orders. He is someone who is wonderfully collaborative, thoughtful, and is, I think one of the leading lights currently serving in the Superior Court in the State of Connecticut. And we're very fortunate to have him in that capacity for years to come. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I too rise in support of this Resolution and I want to apologize to Madam President for speaking after Senator Looney, I promise not to make a habit of it. But I rise in support of the Resolution confirming Judge Albis, because he is a good man, and thorough who has been a real leader on the bench, both in his previous capacity as the probate court judge, and now we are very honored to have him serving and sitting in Middletown in his leadership on the family court matters. So, I rise in strong support of the Resolution and urge adoption. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I will only add that the Judge Albis has been instrumental in helping me to understand probate courts better. And for that reason, I stand in strong support of Judge Albis. But if there is no objection, I'd ask this item be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

And seeing no objection, Senator, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 4, Calendar No. 43, House Joint Resolution No. 31, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THE HONORABLE CHARLES T. LEE OF STAMFORD TO BE A STATE REFEREE.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption, will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. And before us is Charles T. Lee who was appointed in 2013, serves as a JGR in civil and civil matters in Stamford. He has a degree -- law -- he's graduated at Columbia Law School. He has a degree from Harvard, has an undergraduate degree as well. He comes to us on a Favorable Report out of the Judiciary Committee and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The question is on adoption, will you remark further on the Resolution that is before us? Will you remark further? If not, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. If there is not objection, I'd ask this item be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

And seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 5, Calendar No. 44, House Joint Resolution No. 37, RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF YOLANDA CASTILLO OF MANCHESTER TO BE A MEMBER OF THE BOARD OF PARDONS AND PAROLES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption, will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Before us is Yolanda Castillo who comes to us on a Favorable Report out of the Judiciary Committee. She has a graduate degree out of Southern Connecticut State

University. She also was a student at the Boston University. She has a lot of experience. Many of us in the building have worked with her on a lot of issues and she would be a welcome addition to the board and I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there is no objection, I'd this item also be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

And seeing no objection, so ordered. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, that concludes right now our executive and legislative nominations and our judicial nominations. And Madam President, I would like to now ask the Clerk to read the items on our Consent Calendar, followed by vote on Consent Calendar, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk, kindly read the items on the Calendar.

CLERK:

Consent Calendar No. 1, Page 1, Calendar 27, House
Joint Resolution No. 57. Page 1, Calendar 28, House
Joint Resolution No. 60. Page 2, Calendar 29, House
Joint Resolution 17. Page 2, Calendar 30, House
Joint Resolution 18. Page 2, Calendar 31, House
Joint Resolution 19. Page 2, Calendar 32, House
Joint Resolution 20. Page 2, Calendar 33, House

Joint Resolution 21. Page 3, Calendar 34, House
Joint Resolution 22. Page 3, Calendar 35, House
Joint Resolution 23. Page 3, Calendar 36, House
Joint Resolution 24. Page 3, Calendar 37, House
Joint Resolution 25. Page 3, Calendar 38, House
Joint Resolution 26. Page 4, Calendar 40, House
Joint Resolution 28. Page 4, Calendar 41, House
Joint Resolution 29. Page 4, Calendar 42, House
Joint Resolution 30. Page 4, Calendar 43, House
Joint Resolution 31. Page 5, Calendar 16, Senate
Joint Resolution 14. Page 5, Calendar 17, Senate
Joint Resolution 15. Page 5, Calendar 18, Senate
Joint Resolution 16. Page 5, Calendar 44, House
Joint Resolution 37. Page 6, Calendar 19, Senate
Joint Resolution 17. Page 6, Calendar 20, Senate
Joint Resolution 18. Page 6, Calendar 21, Senate
Joint Resolution 19. Page 6, Calendar 24, House
Joint Resolution 54. Page 6, Calendar 25, House
Joint Resolution 55. And Page 7, Calendar 26, House
Joint Resolution 56.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the roll and the machines will indeed be open.

CLERK:

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

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted in the Chamber? Have all the Senators in the Chamber voted? The machine will be closed. And do I do have, in my possession written statements, one from Senator Anwar in the affirmative voting on the Consent Calendar and also a statement from Senator Flexer voting in the affirmative. And with that, will the Clerk please

record the votes from outside the Chamber as indicated, and please announce the tally. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Consent Calendar No. 1

Total number voting	35
Those voting Yea	35
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

And the measure is adopted. And Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 8, Calendar No. 47 House Bill No. 6516, AN ACT MITIGATING ADVERSE TAX CONSEQUENCES RESULTING FROM EMPLOYEES WORKING REMOTELY DURING COVID-19, AND CONCERNING THE REMOVAL OF LIENS ON THE PROPERTY OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE BENEFICIARIES AND A THREE-TIERED GRANTS IN LIEU OF TAXES PROGRAM. There is an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Can we just stand at ease for a moment?

THE CHAIR:

And the Chamber will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, would please call Emergency Certified Bill House Bill 6516.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 8, Calendar No. 47 House Bill No. 6516, AN ACT MITIGATING ADVERSE TAX CONSEQUENCES RESULTING FROM EMPLOYEES WORKING REMOTELY DURING COVID-19, AND CONCERNING THE REMOVAL OF LIENS ON THE PROPERTY OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE BENEFICIARIES AND A THREE-TIERED GRANTS IN LIEU OF TAXES PROGRAM. There is an amendment.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good morning -- Good afternoon. Pardon me. Senator Fonfara, nice to see you this afternoon.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

It's great to see you, Madam President, and to be back in this hallowed building. Madam President, I move for acceptance of the Emergency Certified Bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on acceptance, will you remark further?

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Yes, Madam President, I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further?

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Madam President, this Emergency Certified Bill addresses three issues of great importance to Members of this Chamber of the House, the Governor, especially to many residents of the State of Connecticut would justify this Bill coming before us in this manner. The addresses -- Section 1 addresses mitigating adverse tax consequences resulting from employees working remotely during COVID-19. Specifically, the Bill addresses a timely issue facing thousands of Connecticut residents who are employed out of state.

While the action today seeks to remedy the COVID-19 related circumstance, a more fundamental question of the right of the state to tax of a state to tax income of non-residents who are working remotely may be ultimately addressed in a form other than this one. Connecticut law and rules regarding the taxation of income by residents and non-residents of Connecticut has been long established. However, COVID-19 has resulted in some neighboring states defining working from home or remotely as doing so for convenience.

And therefore, those residents are now subject to the states to that state's income tax despite a contrary interpretation by many of the affected workers. In the general recognition by most states that those workers are working from home, not for convenience, but of necessity and therefore should not be taxed by that state. In fact, many residents are prohibited by their out-of-state employer from working in their employer's offices. Despite these fundamental concerns, this Bill recognizes and addresses the conundrum facing many Connecticut residents who work out of state, the possibility of

being taxed by their state, their employer is located in and by their home state.

It is the position of our Governor and by this Body, I believe that despite our disagreement with this position, Connecticut will side with our residents and not subject them to tax by their state. The Bill provides that Connecticut resident taxpayers working out of state will be eligible for a credit against taxes paid to the state they are employed in during the 2020 tax year only. The credit will be available to residents working in a state that uses a convenience of the employer rule or working in the state that has required the residents to pay income tax to that state on income earned while working remotely during COVID 19.

Connecticut has joined in an Amicus Brief in support of the State of New Hampshire suit against our neighbor, mutual neighbor, Massachusetts and Massachusetts position that out-of-state workers are working from home for convenience during this past year, despite Massachusetts policy that has previously recognized workers are subject to their tax on income only during days, they physically worked in Massachusetts. The suit could have implications for how New York state has defined their convenience of the employer rule as well, even beyond COVID.

Sections 2 and through 4, Madam President addresses limiting public assistance recoveries of real property. Madam President, under current law, the state on behalf of certain state agencies is entitled to recover certain assets from recipients of public assistance. The state seeks to recover those assets by placing a lien on property or interest in property or windfalls acquired by a recipient of public assistance. The state's lien has priority currently over most other claims. From July 1 of this year, the state will be prohibited from recovering any assistance provided the recipient from liens on property and requires the state to

remove any liens previously placed on property provided such action is not required by federal law.

The Bill prohibits the State from recovering payments received by recipients from judgments in landlord tenant actions. The Chair of the Specific Committee of Cognizance will elaborate much more ably than I will. But my support of these Sections is rooted in the belief that if we're serious about addressing fundamental issues of poverty, including we must consider generational poverty, because too often, poverty is generational. As a society, we want to believe that all of us start from the same place. And if someone fails or falls behind is because they didn't work hard enough if only it were that simple.

If a fraction of the resource is expended on continuing generational poverty, we're invested in building generational wealth, many communities in this state, black and Latino communities in particular would be in a much different place. The change we are voting here today should be seen as a start and recognizing how some of our policies inadvertent as they may be, prevent individuals and communities from gaining economic power, which I believe is ultimately the great leveler.

Madam President, Sections 5 through 7, addresses the formula for the payment of lieu of taxes. The Bill establishes a proration formula for the distribution of the state's payment in lieu of taxes or PILOT funding for taxes at state property and taxes at college and hospital property that prioritizes a municipality's capacity to meet its basic service needs while not only, not the only factor causing a municipality to be poor or lack the resources to provide adequate services to its residents without a punishingly high mill rate tax exempt property, and heretofore unwillingness by state government to fully fund PILOT contributes greatly to the challenges, many cities and towns in Connecticut face.

Through the introduction of the equalized grant list, this initiative for the first time recognizes the ability or capacity in the distribution of funding for tax-exempt property and credit. Senator Looney, the Senate President pro tem for conceiving of a model that is obvious in retrospect, but that's not how we do things in this building. For the uninformed, it would be easy to conclude that our historical work product that all towns are created and remain equal.

But we know that's far from true and far from reality. This proposal organizes municipalities into three tiers. Tier one, with an equalized grant list per capita of less than \$100,000. Tier two, between 100,000 and 200,000. In tier three, above \$200,000. If the budget does not include full funding for PILOT eligible towns, the bill requires tier one towns to receive of their full PILOT, 50% of their full PILOT allotment and for tier two towns to receive 40% of their full PILOT allotment. And for tier three towns to receive 30% of their full PILOT allotment. Any modifications to the funding level short of full funding will be adjusted proportionally according to these percentages.

The Bill's formula is modified somewhat to include towns that lack capacity by different definitions than property wealth, or the amount of tax exempt property. These modifications serve to shine a brighter light on the fact that an increasing number of municipalities in this state are faced with the decision to fund critical programs or keep their tax rate competitive. It's unfair and the effect is not born solely by those municipalities, but by our state as a whole. We are diminished as a state and it will only get worse as more towns that believed they were immune from such challenges are finding they are not.

But this bill will only make good on Senator Looney's vision. If we have the will to not only

fund this initiative, but to create a source that will be sustained and not be whipsawed by so many efforts that have been like so many efforts that have been -- many of the -- maybe the fact that as designed several towns will do better or not see less will get us to where we want to be, but this initiative should not be about the determination of one man. It should not be about the issue as your, it should be about honoring our commitments and it should be about standing behind the words we say here today in support of this Bill.

Madam President, I urge passage of the Bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Will you remark? Will anybody remark on the Bill? Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you. Madam President. Madam President, as the Chair of Human Services, I solely totally support this Bill. I've worked in this firsthand people who have started out in the younger years to have to accept some public assistance to move along in life, to work hard, purchase a house, just to find out when they get to retirement to find out when they try to sell their house or try to get another mortgage on it, that there's a lien on their property.

This year, I've tried to look at everything that I'm involved in or moving forward or saying yes to look at it through a lens of equity. And if there's an opportunity to turn the ship around and go in a different direction and help people who have really worked hard in their lifetime to move forward to do so. Under the current law, the state generally has a claim against any kind of property or interest in property acquired by public assistance recipient or their parents. If the recipient was a child, these

claims have priority over other unsecured claims. Beginning July 1, 2021, the Bill prohibits the State from recovering cash and medical assistance from liens placed on real property unless required to do so by federal law.

In addition, the Bill requires the state to deem any certificate or lien previously filed on such properties released. If the recoveries of such assistance are not required under federal law, generally federal law requires recovery of certain Medicaid payments. The Bill, additionally prohibits the State from recovering payments for actions bought by current or former tenants or occupants against owners or lessors of residential premises or manufactured mobile home. Further the Bill prohibits the placing of liens on real property for cash assistance or Medicaid programs unless required by law.

The Bill also prohibits the Commissioner from placing these liens on real property to recover cash assistance or medical assistance unless required by federal law. The Bill also prohibits the state from applying liens on real property to enforce its claim beyond the amount required to recovered under federal law. The Bill additionally prohibits the state from recovering payments for actions brought by current or former tenants or occupants against owners or lessors of residential premises or manufactured mobile homes. This would take effect July 1st. 2021. It would affect anything that is pending and stop anything in the future. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Moore. Will you remark? Will you remark further? Senator Martin. Wait one minute, sir. You should be -- Try now, sir.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Next, here we go. Thank you. Good afternoon, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon, sir. Please proceed.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you. There are some good aspects of this Bill that I do like. In particular, the second portion or second Section of this, I believe that we had some legislation. Oh, I think it was in banking couple years back that tried to address this issue. And it was unsuccessful at that time. But I'm glad that it's being addressed today. I think it'll go a long way regarding curing some of the, I guess, some of the things that prohibit or restrict many of our citizens from moving forward. I do have a couple of questions regarding the Sec, the first part of this, Bill regarding the --

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara, prepare yourself please. Go ahead, sir.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Regarding the employees working remotely. I just want to clarify some things. This is for one year, a one-year period. Is that correct, Madam Chair?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Martin. Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Through you Madam President, that is correct. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you. And I know we had some discussion in our caucus regarding those that were working in state and working out of state and the tax credit that we're going to be providing through this piece of legislation and then those in other states who are traveling to Connecticut, and I'm assuming that we tax them. And I guess I want to have some clarity how we handling those individuals that are living in Massachusetts, Rhode Island surrounding states, but traveling to Connecticut. Are they still going to be paying our taxes? Through you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Martin. Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Through you, Madam President. While there has not been official guidance made public by the Department of Revenue Services, there has been -- there is online some information that does support the position that for states that apply the convenience of the employer test as New York does, that Connecticut will apply the same rule. It's my hope that that will extend to Massachusetts as well, as well as any other state. There's not a convenience of the employer rule in Massachusetts. But I think it would only be fair that we treat Massachusetts residents working in Connecticut in the same manner that that state is treating our residents. And that is to tax them according to our income tax structure. I'm not the Commissioner of DRS. They haven't opined on this officially, but it is my hope and my expectation that they will be doing that. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

So this Bill will basically allow the convenience of the employer rule to apply for Connecticut residents, where if they are taxed in New York, Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey, or any out of state that we are going to provide them a credit. But I didn't quite hear whether or not those that are working outside our state unless you have this convenience of employer rule established -- In New York, it sounds like they do, but we're not sure. Well, it sounds like Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New Jersey do not. And I guess my question is are we going to be taxing those employees who live outside the state, will we be taxing them?

THE CHAIR:

Is that the question, Senator Martin?

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Yes.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Sorry.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Through you Madam President. Again, the only information I have in writing that is available to anyone on the DRS website is that Connecticut again, while it's not guidance, it is in writing and it's

on their website that indicates that for states that apply the convenience of employer test, we will apply the same rule or the same test. However, I don't see anything with respect to the scenario you identified, where Massachusetts or other States that don't have the convenience of the employer test, what will be used there? I'd like to believe that that DRS, I hope they will issue guidance soon. I don't know why they haven't, that will indicate the intention of our tax department regarding out of state residents working in Connecticut and working remotely. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, I asked a question earlier. I know it's same kind of, why are you asking that question? How many years -- does this only apply for one year? But I know, well, it seems like that many of the employers are going to be making business decisions to perhaps continue the remote working. And I don't see that this Bill addresses this issue that we're trying to rectify today going forward, because I think it's probably realistic that that's going to be a happen. Maybe if you could speak to that a little bit. Thank you, Madam Chair, through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin. Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Through you, Madam President. Senator Martin, I couldn't agree more with you that we're already into the third, the first quarter of the year, not likely we're seeing an appreciable change in behavior, at least for the next three months. So that will be

half a year into '21. Is it possible, maybe the likely we'll be back here doing this again for the 2021 tax year, I would say yes to protect now.

We don't know what the Supreme Court will decide, whether they decide to hear the case that New Hampshire has brought that's the first step. And then if they do decide to hear it, how they ultimately rule, is it possible that they could strike down what Massachusetts has done and therefore New York. It's possible.

There are some who feel that this case has a better chance of prevailing than some others in the past or most recently with, I believe Arizona in California. But it's anyone's guess at this point, but your supposition is I think, accurate that, while the Bill focuses on 2020, it may be that we'll be faced with the issue again in 2020 or 2021. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, I totally agree. I'd like to go on to the last Section of this Bill regarding the grants in lieu of the PILOT program. The current method that we are doing or taxing to the PILOT is a percentage of real estate property. And then the new method that's being proposed here is based on the equalization net grant lists. I see that within the Bill, there are a couple of, I guess, entities or municipalities that are going to -- they're going to be at a hundred percent.

I guess the taxes that would be applicable are going to be based on a hundred percent, such as a correctional facility, a portion of a building also that's used by the UConn Medical Center is also, and there are some that -- there's a portion of the Bill that has a municipality that has greater than 50% of

his property owned by the state will also be compensated accordingly. Could you just speak to that a little bit as to, I guess what I'm looking at here is we've got a pie of money coming into this, I guess, is going to be a MERSA Account. And these distributions of these funds based on these percentages, the hundred percent of the correctional institutions and municipalities will be getting its taxes from. Could you just explain that a little bit more?

THE CHAIR:

Is that your question, Senator?

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Yes, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin. Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Through you, Madam President, that is current law.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

So regarding the -- we currently have a PILOT account and it sounds like we're going to be not using the PILOT account anymore and we're going to be placing all the funds into a Mercer, to the current Mercer Account. The funds that are going to supply the Mercer Account, is that going to be a line item from the Appropriations Committee and/or the budget that we're going to be submitting, approving, or adopting, through you Madam Chair. All the above.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin. Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Through you, Madam President, as the good Senator knows I don't have a crystal ball and the intent is that we will identify funding for this initiative, but that has not been decided, not how much and not what the manner will be. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

So the Bill, as I understand it is we are going to be holding them harmless, I guess. So, we're going to make sure that we're making each of the municipalities whole to its current amount that they are being allocated this year. And I believe that was \$158 million. So, are we guaranteeing for this current budget year? I'm going to say the budget that we're working on. Are we guaranteeing the municipalities a minimum of \$158 million? Through you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Martin. Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Through you, Madam President. While the Bill certainly does state that no one will be harmed by this language, there's one word that seems to sneak in from time to time in legislation, that word of notwithstanding that is always available. I'm not suggesting that it will be the case. I'm optimistic

that we will find the resources necessary, but that's for another day. This is the language before us establishes the policy, the process moving forward, we'll establish the funding. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

I see the tier one, tier two, tier three based on the equalization of the grant lists. We have so many municipalities that will be in tier one. I think it identifies 10 municipalities. And then the next 25 will be in tier two. And the remaining the communities will be in tier three. I have a question regarding Alliance Districts 'cause it's in here. It's stating that if you are an Alliance District then you will be in tier one. It's my understanding there might be a couple of tier Alliance communities that are in tier two, that with this language would be actually in tier one. So, I guess if you have -- you're stating 10 in this document before us, and if there are a couple of tier twos, municipalities in tier two that are Alliance Districts, will they be moved to tier one, thus increasing that tier one from 10 to 12 municipalities? Through you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Martin. Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Through you, Madam President. I believe the gentleman is correct that Alliance Districts will be placed in tier one and that will be because there are some Alliance District towns that are not -- do not have an equalizer net grant list per capita amount of less than a hundred thousand that would qualify

them to be in tier one. And I don't have the list in front of me. I thought I did, but I believe the gentleman is correct and therefore, it would be an expansion of tier one. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Fonfara. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Another portion of the Bill has an allocation to the town or the city of Bridgeport specifically. Is it -- What I've read here, it's \$15 million. Is that correct? Or is that a different amount? 'Cause I've heard another number, but my document says 15 million. And regardless of if it's five or 15, why was there an allocation specifically for Bridgeport and no other community? Through you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Martin. Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Through you, Madam President. As I indicated in my opening remarks the adjustments that take into consideration other matters, other issues, other identifiers are definitions of poverty or wealth or the lack thereof. This process only illuminates, A. That there are many ways that a municipality is unable to meet its basic needs. The prime mover of this language has identified one of those. One that as we can see by the list, every town in Connecticut gets PILOT, every town, no matter what your wealth, no matter what your ability to meet your basic service needs and then some -- and I'm happy that we live in a state, that there are a number of towns that can meet much more than their basic needs, far

beyond the imagination of the town that I happen to live in, one more situation situated in today.

But there are many towns sadly, increasing number of towns that can't meet their basic needs. The PILOT, or the lack of taxable property in some of those communities, many communities is a significant issue, but there are other factors that caused the town not to be able to meet his basic service needs. Some of those adjustments that you're talking about, Senator Martin, take that into consideration. Could we have a discussion about? There are many other ways in which towns aren't able to meet their basic service needs? Could we have a discussion about the various ways in which we could address those? I'd have that discussion with you. We'll have it offline.

I know we will in the committee, we'll have it in public, in the committee. I'm certain of that this year. This bill recognizes one aspect of it, a very important aspect of it to many, many cities and towns in our state, and also recognizes that some communities there has to be adjustments to this particular formula to bring them into it and have them be able to receive funding, very needed funding through this particular measure. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Fonfara. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. It just seems to me that the purpose -- well, first of all, PILOT Is we're trying to fix PILOT, making sure that the municipalities are made whole, but because of our inefficiencies in managing our funds for the past decade, we've always seen to be falling short of having enough revenue to meet our obligations.

So here we are today trying to fix PILOT because of that. And we're coming up with a different methodology to address how to make our communities whole through with a portion of it, anyway, with PILOT or addressing PILOT. And we're using the methodology of a equalization grant list, which is, seems fair when you look at it. But yet here we are carving out a specific amount for a community that is part of that formula. I don't quite understand that.

So nonetheless, I'm going to move on Madam Chair. There's a -- I think most of my questions have been met here. And I will thank the good Senator for answering my question. Thank you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Martin. Will you remark? Will you remark further? Senator Slap.

SENATOR SLAP (5TH):

Thank you, Madam Chair. Good afternoon. Good to see you up there.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR SLAP (5TH): I want to speak in favor of the Bill and in one part of the Bill in particular and that's concerning the repeal of welfare liens. I've heard from many, many of my constituents talking about how current law we're one of only 30 States, or one of only two, I should say, one of only two states in the country to still have these welfare liens is very unfair.

In 30 states, over the past few decades have repealed similar laws and we have not. So I've been thinking a lot about fairness and you know,

according to the dictionary, Webster's dictionary defines welfare as government assistance for those in need, those with low income or no income. And in Connecticut, that may be true for people who are poor and the rules are different. So, for people in Connecticut who are poor, they have to pay that back. And if they don't, they could have a lien placed on their home. But for a different kind of welfare, many people call it corporate welfare, corporations, large hedge funds, et cetera. They don't have to be in need. They just have to have leverage, perceived leverage and they don't necessarily have to pay the government assistance back.

If we look at the first five program, which we all know about. One report cites the cost at \$566 million for about 4,600 jobs for about \$124,000 per job. A recent state auditor's report shows that sometimes the rules were followed. Sometimes the rules were changed. Sometimes the companies pay the money back. Sometimes they didn't.

And Connecticut, of course, is not the only level of government here that is engages in this kind of corporate welfare. If you look nationally and again, we're talking about fairness, the airline industry just got a \$50 billion bailout, 25 billion in grants that they never have to pay back. Wow. The top five airlines have spent, I believe the number is 96% of their recent like free cash as they call it buying stocks back.

Now, of course, it's not confined just to the airline industry. I'll give you one more example, Amazon. In 2018, they had \$11 billion in income and paid nothing in federal taxes. In fact, they got a refund about \$120 million. Last or 2019, I should say they did pay federal taxes. And I believe the rate is 1.2%. I don't think anybody in this room paid 1.2% rate their federal taxes.

So, we're talking about fairness and we're talking about government assistance, at least that's how I look at it. Now, the irony is not lost on me that later this afternoon, we're going to be voting on another Bill of the data center bill where we talking about government assistance and for, in this case company corporation, new industry. And I am not standing here saying in all cases, it's wrong to do that. But what I am saying is that there should be some level of fairness and to not apply that for folks who have shown an incredible amount of determination and resilience is cruel. It's unfair. And I believe it needs to change. And I wonder why we haven't changed. It's not about the money. I don't believe it is.

Maybe Connecticut has been trying to teach these folks some kind of lesson about responsibility, but I would argue that, you know, they could teach us a lesson about again, resilience and about, you know, their determination and their now economic independence.

This, I know this Bill is not a comprehensive Bill about Connecticut's tax structure and fairness. That I hope will come later. But this is a start to right a wrong and to be one of the last few states to finally repeal this piece of legislation that just exists and finally get rid of the welfare lien. So, for that reason and others I'll be supporting the Bill. Thank you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Slap. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Senator Haskell, and we will give you a moment to get set up at a microphone. Senator Haskell whenever you're ready, sir.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. It's good to see you and great to be back in this Chamber with all of my colleagues. I rise in support of this Bill. I think that it's wonderful. We're adding a tier to the PILOT formula. I think that there are many wonderful provisions in this Bill, but I did just want to speak very briefly, Madam President, about the issue concerning the taxes paid by Connecticut commuters.

You know, starting at a very young age, we tell students in Connecticut to stand up to bullies. We tell them to hold their peers accountable, to stand up for themselves. And most importantly, we teach them to stand up for others. So today we're talking about where commuters should pay their income taxes. That sounds a little bit dry, but it's important, nonetheless. You know, personally, I understand why commuters who live in Connecticut, but work in New York, pay their income taxes into New York. It's just common sense that Connecticut gives them a credit for those taxes because surely, nobody should be subjected to double taxation. But let's be crystal clear about what this means for our community. Specifically, for the community that I represent. I represent a lot of commuters. They vote here, they drive on Connecticut roads. They send their kids to Connecticut schools. They breathe the clean air and the clean water that we fight in this chamber to protect. And in recent months, they've benefited from a lot of Connecticut services to keep them healthy. They've probably been tested for COVID-19 in the State of Connecticut. They might've worn a mask that was procured by our State Department of Public Health. Those on the older side may have even been vaccinated in Connecticut. Hopefully more soon we will be vaccinated in the State of Connecticut against this deadly and dangerous virus.

Some perhaps are preparing to apply to the Connecticut Department of Housing for rental assistance. And these commuters have not benefited

from New York services. Over the last year, many of them, Madam President, haven't even stepped foot into the state of New York in about a year. And as critically important, they don't have any representation in the New York Legislature, their voices in government. They sit here in Hartford, not in Albany. I think once upon a time we fought a war over the notion that taxation without representation was fundamentally wrong.

So, I rise today to say that I'm supporting this Bill because I don't want my constituents to be subjected to double taxation, but I'm not patting myself on the back as I press that green button. No. Instead, I want to use this as an opportunity to use my platform in the state Senate to call out New York and to call out Massachusetts for what I truly believe to be an outrageous interpretation of the convenience clause. This is an opportunity and in fact, I think we have an obligation to stand up to bullies, whether they be in New York or in Massachusetts. This isn't an abstract fight.

It's a chance, a rare chance to give our constituents a tax break because our income tax levels of course are lower than our neighbors in New York. We don't talk about that enough. And while giving our constituents a tax break, it's an opportunity to bring a lot of money into the State of Connecticut over \$400 million money that I know would it be put to good use to keep our community healthy.

So my hope is that in the pending Supreme court case, for which Connecticut is filed an amicus brief Connecticut, I'm sorry, Massachusetts, versus the State of New Hampshire. I hope that the Supreme Court rules in the favor of states like Connecticut or states like New Hampshire or states like New Jersey. I hope that they do not instead stand with bullies who are, unfortunately, I think unfairly claiming the income tax dollars of our constituents. So, I look forward to voting for this Bill, but more

importantly and more substantively, I look forward to the Supreme Court resolving this matter, hopefully in Connecticut's favor. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell. Will you remark further? And I do believe that Senator Hwang is our next speaker. Good afternoon, Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Good afternoon, Madam Speaker. Thank you very, very much. It's great to be back in the building. I want to extend my appreciation to the good Chairman of the Finance, Revenue and Bonding. And I rise in support of specific sections of this Bill, but I also have some concerns about the process. Firstly, the idea of raising the combination of three very important concepts into one Bill. All three concepts are very well-intentioned and it was a surprise that these concepts were presented today under the concept of emergency certification. That's why we're here today. And perhaps we could talk a little bit about that. First, Section 1, which is the tax and remote work during COVID-19. I think it's been said before. It is for the convenience of the work that is being done in outside states by Connecticut residents.

For me, I support this Bill heavily upon that section of this Bill, particularly in the sense of a fairness argument. We did have very, very extensive public hearing on this issue in the finance committee. And I appreciate the liberation, but I also am extremely concerned that it has not been through the various other committees of cognizance. You will see a common theme in my conversation today is the fact that many of these concepts well-intentioned and very, very important has elaborated earlier, have not gone through the deliberation process of committees of cognizance.

And here we are in this circle today, voting on them. It really fits the concept of putting the cart before the horse. We are way ahead of ourselves without having complete and total input on these important concepts.

Again, we talked about under section one for the convenience rule. There is a potential Supreme Court litigation that may significantly impact how this Bill's conclusion will end up. There is consideration and conversations right now between various states in which we are engaged in this type of interpretation.

Again, why are we putting the cart before the horse. Number two, Section 2 and 4 talks about the public assistance recovery of real property. I want to extend my appreciation to the Chair of Human Services, who I know is a passionate and articulate advocate on behalf of those areas of issue. But I, through you, Madam Speaker, I wanted to ask a good Chair of Human Services, did this Bill have a public hearing in the Human Services Committee? Through you, Madam Speaker.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Madam President, I apologize.

THE CHAIR:

That's okay. I don't think Nancy Pelosi is concerned about me today. Senator Moore, please answer the question.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Through you Madam, through you Madam President. Yes, it did.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. Thank you to good Chair of Human Services. Given the fiscal aspect of it, do you think under normal circumstances, it would have required going to the Appropriations Committee because there are fiscal notes to that. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

No, I don't, through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. Thank you for that answer. I believe in true deliberate, a process in which this building should work to the benefit of all the residents of this state. That transparency and due process should be respected and engaged in. I do believe under normal circumstances, these types of Bills would go through the appropriate parties or committees of cognizance.

That being said, I think, again, this Bill and its significance alone should have married at a standalone vote on this concept. Moving on to sections, the third section of this Bill, what we call the tri headed bill. And it's an important issue of PILOTs. Pilot is an important concept that

supports our communities that have schools, municipal buildings and non-taxable properties. It's a very important concept. And as the Chair of Finance, eloquently stated it is one about fairness. And I do believe that we need to move toward that to balance out those communities in need to break out the cycles of poverty to give them an opportunity to succeed.

But again, the process wasn't there. The fact that we did not have this meeting in the Appropriations Committee to discuss the fiscal point. As the Chair eloquently decided earlier and I hope not talking out of term was the fact that we will get to it and the non-withstanding language that we use so often than this legislative body, the reality is that this could have been done much better, much more extensive, much more transparent in its process. So I rise as I do in supporting this Bill, but I do raise the concern about transparency, about due process, about having all the shareholders having their voices be heard. But I also take the concept that we're not going to throw out the baby with the bath water. That one potentially great concept would be defeated by other concepts equally important, but not fully vetted.

So, I stand with some reluctance in supporting this Bill, but I believe I want to, and I believe that we should, because it'll benefit a fairness issue for those that worked out of this state. And I do believe Sections 2 and 3 that I cited are equally important for us to evaluate in this body. But I wish we had more time to deliberate under this, that there was no need for these bills to be deliberated under emergency certification. Thank you, Madam {resident. I appreciate the opportunity.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the legislation that is before us? Good afternoon, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Madam President, I have a couple of questions if I might, through you to the Chairman of the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed. Senator Fonfara, prepare yourself.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, Section No. 1 of the Bill. I was listening intently to the back and forth between the Ranking Member and yourself. And I wanted to be sure to the extent, I guess, you are sure we've got a fiscal note that I think makes a representation of what the revenue might be for individuals that currently work in New York and, but for us providing this credit, they would have to pay not only to Connecticut, but theoretically, some other number to the State of New York. Am I correct, through you?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Through you, through you Madam President. Yes, as the complicated the York Convenience of the Employer Rule, which I struggle to understand much less agree with, has been in place prior to COVID, makes it very, very difficult for a Connecticut resident working in New York to ever be able to claim an exemption from their tax, to ever be able to, in essence, ever to be able to claim that they are working home by necessity. And so, that notwithstanding you were right, that if Connecticut were able to and should be able to recognize those workers for working remotely or from home now in

Connecticut, the most of those I assume are working exclusively from home now. As I said, in my opening remarks, there are many employers who are prohibiting their employees from doing so from working onsite.

My daughter who lives in New York, works in New York is not able to go to, she has nowhere to go. She's not able, now she's not, does not fall under this situation, but to shed some light personal experience on this issue by so many Connecticut residents who work in New York, they're unable. Even if they want it to go to their workplace in New York state. And so the potential revenue opportunity is significant for Connecticut that we're forgoing because of the interpretation by New York, which again, extends beyond COVID. Although this brings even more attention to it because of the restriction and the prohibition by employers. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Earlier gentlemen spoke about standing up to bullies, I would hardly categorize this Bill is one that stands up to bullies. This is a Bill that takes taxpayers' money from Connecticut, continues to send it to New York, even though our constituents didn't go to New York and we are in my mind actually rewarding the bully.

If we really want to take on the bully, we would have jointly signed a letter to the attorney general and said, Get in the game, get in the game. represent the State of Connecticut. Take the bully on. Let's stand up to the State of New York that is not entitled to this revenue at least from the point in which the Convenient Rule occurred and said, you can work from home.

But that's not what we're doing here. What we're doing here under the guise of an emergency is we've developed a train. That's what we got. We got a train. We don't have one section of a Bill that deals with a significant tax problem on the 15th of April. It's not an emergency today. It's an emergency on the 15th of April.

The gentleman used the word notwithstanding. I think he and I have been around here about as long as each other. And that is a word that shows up almost at the most inconvenient times, because he also said honoring our commitments, you know, what are we honoring? What are we honoring in this Bill? We're honoring an obligation to defend our Connecticut residents, I guess. Is there anything in this Bill, Madam President that obligates Connecticut taxpayers to pay the State of Connecticut if the court decides in their favor or as a credit to credit, and for the year in which we're offering the credit, is it theirs? Are the people that earn on average about \$400,000 a year are going to be tax-free both to the State of New York and the State of Connecticut should they prevail on that decision? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Through you, Madam President. Regarding the first point or part of your question, I agree that the language could be stronger with respect to the challenge we have. Our Attorney General has joined the amicus brief in support, which I believe would address New York as well if the court, A, were to hear the case and be fined in favor of New Hampshire. So in that regard, and I've read the brief and this is with respect to New Jersey and in other states as well, who have joined on this.

With respect to your second point, I've thought about this. I don't know the answer of how that would come down with respect to revenue, would we ever recover this lost revenue? My inquiry has not led to greatly informing me in that regard. I'll just say that I don't know that we're done or do we have to be done with respect to this? This certainly addresses the immediacy of the issue that people are facing from April 15th. Does that mean we can't address some of the issues not covered here in the remainder of the session? No and I'm not adverse to that. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I thank the gentlemen for his answer, Madam President, back to the issue of emergency. There is an emergency in the State of Connecticut. The emergency currently in front of the State of Connecticut COVID aside is that the Governor has put forth a budget, that's not balanced. It's not balanced. The Governor appropriates \$1.7 billion over two years, that comes out of the rainy day fund or out of some gift from the federal government. That's not yet identified. So, we don't have a balanced budget. There is not a balanced budget in front of the Finance Committee. There's not a balanced budget against the Appropriations Committee. So, when every section of this Bill, when we make these decisions, we make them against the backdrop of a hole, a significant hole, not a little hole, not in the little hole that you cover with a word like a lapse, maybe 50 million, maybe a hundred million, it's \$1.7 billion.

The budget depends on 400 additional million dollars to balance ECS, \$400 million to balance ECS over and above the 1.7 billion. Governor has got some revenue

ideas, conveyance tax, fuel tax, mileage tax, marijuana tax, all of which you're currently expended. They're part of the budget. That's the emergency. If we had an Emergency Certified Bill, we'd be talking about the total budget, not about these ideas and they have merit.

Section 2 of the Bill talks about us forgiving the debt that we assigned to people when they needed us most. I think that number is somewhere between 13 million and \$18 million depend on who you talk to. I don't personally have a problem with that. Against the backdrop of everything else, we should be having that conversation against the backdrop of everything else, not on its own. It's not right to have it on its own, especially when the budget is not balanced.

I don't have a problem for given that debt. I couldn't imagine trying to sit across the table at a bank and refinance a house with a lien when you know, just the savings in the interest rate would help you get farther in life. Sign me up in the list that has no problem with doing away with that, but you can't do it this way.

It's become part of the train. There is no emergency with any one of these things today. It's just something that got going. So, I think we all should have a lot of questions about what the implications of Section 1 are. I don't want people being doubly taxed. But in a Chamber where I've heard people talk about taking on bullies year after year after year, the biggest bully in new England and I guess new York's not technically part of new England is in New York and it should be taken on.

I worry about the people from my district that actually commuted into the heart of New York when COVID was at its worst hour by hour, day by day, and really, really took a risk with their life. Those people worked every day and know they ought to pay a tax

Madam President, for whatever reason Section 3 is before us and I do believe the gentlemen that the introducer has a sincere interest in trying to make certain parts of Connecticut more affordable, more financially manageable. I understand the purpose for which this Bill is before us.

But once again, Madam President, Section 3 is before us under the backdrop of a non-balanced budget. And certainly, certainly with no revenue to pay for it, why this additional potential obligation didn't go to the Appropriations Committee is beyond me. That's the least of the emergencies in this Bill. We could have a conversation about PILOT payment. We can have a conversation about PILOT payment, along with personal needs allowance. We can have a conversation about PILOT payment over more money for mental health. We can have a conversation about the PILOT payment about you name it, but in fairness to the people that serve on that committee, we're not having it.

Not only are we not having it, we're tying their hands with this Bill and we're tying the hands at least to the tune of \$5 million, this was discussed here already. Why? Because no matter what, when this Bill becomes law, City of Bridgeport gets 5 million. That's what it says.

Madam President, as I said earlier, I think we should step away from those lien obligations. I'd be happy to vote on a Bill that does that. I think we've got some time to take care of Section 1. I'm not convinced it's an emergency. I suspect people that are sitting at home watching this, they'd say, if you had to pay double taxes, you'd call it an emergency. And I get -- I get that point, but there are a lot of things that can happen in the unknowns in Section 1, I think are problematic.

But Section 3 to my mind, Madam President are pretty clear cut. Unfortunately, I don't think this really is about how we honor commitments. Unfortunately,

unless this budget ends up with another a hundred plus million dollars, we can't hold people harmless, not under the new formula. It obligates us to raise a tax or cut another expenditure. And for that reason, I think this should be part of a conversation in the Appropriations Committee. I think it should be something that we deliberate beyond today. And for that reason, Madam President, the Clerk has an Amendment LCO 4289. I would ask him to call the amendment and I'd be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 4289, Senate Schedule A.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. What the Amendment does is it strikes Sections 5 through 8 and renumbers the internal references accordingly. I am absolutely committed to have a conversation about PILOT. Absolutely. Tell me where, when, what day as an individual issue, let's have that conversation. Let's talk about how we're going to fund it. Let's be honest. Let's be intellectually honest about how we're going to fund that idea.

Maybe it should be a tax on things that we don't currently tax. You folks think you're the only ones to get letters from constituents saying, why aren't we taxing this? Or why aren't we taxing that. I'll have that conversation. I'll participate in that deliberation. You might be surprised at my answer. I do honestly understand the dilemma that larger

community seem to find themselves in. I might have a lot of reasons for why they're there. You may not agree with me. Well, we can have that conversation.

So Madam President, I move the Amendment. I ask that when the vote be taken to be taken by roll call.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Senator Fonfara, will you remark further?

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in opposition to the Amendment. Madam President, the good Senator Miner has indicated the amount of time that we have spent together in both chambers. And I have not only great admiration, but fond memories of our years together. And I enjoy listening to him and his articulation, always have, today no exception, but as is true for every one of us. What is a priority for me may not be for you? What may be important to you may not be for me. And that is so true given the various places that we come from to get here. But there's another reality that's before us. And that is the unknown, the unknown just like one year ago, almost one year ago that we were moving along in session and then it came to a screeching halt, almost exactly one year ago, never entered the building again, except for a special session.

Something we thought was going to be a two week hiatus turned into a year and things really haven't changed. And we have the specter of variants of COVID. We don't know in a week from now, a month from now, two months from now, what the status of that will be and what our behaviors will be then in our ability to even come into this building.

So, in that regard, Emergency Certified Bill doesn't look so out of order, and this opportunity addresses again, maybe not a priority of everyone in this

chamber. I think the vote today will reflect that, but it is a priority of the Governor, it is a priority of a number of legislators. Some parts may be in Section 1. I think if truth be told that a good number of folks in this Chamber want to see Section 1. But again, that goes to how different our priorities may be. Some communities, Section 3 is critical, absolutely critical. Long overdue, never mind, is it not too early? It's too late. So for those reasons, Madam President, I urge that the Chamber defeat the amendment and allow us to move forward with this Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Will you remark further on the amendment that is before the Chamber. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of the Amendment and I rise in support of the Amendment really for one reason. And one reason only with all due respect to what I've heard around the circle today, these are three different Bills today. And in my view should have been treated three different ways.

I am in support of some, but I think they need to either stand or fail on their own merits. And I think that this Amendment begins that process. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly open, call the roll and I will open the machine for a vote on the Amendment.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on LCO 4289. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on LCO 4289. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on LCO No. 4289. Immediate roll call vote in the senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? We will close the vote and I will announce that Senator Flexer has voted in the negative and Senator Anwar has voted in the negative. And did Mr. Clerk, if you could kindly call the tally please.

CLERK:

LCO No. 4289

Total number voting	35
Those voting Yea	12
Those voting Nay	23
Absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

And the amendment fails. Will you remark further on the Bill that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further? Senator Osten?

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And I rise to talk about the underlying Bill, but I would first like to say that I thought that Senator Miner in his conversations about the Bill at hand today, talked about a few things and one, there is no promise here today to fund PILOT with the dollars necessary to complete this in its entirety.

What this is, is a policy change on PILOT to make sure that the poorest communities among us are

receiving the dollars that should be transferred out from state funds rather than giving our richer communities, unneeded state revenue. But my real concern on the Bill that's before us today has nothing to do with the policy on PILOT, which I think makes complete sense. It has nothing to do with the policies on liens, which I also think makes complete sense.

But it does have to do with what is being referred to as double taxation. And this part of the Bill deals with an issue revolving around people who generally worked on the western end of the state, who usually during their day-to-day work life worked in New York. And as a result of the COVID-19 experience, we have seen those folks work most of their time in Connecticut. And to be clear, Senator Fonfara can rest assured. I have no questions for him today on this Bill. He can relax, but I am deeply concerned about the fact that we are looking to give a tax break to those amongst the residents of the state of Connecticut who don't need it. Sure. They'd have to pay what they refer to as double taxation, perhaps they themselves could join the lawsuit that is in New Hampshire. Perhaps our Attorney General can initiate a lawsuit here in Connecticut in their name, but we're not doing it that way. We're absolving them of a taxation that they can well afford. Later on, today, we will talk about another area where we will allow a business to pay no taxes for some 30 years. Yet in the neck of the woods that I live in eastern Connecticut, where people make nowhere near what the people on the western side make on this double taxation. They pay their taxes every year and no one's ever put a bill forward for them not to pay taxes. And when we're looking at a hundred percent increase in unemployment, I have not seen this administration come forward with a Bill that would protect the jobs in Eastern Connecticut or the residents in Eastern Connecticut.

I, again, state that we need to start looking at these things comprehensively and not just for the people on the other side of the state. And there will be people here that disagree with what I say, but I can tell you that my neck of the woods feels that they are being completely disregarded in 2008 through 2015. We were the ninth, worst labor market in the country, in the New London area. We scratched our way out of that. We're right back in there now. I'll support this Bill because I think it has in its preponderance real value in a policy that changes through Senator Looney's leadership to finally giving dollars to the municipalities that deserve it and not to those that don't or don't need it. But this one section of this Bill doesn't seem to fit in with the policy in Eastern Connecticut affecting Eastern Connecticut.

I'm hoping by the end of the session, we'll start dealing with our unemployment or lack of jobs, the complete disregard of the hospitality and tourism and gaming industry, where we look for them to make up for the taxes we've lost.

Again, I just am so dismayed that this administration thought that that section of this Bill had to be here when this Bill was talking about fairness, this is not fair at all to forgive taxation for people who can well afford it. Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I rise to for some conversation about regarding this Bill, and as I supported the Amendment previously that failed, I support the idea that there should be separate

conversations and separate opportunities to talk about these very, very important issues that stand before us in this Bill. The repeal of the welfare lien should stand alone. And I like many of my colleagues and many of who I suspect sit around the circle would be in favor of that. But if I find myself opposed to any one of the other opportunities in this Bill, then I must say no to this Bill, which means I have to say no to something that I'm not opposed to. And there should be no reason to Senator Miner's point why all of these are lumped together in this Bill. So I stand in favor of that section of the Bill.

And Madam President, before this life here in this great place, I served as first selectman of a community in Eastern Connecticut, who is home to two prisons, two parks, two Connecticut National Guard Posts, and other state property that was never fully recognized by any of the PILOT programs. It may have been recognized in the write-up, but it was never recognized in the budget. You may say, well, that community is a little more well-off than perhaps some other communities, but that community still has a negative as a result of supporting that those properties that are falling under PILOT. Now I agree. And I'm very happy the conversation about PILOT is coming forward because it is as has been said before, long overdue to change. Einstein once said, the definition of insanity is doing the same thing over and over again, and expecting a different result. Here we are. This is an opportunity to look at things from a different paradigm, a paradigm shift, and we have an opportunity to do that and an opportunity to have that debate. But if we don't agree with the way that this debate is framed in the confines of this Bill, then we'll have to vote no on that.

There is no conversation about funding. The good Senator who introduced the Bill today talked about policy first and then funding and the copy of the Bill that I had until just recently had a list of

funding items and numbers written that would have been obligated to by this Bill. But I guess that was eliminated at the last minute. So, I will just ask a question of the good Senator to verify that I was correct. And are there any numbers in this Bill that would, the state would be obligated to pay irrespective of any funding moving forward? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Through you, Madam President, as the good Senator knows that there will be action by this body in developing a budget. In that document, we'll spell out our priorities. I expect that we'll and my hope is that we will honor those not only with respect to specific communities, but in general, the thrust of this legislation that is before us, I feel fairly confident that that you'll see that when the document is presented, but that's not today. And so in that regard, we don't know what the ultimate Resolution will be other than I'll bet on my Senate leader any day in terms of his long standing philosophy regarding this issue and how it's been manifested in the development of this legislation, through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH): Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. It's good to have the numbers too around the circle. My question though, I'm not sure if it was answered, in that -- in this bill, which came, I think with a corresponding spreadsheet that keeps all municipalities harmless, all those numbers are there. This Bill passes, regardless of what happens in the budget cycle, those numbers need

to be honored. That's my question, through you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara. Oh, thank you, Senator Formica.
Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST): Through you, Madam President, that is the intent. That is what we're voting on today. That not only will specific communities that have been identified receive additional funding, but that no town is worse off, no town, your town, my town, your district, towns will not be worse off. And that -- again, that's our intent. That is what we're voting on today. That's the work that has to be done to identify the resources to allow that to happen. I don't think anybody can say that with respect to the current level of funding for PILOT. And that's the intent of that language that at minimum you'll receive what you're receiving today.

I don't think anybody can say prior to the actual identification of those resources and that we have a budget that amasses the necessary level of support in this Chamber and the Chamber downstairs and the Governor that what the outcome is. But again, I think that that is clearly the fact that it's before us today and the manner that it is today demonstrates that there is strong support. It's already been through one Chamber. Range to be seen what the vote will be today and then the support of the Governor. But I think there's pretty good indication that the language in the legislation before us today has a strong support. And that means not just today, but over the next two, three months. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fonfara. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you Senator for that answer. It seems like we are obligating the process to this number and putting a marker in the sand that the Appropriations Committee must fund these dollars, perhaps to the detriment, to these very many communities and other areas that may suffer as a result of having to stick to not being worse off in PILOT, could they be worse off in other areas, ECS or taxes or property taxes or new taxes or. So I have concerns about that and I will watch the process go forward.

I would look forward to be part of a new process with regard to the PILOT. And I'm intrigued on how this tax conversation with neighboring states and income tax will move forward, given what I sensed was a bit of a hesitancy on the Senator's part who introduced this, about how far down the road this solution will last or take us.

But we're here for today. So, while I am dismayed that all of these are together and not individual because I could support very much some portions of these and I have disappointment and others. I appreciate the opportunity to have the conversation and I appreciate the thought that went into some of these ideas. And I thank, thank you Madam Chairman for the time.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Thank you, Madam President. I'd just like to follow up on the one last point of the good Senator regarding our will to sustain our commitments. And if I can elaborate, I won't take, but a minute on this. The fact the matter is there's this annual battle may be too strong of a word, certainly not an

open battle, but certainly a conflict. Certainly a challenge that we face every year between our desires to support the communities that we live in and represent and balancing a budget here. And part of that reason is because we have this heavyweight of unfunded liabilities that drag down our ability to do a lot of the things that we would do as a state.

That's a legacy of past administrations and past Legislatures, even before I got here. And that's a sad chapter that has been laid upon all of us here today, and we live with, and it's our obligation to address. We could pass it on to the next generation, but I don't think that's wise policy. I don't think that's fair to anybody, our children and our grandchildren, but that's what happens because of the inability to expand, to address issues fairly, we have to prioritize/ Sometimes communities back home win, sometimes they don't. My hope is that we find a revenue source.

One thing we have never been willing to do is to share revenue that is generated at the state level with resident, with towns. We just don't have a culture of it. Other states do. New York state gives 4% of their sales tax to counties, and it's never questioned. It's not in their constitution. It's never questioned. It's never raised in their Legislature to change that. It's a given. We give the half point and we quickly take it away. And it's unfair to towns. It's unfair to have only one revenue stream. You are a former first selectman, as you indicated, you know, that seesaw that you have to work with, not just with the state, but in terms of balancing the budgets back home and having only one significant revenue stream to do that.

Some towns, it works. Many towns, it doesn't. An increasing number of towns, it's not. And yet we are willing yet to say, we need to change the way towns generate the revenue they do, what abilities do they have beyond that one source that is exhausted. It's

used up its useful life, if you will. Thank you,
Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR DUFF (25TH): Thank you. Madam President,
Madam President, I rise to support the emergency
certified legislation. And, first of all, I want to
thank Senator Fonfara for his leadership and
bringing out the bill. Senator Moore for her work on
the Bill as well. And to talk about the fact that
these are three pieces of legislation that are
writing wrongs. And the first part of that I'll talk
about is, in this double, potential double taxation
that we are facing from the State of New York.

Senator Haskell had said it correctly before when he
was talking about how constituents and our part of
the state are at home right now, working hard and
probably working harder than they had before.
As we all know productivity is up, uh, people are
commuting less, but they're working harder. And yet
they have to pay taxes into a state where they may
not have been even for the last year. And there's no
recourse to that right now. So, we have to make a
determination in our state as to that we're not
going to unfairly penalize people wherever they are,
whether they're in Fairfield County, working in New
York, whether they're in upstate Connecticut,
working in Massachusetts or Rhode Island or the
Boston area. And to say that there's going to be
some fairness for this year during this
unprecedented pandemic that we're facing right now.

And so, while we wait for this court case to get
through the halls of the US Supreme Court and get a
decision, we certainly hope that the justices of the
Supreme Court will see this issue in a matter of
fairness that residents of Connecticut and other
states that have been unfairly taxed by states that

they don't even live in will help bring relief to the residents of this state. And so that's why this issue is important to this Legislature. It's important to the Governor, you, Madam President and others, because of the fact that we know that we see this unfairness being taken on by other states and we have to make sure that we're standing up for the residents of our state.

Madam President on the second issue of righting a wrong is our PILOT that we have here in the state, where we have wrestled for years and decades and decades to try and help fund our cities and our communities when they have state properties or hospitals, and to help them with state funding to be able to better fund their priorities and the priorities of our residents, such as education, paving roads, police and fire, and other essential services. And it's been, it's always been a very difficult proposal to try and bring fairness and to try and bring the funding that has been necessary for these communities.

We are a state that is small. We have many communities, 169 of them, many that do redundant that have redundancy to them. We don't -- we have what we consider big cities like Hartford and New Haven and Bridgeport, and even the City of Norwalk, which is the sixth largest city. But in comparison, they're actually very small cities to what we would normally view as a big city around the country. And so, when you have then hospitals and prisons and state property, and other types of land that is not taxable to the property tax system, it puts those communities that are small to begin with in a very difficult position of how do they raise the money to be able to provide the services that they need to provide to make their cities and their communities, the best that they can be.

The simple answer is they can't. And so, we have this opportunity and an obligation to be able to fund these communities in a way that at least

provides some more help than they're getting right now. And it is important for us to acknowledge that this effort has been really been happening and going on for a number of years to try and find the solutions to help these communities with some additional funding that they need.

And that's why Senator Fonfara said, Senator Looney has been spending many years or not longer to try and resolve this issue, the issues of unfairness, especially in our urban areas. He knows like everyone else does and knows better than anyone else that our larger cities are hampered by the fact that they have -- some of them have up to 50% of their property is not taxable. I couldn't imagine that in the City of Norwalk where I live, if half of our land could not be taxed by property taxes and mayors are then hampered in other ways, so they can't raise the revenue that they need to do that. So, you have cities like New Haven and Bridgeport and Hartford and others that can't get ahead because of the fact that they don't, they don't have the taxable land and they don't have the proper funding to be able to meet the needs of their communities.

So I want to thank Senator Looney for bringing out this, this new formula that sets a promise for the next fiscal year and beyond to finally have a system that is reliable and brings promise to these urban areas and cities and towns all across the state. As Senator Fonfara said, there's this hold harmless, no town is losing money.

We're not taking one and giving to another. We're providing at least no one loses any funding and it does cost some money. But as we know in the Legislature the priority is for us to fund this. We will fund it. And I will bet as well that it will get done in this budget, because we have a leader who was strong, who cares about this and who understands the positive impact this will have for communities and property taxpayers, all across the State of Connecticut.

And the third one is in our welfare liens and have to be one of two states that has welfare liens and to eliminate those is writing, I know they're wrong to think that here in the State of Connecticut, where we think of ourselves as so progressive, that we would have this kind of a mechanism that is so wrong and so backwards for so many years, that it is time now to address these issues.

We talk a lot about equity in this building and outside this building. And we know that providing equity is not a simple solution. There's no simple answer. There's no magic wand. There's no one thing to do. It's a series of steps that we take, and I'm glad that today we're taking this step in this Bill to help right this wrong. So, Madam President, I'm just glad that we're here today to have that opportunity to do that.

So, I want to thank again Senator Moore for her hard work on this legislation. So again, Madam President, I think that the pieces of this Bill, three pieces of the Bill right some wrongs that we have, and that is time for us to pass this legislation to send a message to our constituents across the State of Connecticut that we are working, we are on in their corner and I will continue to work towards better equity and that we will fight for fairness in many different ways. Thank you so much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further on the legislation before us? Good afternoon, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Good afternoon, Madam President and thank you. I rise to discuss this Bill, but first, before we even can get to that, I just think it's important to talk about the process that here we are March 1st in the

middle of a pandemic and rush the emergency bills, we're going to deal with. Aren't dealing with the COVID pandemic. They aren't dealing with healthcare equity. They aren't dealing with initiatives to help the families where we have a hundred percent increase in unemployment and families who are struggling to make ends meet. No, we're going to deal with tax credits, PILOTs for cities without funding and DSS liens.

This session has been littered with examples where the majority has bent over backwards last fall to make sure that every voice in Connecticut had the right to vote. We went so far as to send every house in absentee ballot to make sure that vote was registered. But now when voices of those who vote show up, that's a different story. Not so sure, we want to hear those voices, whether it was with a virtual legislative session, mindful that 23% of Connecticut has no connectivity to the internet and that most of those individuals reside in cities. We nonetheless move forward. Move forward and have public hearings that get terminated when there's 1,700 voices waiting to be heard, the people in this city decided on constitutional government. It is our tradition. It is the people's government, not ours. And here we don't listen to those voices.

Once again, I asked, why are we rushing when the Governor said today, this one of these Bills he's going to augment later because you couldn't get your ducks in a row now. To me, it would be more prudent that we should exercise in abundance, an abundance of opportunity for people to voice their opinion in this legislative session. And maybe we needed to wait so that we know what's in the Bill and what it's fully going to be instead of moving parts of it now and pass other parts later to catch up with it.

We're passing a policy without funding. Wow. So back to the Bill. So yesterday I had the opportunity to watch some of the early morning, Sunday news programs. And I was watching an ABC News report on a

precious story, where there was a woman in Pennsylvania, an employee of McDonald's, who is about to turn a hundred years old, a hundred years old, and she's still working. A lot of it had to do with the fact that she enjoyed it. The customers enjoyed her.

As a matter of fact, she has a mailbox outside the store. And the point of it was she continues to work so she can pay her bills. And what really struck me was when she said, when they asked her about the money, she said, I didn't have a lot, but I always had enough. And that's what I'm hearing in Connecticut, that it's becoming more and more and more difficult for the Ruthie Schuster of the world to have enough, enough to get by. We're looking at a Bill that's over almost a half a billion dollars with no funding mechanism. Wow. What do you say to someone like that that's struggling? They've always had enough and they may have another tax increase coming down the line.

We've heard a lot. I've heard about double taxation, righting wrongs, unfairness. Let me tell you, I think where we have agreement is on the DSS liens. And I thank Senator Moore for bringing this issue forward.

It was as Senator Duff said wrong and backwards, but many of the policies of the DSS in the State of Connecticut are wrong and backwards, which I have been watching for the last decade as we have turned, I shouldn't say we, as I watched the majority, it started with the administration of Governor Malloy, turn the hands of time back.

When we had a Republican Governor, Jodi Rell, we had a full community spouse protected amount, no longer note, we're going to cut that. We had personal needs allowance, 72 bucks a month. That's all these folks had after expending all their finances that had to get cut back to \$60 to save a million dollars. And for the past 11 years, it's never been put back.

Meals on Wheels, home care reimbursement, this is the legacy of the last 10 years. You want to talk what's wrong and backwards. That's what's wrong and backwards. This Bill, I agree with. This, this part of the Bill, I agree with because what it does is it enables an individual who in their time of need reached out to the state and asked for help.

They're between a rock and a hard place. They got the assistance and the state did place a lien, but many times that lien becomes a structural impediment to enabling that family, to move out of the neighborhood where they are, and to move into better neighborhoods, where they might have a more safe community and a better education for their kids to get up and out of poverty. And the lien becomes the structural impediment because it takes equity out of the home when they try to sell one house and move to another.

For that reason, I think this DSS, the release of the DSS lien is appropriate because it gives people the opportunity that when they were in a tough spot and the state helped out, it's not going to always follow them wherever they go, and they have the opportunity to move forward. But the other two components. When we look at the PILOT program, fairness comes to mind. Fairness comes to mind because I reside in a community that has a municipal airport, 100% within its geographic boundary, but yet by law, Connecticut General Statute 12-19A only gives the host community half the PILOT and has to share it with someone else. It's even -- there's an exemption in this PILOT bill to continue that unfairness.

And the fact that it's a policy statement, and we don't know where the revenue's coming from. It's another one of these promises, broken promises I might add that It just, this is what Connecticut, this is what happens with this majority. You have affordable healthcare eight years ago, promise made promise broken, the MERSA promise made broken. ECS,

we redid that formula to base it on fairness and need. That was part of the bipartisan budget, but this budget now, this Governor's budget turn the hands of time back, go back to when educational funding is based on political whim, which resulted in the largest, one of the largest achievement gaps in the country. That's a promise made, but we're going to leave kids behind.

And how about that property tax credit? Where's that? It's not here. This PILOT issue as Senator Miner said, there's a budget hole. We don't have a balanced budget. We're taking money either out of the rainy day fund or hoping that Washington can bail us out. But the fact of the matter is when you make these promises without putting a dollar amount in the budget, you're looking at a tax increase and that tax increase is going to fall upon Connecticut's middle class. And I'm here to say what the middle class believes in this.

Just looking at the PILOT, you know, if we were to take this PILOT and every time I've heard about this, this revision to the PILOT program, it's always been coupled with the mansion tax and the mansion tax is defined as homes of \$400,000 and more. So crunch a little numbers. I looked at the runs that were provided. Town of Strafford, my hometown, we would get at a hundred million dollars and extra \$126,000, \$127,000. That's what we would get under this new PILOT. But if the majority adopts the property tax, the statewide property tax, the mansion taxes, they define it at \$400,000. The effect in my town would be that the Town of Strafford residents, the taxpayers in our town would send \$1.34 million to Hartford for the \$126,000 in return. That middle-class town loses \$1 million because the state levees a tax to take out of our community to send it somewhere else.

Once again, keep in mind the comment. I didn't have a lot of money, but I always had enough. That's like the middle-class mantra, but in Connecticut, enough

isn't making it anymore. It's getting more and more difficult and Bills like this contribute to it.

Last is the DRS. I hear double taxation. I hear that New York is a bully. Here's the fact under current law, Connecticut's entitled to the 300 million. But by extending this credit, we're giving up that revenue. Just think what that revenue can do, first could do away with the mansion tax I just talked about, and you could fully fund your PILOT. Two, we could not put a \$75 million tax like the Governor proposed in his budget on healthcare premiums and instead give premium relief. And if we extrapolate that out 300 million could give somewhere in a neighbor of 70 to 80% reduction in healthcare premiums for middle-class families, that's like taking a mortgage payment of \$2,000 and reducing it to 400. Talk about relief. There you have it.

And I constantly get asked when I'm pushing on the re-insurance, Oh, where's the funding mechanism. How are you going to afford this? It's right here. Here's a place you can do that, but we're going to pass up on that opportunity to provide it to individuals who based on 2013, 2014 statistics, people working, living in Connecticut, working in New York, the median income was \$433,000. I come from a town where the median income is \$38,000. And yet the budget that we see that's proposed because there's not enough funding has a mileage tax, a gas tax, a \$75 million tax on healthcare premiums and asking those families from Stratford to pony up the extra cash.

If we don't provide or extend this tax credit, all these things, the healthcare, the mileage tax, the gas tax don't need to be imposed on Connecticut's middle-class. Once again, I'm just guided by Ruthie Schuster who always didn't have enough, didn't have a lot, but she always had enough. This Bill makes it more difficult for middle-class families to have just enough to get by. We need to be more mindful of the middle-class. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Will you remark further?
Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'm speaking in support of the Bill. Madam President, first of all, I wanted to thank Senator Fonfara for his work as a finance chair that had the hearing the components on this Bill. Senator Moore for her work also on the public assistance lien portion and the speaker and Representative Scanlon and others in the House who worked on this as well, as well as the Majority Leader, Representative Rojas in the House and helping get passed last week and our own Majority Leader, Senator Duff, who has been a champion of all of the components of this Bill.

First of all, Madam President on the dual taxation piece. It does clarify our position on this issue for a single year. It is not a long-term policy choice. And certainly, I think there are a significant arguments that can be made in terms of Connecticut capturing a significant parts of this revenue in the future when people have had a more of a chance to plan for it. Clearly, people are now trying to make their tax decisions and understanding where they stand for the taxes they have to file in the matter of a few weeks based upon their 2020 calendar year income. This is an interim measure to deal with this without committing to any particular policy approach for the future years.

So I think that it, it makes sense not to have a kind of situation where people would be bereft of planning opportunities. But we'll be, I notice that there is a future decision to be made on this issue that could affect future years, especially at this point, when it is hard to predict what is the long-term change that the pandemic may be costing, how

many people who have been working from home on a temporary basis rather than commuting to another state, for how many of those people will that become the permanent way of working, and rather than returning to prior commuting patterns. It's too soon to tell that yet. But we will probably have by this time next year, a better indication of what permanent change there may have been in commuting patterns versus working from home. So I think that it's important to take this interim measure this year.

On the public assistance lien component, Madam President, it's important, I think to keep in mind and I have seen this many times with constituents in New Haven and Hamden that years after having had some public assistance early in their lives, people have had, they're difficult to climb into, at least the lower rungs of the middle-class. Having the rug pulled out from under them by having a public assistance lien on their property when they have an opportunity, perhaps to refinance it and find out that because of the lien, they don't have enough equity to refinance or come the time when they want to sell the property and find out they may wind up having a deficiency after the lien has been paid that they're no longer able to take any, have any benefit from the appreciation of their property value over the years and are left either not being able to sell or selling at a loss because of that lien.

So, it's in many ways, it's a cruel joke to play on people say, Well, we'll help you now, but we're going to pull the rug out from under you 20 years from now, perhaps. Most other states don't do that. There are only about a dozen states that do, and it's time for us to move into the more enlightened category of the states that recognize if you are helping someone, you should help them in a way that is not just a temporary help, but you may put them in even a worse position later on by climbing that away from them.

I think it's important to remember the comments that Senator Slap made earlier that we give all kinds of assistance to businesses and often don't have them be required to pay it back, because we see it as being good public policy to stimulate the economy by those business grants. We should think of this in the same way, and I'm glad that we're moving in that direction now as so many other states already have.

The third piece, of course, the change in PILOT, Madam President is one that is a matter of greater equity. We were one of the few states to create a PILOT at all over 40 years ago, but it was created in a way that gave the same percentage reimbursement to every community for its PILOT eligible property, regardless of their need. That has been the problem with the program because there are some communities in this state that have very little tax exempt property in single digits, in some cases, even low single digits and other communities where 50% of the property is off the tax rolls and not available to be taxed.

As our Majority Leader, Senator Duff pointed out that problem is exacerbated in our larger cities, by the fact that they are small in area and have very little land available for development. And that is a critical problem for Hartford, critical problem for New Haven, critical problem for Bridgeport Waterbury, a number of other our cities that the irony is that many of those cities are actually smaller in area than many of their neighboring suburbs.

The suburbs may have significantly smaller populations, but they are actually larger in area in many cases with more land available for development than the central cities that are so much in need of development and unable to do so, and then having so much property taken off the tax lists and left without the possibility of development. And that is one of the underlying problems here. And that

problem is not addressed in Connecticut, as it has in some other states by having a structure of county government or regional planning, regional land use planning.

None of that happens here because of every town is a separate [inaudible] itself and there's not any regional structures to promote economic growth in the way there might be elsewhere. So we have such stark contrast here in Connecticut, Madam President, and they're made more stark in Connecticut than they are in many other states because of the close proximity of communities of great wealth to communities of great poverty.

So for instance, this Bill, one of the components is to look at net grant list per capita as an indicator of need. And there are also quite a few communities in this state who have relatively low net grant list per capita of under a hundred thousand dollars per person. And they're not urban areas. There are many small rural towns notably in Eastern Connecticut, that have net grant list per capita well under a hundred thousand dollars. I've had this discussion with Senator Osten, and it was one of the main reasons that we framed the Bill this way. Many of those communities may not have a great deal of PILOT eligible property, but for whatever they do have, they will see an increase under this Bill, especially for those that will go into the 50% threshold, they would have their PILOT doubled from what it is now, and at least would be some assistance and would create a broader base of benefit for the PILOT program.

The fundamental problem, Madam Precedent is that we do have some communities, notably Greenwich at the high end where the net grant list per capita is about \$735,000. At the other end, at the way at the other end is New Britain with a net grant per capita of about \$50,000. Therein lies the problem. Therein lies the inequity.

Therein lies a problem that we've been trying to deal with in one way or another Madam President, back to the original Horton versus Meskill School Finance lawsuit, where the initial premise of that lawsuit was the lack of capacity for some municipalities to fund education services in an equitable way without the infusion of state aid, because the local grant list was not robust enough to provide sufficient funding to support a local school system.

That is still the problem. We've been trying to address that now for four decades or more through varying formulas. But that is still the crux of our problem is that we have so much property, not on the grant list, a lack of valuable property, and yet a burden in many communities where the mill rate is high, both as a percentage of the value of the property and also as a percentage of the average income of the people in that community. And that is why most people find the property tax more burdensome than any other tax that's levied directly by the state.

Revising this PILOT formula is I think also a way to start moving in the direction of greater equity in that way. It's also important to just in terms of the way we assess property for tax purposes. Even there, there is a benefit to the owners of more valuable property. If you think about it, a house that has a market value of a million dollars it's assessment is \$700,000. So, it gets \$300,000. The owner gets \$300,000 of an exemption for tax purposes.

At the other end, someone who has a very modest \$200,000 house in Hartford or New Haven or Bridgeport that 30% exemption is only \$60,000. They're taxed on 140,000 out of 200, as opposed to 700,000 out of a million. So, there is a \$300,000 exclusion on one end, a \$60,000 exclusion on the other. So the inequity is built into the system in so many different ways. This is one modest attempt

to recognize need based upon those three tiers to create a 50% reimbursement tier for those, not only those that have net grant list per capita under a hundred thousand dollars, but also some of those communities that may have a slightly higher net grant list per capita, but are characterized as Alliance Districts because of the challenges of low income and poor achieving students within their school system. So there are another 13 communities that are added to the top tier by virtue of being Alliance Districts, in addition to the 29 that qualify because of their net grant list per capita being under a \$100,000.

So, Madam President, this is a commitment to greater equity in this process. The debate will go on for the rest of the session in connection with the budget, but it is important, I think, to establish this principle that needs to be taken into account that it blanket rate of reimbursement, applying to all communities regardless of need is not the way to go, is not the way to make the PILOT program efficient and equitable. So, I urge the Chamber to adapt this bill today with its three components to act in concurrence with the House and to move forward with the Bill to the governor. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Will you remark further? Will your remark further? If not, the Clerk, if you could please. Mr. Clerk call the roll and the machines will be open.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 6516. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 6516. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be locked. And Mr. Clerk, I have in my possession the votes of Senator Flexer who votes in the affirmative and Senator Anwar who votes in the affirmative. And if you could kindly announce the tally, please.

CLERK:

House Bill 6516.

Total number voting	35
Those voting Yea	28
Those voting Nay	7
Absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

And the Measure is adopted. (Gavel) Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 7, Calendar No. 45, House Bill No. 6514, AN ACT CONCERNING INCENTIVES FOR QUALIFIED DATA CENTERS TO LOCATE IN THE STATE. There is an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Thank you, Madam President, Madam President, as provided for under Senate Rule 15, I will be -- I am recusing myself from this vote.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Thank you, Senator and the record will reflect that.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to yield to Senator Needleman, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Good afternoon. Do you accept the yield, sir?

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Yes, Madam President. I accept the yield. Madam President, I move passage of Emergency Certified Bill 6514 in concurrence with the House, and with the Chamber's permission, I would like to make a few remarks.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, indeed. And the question is on passage and please do remark further, sir.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Thank you, Madam President. Ladies and gentlemen, I'm delighted to stand here today before you to bring out a Bill that continues a line of legislation, which I and others have been responsible for that positively impact Connecticut's future.

We started in 2019 with a Bill authorizing the development of offshore wind. We continued in 2020 with the Take Back Our Grid Act. And now in 2021, we have another such landmark opportunity incentives for data centers. These important Bills have received broad bipartisan support and materially impact Connecticut's quality of life and their economic future.

I'm sure you know, that Connecticut is often referred to as the land of steady habits. However, the reality is we have a rich history of innovation and invention in communications and technology, which has changed the way we live, not just in our state, but throughout our country. For example, the world's first commercial telephone exchange opened in New Haven in 1878. And several years later, the invention of the portable typewriter in Stamford, which further revolutionized communications.

Today we have before us a Bill that follows this rich history and presents us with yet another opportunity to be a leader in an innovative industry of the future. Just like we have done many times in the past, this Bill concerns data centers also known as computer server farms and is designed to help facilitate their deployment in Connecticut.

As we have become increasingly reliant on data for every aspect of our everyday lives, the significance of, and the need for data centers expands exponentially. So, let's talk process. How will this work? Interested applications who wish to develop a data center, apply to DECD through a newly created

office within DECD, which will be funded by annual payments from qualified data centers.

DECD will notify the local legislative body in the municipality where the facility would be located. The applicant must demonstrate to DECD that they will make the necessary qualifying investment within five years before DECD approves the application and signs an agreement. This agreement must include a clawback provision for exempted taxes, as well as interest in penalties in the event, the requirements are not met.

The Bill also includes the sale tax exemption based on dollars invested in the project. There are four levels of tax exemptions available depending on where the project is located and the size of the investment. The first two levels, an investment by the developer of \$50 million if the data center is located in an opportunity or enterprise zone or \$200 million if located outside of these zones makes them eligible for a 20 year tax exemption. The second two levels, an investment of 200 million if the data center is in an opportunity or enterprise zone or 400 million if located outside of these zones would extend the tax exemption to 30 years.

Why should we do this? Because it is a very capital-intensive business. In addition to the huge amount of money required to construct one of these facilities, the ever-changing technology means that much of the equipment becomes obsolete within two to three years and has to be replaced. We should think of these data centers as the new manufacturing. Right now, in Connecticut, we don't apply the sales tax to new manufacturing equipment purchases. So, we similarly should be consistent when it comes to helping businesses move forward.

So final financial transaction tax exemption is another part of the Bill. While Connecticut presently does not have such a tax and no such tax is contemplated, this provision would exempt the

entity from such a tax for the duration of the agreement if one were to be enacted. This is important because other states such as New Jersey have passed such a tax and including such a tax exemption makes us more competitive and as a powerful draw for data centers.

Property tax exemption, and host municipality fee agreement, assuring local control is the next point. While the Bill also sets out a property tax exemption, it is absolutely critical to note that this is the local municipality, that the local municipality, not the state that will ultimately determine the payment structure of each one of these data centers.

The local legislative body is empowered to do so through a host fee agreement, which this Bill requires to be established between them and the data center developer. In this agreement, the municipality consider rate and lieu a property tax payment below it, add it or even above it, the existing property tax rate, along with other terms and conditions the municipality sees fit.

Recourse in the event of the data center not complying is the next piece. If the data center does not comply with the agreement at any point, the municipality has to notify them. If it within 180 days, the data center does not come into compliance, the host agreement is automatically terminated. And both the state and the municipality may act to collect taxes due including attaching liens and filing lawsuits to protect their interests.

Several other important points, physical location in this business, milliseconds matter, our proximity to New York and Boston plus our location at the edge of the East coast is a huge plus. Furthermore, our already robust and well-located infrastructure, we are closely located to fiber and electrical trunk lines.

Jobs, this is a major point. This is very exciting. Each facility's build-out involves 1000 to 1500 construction jobs. A huge boost at a time when our construction industry and building trades are certainly looking for work. So, as a matter of fact, I have been told that they have around 30% unemployment in the building trades right now. Post construction, the continuing jobs, although not nearly as numerous are the jobs of tomorrow. There is tremendous opportunity for uptraining as well as ancillary jobs connected to these projects and new businesses that would move to the area to be close to the data centers.

I would suggest this as the single most important economic development initiative on the table now. Let's remember economists have suggested that Connecticut has one of the worst performing state economies in the nation and our current trend will not recover until 2030.

Let's discuss energy and the environment for a moment. It is absolutely correct that these data centers consume an enormous amount of electrical power. There is a concern over the data center's potential environmental impacts. First, it's worth restating that these centers will be governed ultimately by a local process which is an important safeguard. Second, I would point out that no industry is more committed to green energy than data centers. Third, remember that big tech already buys millions and millions of carbon credit among others. Google claims to be carbon neutral. Fourth tech leaders like Bill Gates, Jeff Bezos, Mark Zuckerberg are amongst the largest personal investors in green energy and new green technologies.

And in 2020, a summit that brought together digital infrastructure leaders from large hyperscale firms and data center developers around the world, established a commitment to the following, making renewable energy available everywhere, reducing carbon emissions, starting with lifecycle carbon

emissions, defining this sustainable data center framework, eliminating waste, including energy, heat, water, and unneeded redundancy, achieving radical efficiency through innovation, being people positive, increasing the quality of life in communities where they locate.

While all of that is significant, it is not enough. That is why I joined today with my leadership and a number of my colleagues in calling for speedy enactment of legislation to address any lingering concerns regarding the environmental aspects of data centers.

In conclusion, this is a Bill for our future, just like the telephone exchange and the portable typewriter were in their time. It is once again, essential for Connecticut to be an innovative leader. We can do so in a way that energizes our economy helps secure a bright future and respects our environment.

Madam President, I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Will you remark on the Bill that is before us? Good afternoon, Senator Sampson. Let's get your microphone on. There we go.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Thank you very much. Delighted to be in the Chamber with you this afternoon to shake a little bit of the rust off since we haven't been here in a little while. I rise to speak regarding an act concerning incentives for qualified data centers to locate in the state. And I was initially going to use my time to kind of go through the Bill step-by-step as Senator Needleman did, just to draw some attention to different things.

But I actually think it's more important to talk about what this Bill represents more than focusing on each provision in the language. Suffice it to say that any legislative proposal that comes before our body, that includes a term such as negotiated host municipality fee agreement automatically become suspect in my eyes.

The Bill has quite a few provisions, which I believe test the limits of good government both on the subject of local versus state control and also including provisions that extend way beyond our time here in the Legislature. There are some provisions that last 30 years. I've always said that we've never should take it upon ourselves to put laws into place that will set up special circumstances for folks that extend beyond the immediate future and our ability to change them.

In the simplest terms, this Bill is designed to create an incentive, to bring a certain industry into our state and to do that by bringing, offering them tax credits and incentives to make it a more attractive arrangement for them. In other words, it's the exact definition of what we call corporate welfare, and just to prove that the Merriam Webster dictionary of corporate welfare is money or aid given by the government to help a large company.

One of my favorites political philosophers and writers, Frederic Bastiat would call it legalized plunder. And I believe his book, *The Law*, ought to be required reading for every legislator before they are sworn into service. So, what's wrong with corporate welfare? Well, it's important to start by remembering that we should measure what is good policy by its results and not by its intentions. And corporate welfare is never good policy.

The first thing you should think about when something like this is proposed, which is why, why are we making a proposal that requires incentives for someone to relocate to our state and Senator

Needleman pointed it out. He said that we are well-known as a state that has financial problems and is unattractive to businesses. And this type of proposal is an undeniable admission of just how unattractive Connecticut has become as a result of our economic policies.

It's also an admission of what needs to happen to make Connecticut more attractive, because we are doing it in this Bill for data centers. This Bill essentially modifies the tax and regulatory structure to make it attractive for qualified data centers. And that's right. Our environment for doing business is now so weak that we effectively have to bribe entire industries to come to our state by offering them special deals.

The only thing worse would be if this state went ahead and raised taxes even further this year, but I understand that's also on our agenda. Over the years, I've seen a lot of different corporate welfare policies come through this Chamber. Does anyone remember the First Five, for example? It always amazes me that this body doesn't seem to learn from its past mistakes.

And I remember saying when we were debating the First Five, that it was like putting a band aid on a broken arm. Our state's economy is in dire straits, and yet we're going to try and prop it up by giving a special deal to these companies to get them to stick around here. But this continuation of these policies and we've had a number over the years might be more like giving morphine to a dying man.

The bottom line is that rewarding one business with incentives, means that all other businesses or potentially local property tax payers have to make up the difference by paying more, effectively making the entire state's level of attractiveness to other businesses and industries even worse.

There are 36 of us in this Chamber, and I don't know where the very first or second or third or how many data centers will come to this state, but just know that if it's not to one of your 36 districts, the people who you represent are going to end up paying more, simply by the fact that whatever obligations that data center would have had, needs to be replaced by someone. That is the very definition of picking winners and losers.

What should be really obvious is that if the people in this Chamber believe that revising the tax and regulatory structure is something that attracts businesses, which is why they put it in this Bill for qualified data centers, then they should be doing that overall to attract more businesses and jobs to our state.

Every one of us at some point in our political past chose whether we were going to be a Republican or a Democrat. And I suppose I became a Republican because I identify certain political ideology with that. And I don't mean to imply that Democrats don't believe in freedom and equal protection under the law. I'm sure they do. But for Republicans, we believe the key to ensuring that freedom and equal protection is achieved by the concept of limited government, keeping the government out of the business of picking and choosing who benefits and who does not.

Keeping the government small is necessary to prevent policies like corporate welfare. And I want folks listening to just consider how dangerous this kind of policy is, because what it does is it involves putting a tremendous amount of power in the hands of a very few elected officials who then have the power to decide what businesses, what industries, what individual companies sometimes are going to get a benefit and at whose expense, and where does that end? What happens next? What's to stop companies to keep coming forward to our state government and say,

Well, you know, our company might be leaving Connecticut unless you offer us something

You're creating a terrible set of perverse incentives that there's no end in sight to. And when does it stop? Does it stop after every specific industry has their own specific rules that we've done our best to negotiate to keep them here. Wouldn't it be better just to have a level playing field? Wouldn't it be better just to have policies that make Connecticut and attractive enough state so that data centers want to come here even without these incentives, that would make more sense to me.

So we're sending a terrible message, encouraging more and more large companies to approach our state Governor, whether they're here or not looking for special treatment. I think of the terrible incentives for those few elected officials that have the power to make these decisions.

Our constituents are very distrustful of our government as it is. This is one of the reasons why, because they see the danger in giving the power to make these types of choices to a few elected officials. So, let's not give any more power to a few well connected people to decide who wins and loses. You can be certain, I want to see qualified data centers come to Connecticut, just like anyone else. But I refuse to invite them here at anyone else's expense, particularly the current Connecticut residents and businesses who have been suffering and who'll be asked for even more.

This is my 11th year in the Legislature, Madam President. And during that time, I have watched a parade of policies come through both the House and Senate that have made our state less and less competitive and less and less attractive to those who would choose to invest in our state or to move here as a person or a business.

And I'm proud to say, I haven't voted for any of that. I have stood up and said, no, there's a better way every time. And there is a different and better way. Everything we do here should be focused on restoring Connecticut as a place people in businesses actively choose where data centers want to come even without incentives. And that's the Connecticut, I will continue to fight for Madam President. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, you know, there's a lot to unpack in that and all I would say is that we could stand here and debate Jefferson versus Hamilton all day long. And I'm not prepared to really do that now, but the State of Connecticut competes with 49 other states. One of our prime competitors in this specific area is the State of Texas and Governor Abbott in order to attract this industry is prepared to enact a constitutional amendment to move forward with this, to attract these data centers.

I could debate whether it's right that states have so much power or not, but the reality is we are in a competitive environment. We are trying to be competitive. I do want to point out that the one difference between this and prior incentives is we are giving no one anything upfront. We are incentivizing people to come. We are not losing any income because we're not giving anyone, someone else's income to attract another business. We are looking to attract new businesses and it's incremental income, and yes, we're giving up a piece of it, but understand that there are thousands of jobs where employees will pay property tax, personal income tax to the state. There's going to be

incidental businesses that's move into the state around this.

There's a lot of great opportunity that is exactly the kind of economic development that I would assume we would all be in favor of. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Will you remark further on the legislation before us? Good afternoon, Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I rise for the purposes of a couple of comments and questions for the proponent of the Bill. My colleagues that know me know that I'm a consummate advocate of new business, bringing new business into the state and growing our economy.

I understand we have an opportunity here to incentivize a brand new industry that has some potential to generate some construction jobs and some potential ancillary business in the areas in which they choose to locate.

However, I am concerned as the proponent pointed out some of the environmental impacts associated with this new industry. Research that I've conducted on data centers shows that they use massive amounts of electricity and therefore responsible for unusually high levels of greenhouse gas emissions.

Additionally, I understand that many use diesel generators thereby impacting ambient air quality. So, a couple of questions through you. Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Cohen. Senator Needleman. prepare yourself. Please proceed.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Is there a concern over the amount of electricity supply required for these facilities? Should they be enticed to the State of Connecticut [inaudible]?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President. I believe we have a very, very good grid manager with ISO New England. And I believe that this grid is ready to handle the extra load should it happen?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President. It's my understanding that we're currently in next net exporter of electricity. We produce more than we are consuming at this point. And is it the proponents' understanding that we would not be impacting our ability to still be producing in excess of what we consume right now in the state of Connecticut. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Again, through you Madam President, we are part of a regional grid operator. So even though there are

assets that generate energy in Connecticut, they satisfy the needs of the entire New England region along with other assets. But out there, I do want to remark that we have been the most aggressive state in terms of looking to be carbon neutral by 2050 and hopefully by 2040 with legislation that's being proposed. My understanding is that with the first tranche of wind energy that we have issued procurement for, we will be at around 90 plus percent carbon neutral for the energy that we use in Connecticut.

And I do believe that when you add on the next tranche, we will get much closer to a hundred percent, a lot faster than even 2040. And this would just be part of that.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And again, through you, if the proponent could explain what type of backup generators these data centers are typically using? Are they renewable energy? Are they diesel? Are they fuel cell? What type of backup generation do they use?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen. Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President, my understanding is that they are predominantly backup generators and not fuel cells. And I have not done enough research to know the details of that. And I would imagine that they are most likely to be diesel fuel generators.

Although I do believe there's a lot of research being done on backup battery generation at least for short intervals of time for peaking.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And also, through you, Madam President, is it the proponents understanding that these generators would be used for peak shaving? Or would they be using their backup generators purely for emergency use?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President, my understanding is that they will likely be used for both.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And will these data centers be required to obtain an air permit through DEEP, through you Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President, I believe generators of this size are required to receive that permit from DEEP.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And is it the proponents understanding that these data centers would in fact use an excess of 10 megawatts of energy and that if they end up in an environmental justice community as such, they would be subject to our environmental justice statute and therefore a process with more stringent environmental standards and thresholds to meet? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President, I believe so.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And that will be all for my questions. I do have a couple of comments and I am glad to hear that air permits would be required for those with diesel backup generators, certainly a concern of mine and that environmental justice legislation here and procedure would prevail.

My concerns remain. We have come so incredibly far in the State of Connecticut. We've really become a leader nationwide in taking climate action. This is

evidenced through initiatives such as zero carbon by 2040, a full decade earlier than we had originally set out to do, evidenced through electric vehicle incentives, land preservation, and coastal resiliency efforts.

As Chair of the Environment Committee, everything I do and view is done through an environmental lens. Is this going to mitigate the impacts of climate change? Is this good for the people of our state and for our future generations? Is this in line with our initiatives around clean air and clean water and land preservation? Does this impact overly burdened communities by pollution?

Well, this Bill calls into question whether or not we can continue to meet our goals while welcoming in this growing industry. I have been pleased to learn that others are of a similar mindset and wanting to tread carefully as we navigate balancing our economic needs with our environmental considerations.

I've had recent conversations with the Governor's office, the Commissioners of DEEP, and DECD, the leadership here in the Senate and many colleagues. And I'm really pleased to know that they are committed to moving language forward this session to address all of these aforementioned concerns. To clarify that those who use diesel backup generators will be beholden to certain air quality standards. To encourage green building standards as we move forward with constructing these data centers. And to be assessing consistently how we are shaping up against the very important global warming solutions act and our greenhouse gas emissions.

So, Madam President, I will be voting yes today in favor of welcoming new business growth and development, but I'll be doing so only with assurance from leaders and the executive and legislative branches that we can collaborate to

create a future companion bill with the environmental health at the forefront. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen. Will you remark further on the Bill that is before the Chamber? Good afternoon, Senator Martin. Good afternoon, Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Good afternoon, Madam Chair. Thank you. I want to begin by sort of piggy-backing a bit with what Senator Sampson had to say and to use a phrase that the good Senator Needleman said that, you know, Connecticut is a land of steady habits. We sure are, in particular with our finances, you know, we've been struggling for four decades balancing our budget. And we continually run in deficits five of the last 10 years where we seem to be back in the circle here. At least the years that I've been here, this is I'm starting my seventh year and we've been here pretty regularly dealing with the reoccurring budget deficit.

We seem to be scaring off businesses because of these financial issues. You know, we've lost major businesses such as Aetna and GE and a few others. And we've declined in jobs. Prior to COVID we had not even reached gaining back all our jobs that we lost in the great recession of 2008. And now it's even more of an uphill battle since COVID in getting our jobs back.

So, I think, what I like about this Bill is we are working on new jobs and I think to turn our state around and to stimulate our economy job is part of that equation to creating jobs. You know, we've heard a couple of times that this, our state is one of the worst performing states economically wise in the whole country. So we've got a lot of work to do, and hopefully it doesn't stop with this one piece of

legislation. This is just a sort of little drop going forward, but it is a step into job creation.

You know, we need to work on the, you know, the state expenditure side. We know that those fixed costs are greater than our revenues, you know, and then we also have the budget obligation, excuse me, the pension obligation, the unfunded portion of it that we have to address it as well as the healthcare cost.

So there is work to do. And hopefully we can begin down that road to correcting our deficiencies. I'd like to ask the proponent of the Bill, just a few questions, just to clarify some things. I know that I believe that with this piece of legislation that all qualified data centers, regardless if they're contributing 50 million or if that's if they're in the enterprise zone or the opportunity zone, or if they are out of that, it's a \$200 million investment.

But regarding the legislation that we haven't, we don't even have currently, but the way I understand this Bill, and what I heard you say is that they will be exempt from any future financial transaction that we may adopt here in the Legislature. Is that correct?

THE CHAIR:

Senator. Thank you, Senator Martin. Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President. Yes, that's my understanding.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Through you, Madam Chair. I have a question. I was speaking with our town assessor in Bristol, and as you all know, we have, headquarter of ESPN is in Bristol. They have a huge campus. And the question that I have with that, he and I had a discussion about is on line seven. I don't know if you have the document, but the term rehabilitation you seem to qualify the eligibility of a data center would include a new development, the acquisition, the construction of rehabilitation, renovation repair and the operation of a facility. Can you give me, provide some information regarding the terminology of rehabilitation? What does that mean specifically? Through you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin. Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President. My understanding is that over the lifespan of the data center, any work done on it, subsequent to its being built like rehabilitating it, re-purposing it, not repurposing. I take that back, buying new equipment, upgrading, for example, diesel generators to battery backup storage. Those were the things that I understand that that makes reference to them.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

So, I guess our discussion, the assessor myself was a possibility if ESPN tore down one of its buildings, or it added on a new building, let's say on its campus or bought a piece of property next door and they spent 200 million because it is not in

the enterprise zone or opportunity zone. They are, I think, a data center. So, would they qualify under this program, under this piece of legislation? Through you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin. Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President, I think the definition of data center as what would be the guiding force here, if they were to apply to DECD to develop a data center and DECD granted that right, then they would be allowed the tax exemption for the data center.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. So to, would they then, should they qualify? And for that I guess facility, because the rest of the facility is on the campus and you know, it ESPN owning that with the rest of the campus, be part of this qualifying facility? Through you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam Chair, my understanding is no. However, I would say this is where the element of the host municipality agreement comes into play. The host municipality to lay your assessor's fears to rest, because I'm sure that she would have them. That would be a negotiation between the town and the

data center. No data center can be built without a host municipality agreement. So if they were going to take a portion of their property, apply to DECD to build a data center, they would have to go and negotiate with the town as to what that would mean. And the town would have broad latitude to make that decision because they can't build one without that agreement.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Well, I understand that. And I think that's a great aspect of this Bill regarding the host community fee and then negotiations part of that. I think that is a good positive aspect of this Bill. I guess the fear is we currently have a tax base with ESPN. They get qualified under this piece of legislation. And then now they use that as leverage to come open up the door for what they currently are obligated to pay to the City of Bristol. That's our fear.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President. Again, you know, for example, my company has office and manufacturing and the office operations are not tax exempt. None of the equipment within the office operations are tax exempt, but manufacturing equipment is tax exempt. And that part of the building, there's an exemption on property tax for that within the town. I do not believe that any company could say we are going to build a data center in one corner of our property, as a means of getting a tax exemption for their entire property, would be worth a shot for them to try to game it. But I do not think it would happen.

I think that that would be outside of the bounds of the legislation.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

I sure hope you're correct. Regarding the tax exemption, I didn't hear you say, and I read it in the Bill that it's not only the property tax that is exempt here and that the host community too, it's a negotiated and there was an agreement made, but there are other tax exemptions that come into play here. Can you speak to that, through you Madam Chair?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President, it's not only a property tax agreement, it's a sales tax exempt, property tax exemptions to sales tax exemption on all equipment and construction materials related to the construction of the data centers.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam Chair. And does that include the pipeline to those that are subcontractors, suppliers, et cetera. Does that certificate that is issued by the DCD or excuse me, the Department of Revenue Services, is that handed or is that extended to the pipeline? Through you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Madam President, I'm assuming you mean the supply pipeline, not the fiber pipeline or the gas pipeline. Through the supply chain pipeline of vendors, I would imagine that it would apply to the vendors in that they would not be able to charge nor would we be able to collect sales tax from those vendors for the supplies and work that they performed. That said all of those employees involved in doing all that development and construction would be paying income tax to the State of Connecticut. And that's the incremental income. One of the estimates is that because these are so labor intensive to build that there might be three, four, \$5 million worth of state income tax per year per data center during the construction process and then additional income tax to the State of Connecticut during the years that they operate as well as other tax payable to the state for all their living expenses and lifestyle while the new employees live here. So I think there's a net benefit, but I do believe that the sales tax exemption works through the supply chain. Just like anything that I buy for manufacturing, we don't pay sales tax on those ingredient, on those items.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam Chair. One additional question regarding the tax exemption are the operating expenditures for the facility or for the operator, the developer or the location, I'll just use the term operator. Are the operating costs tax exempt? Through you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President. I believe that they are.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you. Madam Chair. And just one additional question and I'll wrap up is can you explain very quickly how -- passing this piece of legislation, how this is going to enhance or I guess help grow our state economy? Through you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Sure. Thank you, Madam President. Through you, absolutely, I think that's a very core critical question. Initially, the opportunity lies not only with host municipality agreements, which I think will be negotiated very favorably towards the municipalities, but also the direct immediate impact is the construction workers. The building trades are desperate for work. They have 30% unemployment by some measures and putting these folks to work as soon as possible would be critical.

Once you go beyond the construction phrase, this is attracting a new industry to the State of Connecticut is it is saying to the tech world that welcome, please come. We want you here. Technology

is the future. We spend a lot of time lamenting the businesses that we lost, and we should be talking about the businesses we want to attract. And I need to say for the record, I commend Commissioner Lehman and the Governor for having the foresight to proactively work to do this.

This is a great opportunity. It's done a new way for Connecticut. It's not done by handing somebody some money, which sometimes is necessary, but it's done by saying you come and we will give you a benefit for your coming, but there's value in scale, as these things happen, as the first one happens, another one happens, then then you begin to have scale and 50 or 75 ongoing jobs, which are tech jobs, engineering jobs, as well as all the up training jobs for the ancillary technician businesses and, you know, technician jobs in these facilities.

One becomes five becomes ten of these data centers. I do want to mention that for many reasons, Connecticut is unique in a unique position to do this. One is there is a major fiber trunk line along the I-95 Corridor. And up by I-91, it's barely tapped. It just connects Boston to New York. And for me personally, as a business person, as a resident, as a chief executive officer of a municipality, I hate being told that we are halfway between New York and Boston, and that's our claim to fame. That should not be our claim to fame. Our claim to fame should be the new businesses we attract them and the new industries we attract. And I think that this is an exact step in that direction.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you. Thank you, Madam Chair. Thank you, good. Senator Needleman for your answers to questions. I

agree with Senator Needleman. I think that we are, what we're doing here is the, at the time of a twist or a different than what we've been doing in the past and we are not just simply handing out, here's a couple of million dollars, 5 million, 10 million, whatever the number may be, but we're asking them, you make the effort first, come into our state and then here's how we're going to reward you.

It's a little bit different and I think from what I've read, the little that I read in order to somewhat educate myself here, I think it looks like this is an emerging market. And I think Senator Lehman, not Senator Lehman, Commissioner Lehman and his staff and the Governor's office are doing the right thing here.

Regarding another good aspect of this Bill that I liked was the ability of the municipalities to do their own negotiations. I'd like to think that most of them will be able to handle their own negotiations, but I also like to, I guess, encourage the CD if they need to help and make sure we have a fair negotiations take place on the municipal level with these holes communities that the offer may be there for some assistance From his department. I think this is a good win. Good win-win for the state. Particularly, you know, we're looking at 1,000 to 1,500 new construction grounds. And not only that, but the jobs that will, we will be gaining each of the facilities that are built here, plus the ancillary jobs as well. So, Madam President, I'll be supporting this Bill in hopes that this is the beginning of the stimulating our state economy, as well as restoring the State of Connecticut. So thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President, and I appreciate this Bill that is before us today, and I'm not certain that I will have any questions for Senator Needleman, so he can relax. But I do have to say, this Bill for data centers made some significant changes at the request of the Eastern Connecticut Delegation. Not because they were negotiated by the Governor or the executive branch, but because the Eastern Connecticut Delegation where data centers may possibly locate, brought forward two really significant issues. One, that municipalities were not given the right to negotiate the host agreement in its entirety and did not give them that ability. And now this bill does do that. That was directly reflective of the Eastern Connecticut Delegation.

In addition to that, the rights to taxation under foreclosure or bankruptcy should one of these data centers walk away, now that language has been tightened up to allow Eastern Connecticut, where many of these data centers are purported to be going, will have that ability to step up like any other property that is being foreclosed or being in a bankruptcy situation.

Now, my understanding on data centers and there has been talk about data centers for a little bit, is that, that this administration decided in December after meeting with Wall Street and NASDAQ and some other high-level businesses that they were looking to come out of New Jersey. In December, this was decided, and today we have a Bill in front of us.

And what is the effect of said Bill? The effect of said Bill is allowing data centers who are high value, essentially manufacturing sites in a new industry. They will be about a 1,000 to 1,500 construction jobs. I applaud that. My understanding is that there are project labor agreements out there to provide the most qualified workers to be in these data centers that is not included in the Bill today.

My understanding also on this is that all of this was decided since December and here it is March 1st and here we are standing in front of everybody. How many full-time jobs are within the confines of data centers? About 50. And I want that to sink in because it's 1,500 construction jobs and about 50 full-time jobs. There are no taxes to the State of Connecticut, either in sales and use or in personal property or real property, other than the host agreement that the municipality may at their own discretion negotiate.

Again, it's a new industry. It might provide some value. We should try it. We should be at the forefront of it. We should negotiate for it. I am extremely offended though that this administration, after two and a half years has not sat down with two of the largest employers in the State of Connecticut and negotiated a deal, a real deal that in two businesses that have put billions of dollars into supporting construction workers around this state, billions of dollars in supporting construction workers around this state, given thousands of construction workers jobs at both the two internationally acclaimed gaming institutions, billions of dollars.

They've never asked for a dime from the State of Connecticut, yet we can't in two and a half years come up with an agreement between the parties. Two and a half years, we've waited for something to happen here. Two and a half years for two companies who have brought billions of dollars in construction trades work that have provided thousands of construction jobs. And that's what we're touting with the data centers that these will give us some 1,000 to 1500 construction jobs and 200 to 400 billion in construction, well below what the two tribal nations have done, well below what they have done in the work that they have brought out.

Now let's get to the jobs that are in the data centers. The equivalent of 50 full-time jobs at the most, in one of those places, that is a \$400 million business. That is not true of the two tribal nations. What have they hired? Tens of thousands of workers every single year in the two tribal nations, two of the largest employers, two of the largest employers in the State of Connecticut. And we yet don't have an agreement between the administration and the two largest, two of the largest employers in the state.

Now, what else have they given to the State of Connecticut? Another thing that's offensive. We have the largest effective tax rate on gaming in the country with tribal nations, 25% of the gross, none of the net, but of the gross. That's what we get. And they have given us over \$9 billion. Now we're saying the data centers are worthwhile. I think they may be. I'm willing to take a shot at it. The two tribal nations, nearly \$9 billion, they've given to the State of Connecticut coffers. Yet we don't find them valuable enough to stand and come up with a negotiation and bring it to this Legislature, two and a half years, less than 60 days, we have come up with an agreement with the data centers, two and a half years we still don't have an agreement. I find it offensive. I find it offensive. And we've talked a lot about equity. Let's talk about equity for a second. These two tribal nations are the two largest minority owned businesses in the state, two largest minority owned businesses in the state. And I can tell you Connecticut doesn't have a great track record of living up to its compact negotiations with native Americans. We have a horrible, horrible reputation on coming up with agreements with native American tribes. And we have five of them in this state. Two of them are also federally recognized. And if that agreement today, which gave us 25% of the gross was brought before the Bureau of Indian affairs today, it would not be agreed upon. It's richer than they would allow to happen today. They would not agree on it. They would say go back,

because what you are doing is giving more money to the State of Connecticut than you are to the two native American tribes. And that's just a fact. That's an absolute fact.

So yes, I will support a burgeoning industry in the state and I will applaud them if they actually built something because there is no developer right now in the state that's coming forward to build anything. And I will applaud them if they have 1,500 jobs that help build these construction, that help with construction workers. And I will applaud them for the 50 full-time equivalents. But today in Eastern Connecticut, I have over 6,000 workers waiting for a job as we struggle with COVID because of the gaming and hospitality and tourism industries directly impacting Eastern Connecticut.

Our unemployment went up over a hundred percent. In 2008, we were the ninth worst labor market in the country. I brought this to the attention of the administration and said, I don't want to see us fail and go back to the ninth worst labor market in the country, not in the state of Connecticut, but in the country. I still wait for an agreement. And maybe, maybe by the end of this legislative session, we'll come up with an agreement, but we should have come up with an agreement two years ago. And when are we going to recognize these two tribes are two of the largest minority based businesses in the state and each time I listened to people, tell me that the native Americans need to just wait their turn. I remind everybody, they were here before any one of us. They have a history that's rich in this state. The name Connecticut comes from native Americans. It doesn't come from us. So, I'm asking, when is it going to be time that we'll come up with an agreement with these two tribal nations who have supplied that State of Connecticut with thousands of jobs, both full-time equivalent and thousands of jobs in construction and \$9 billion to the state coffers not calming the income taxes that were paid with the workers that were associated with them.

I still stand waiting. And when will this administration come up with an agreement with them? When? Will it be tomorrow? I certainly hope so, but it better be by the end of this session. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Will you remark further? Senator Somers. Senator Somers will be followed by Senator Lesser.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Good evening, Madam President. And I rise in support of the Bill that we're talking about today, the Data Center Bill. And although I will agree with my colleagues, Senator Osteon that I hope we can come to an understanding for our tribes that have given so much to our state and our communities in Eastern Connecticut.

This Bill is about data centers. And I would just like to say that in 2015, I was appointed to an economic competitiveness committee here at the State of Connecticut before I was elected to the Senate. And one of the things that we looked at as the group was where could Connecticut look at economic development? And we were lucky enough to have McKinsey do a pro bono report for our committee. And three areas that they identified for us were manufacturing, finance, and data centers. And that was in 2015. And that has stuck with me and people have different ideas on what data centers are. And in this Bill, I think we're talking about hyperscale data centers, the cloud, and you know, the cloud is not up there. The cloud is actually a building that has loaded with all kinds of computers, running at a very warm temperature. And quite frankly, the United States and our country does not have enough cloud storage space.

Many of us don't recognize that many of our hospitals, all their data is stored in Indiana. We are in a prime location here in the State of Connecticut located between Boston and New York, to be able to provide data that will be traveled quickly between New York and Boston. Right now, it takes 4.2 milliseconds to transfer data. If we had data centers here in Connecticut, we could get that down to 1.2 milliseconds that is huge in in a burgeoning industry.

So, if you look at hyperscale data centers, they really are the backbone of modern technology. There's no easier way to put it. And data is doubling every 18 months in the world. That is huge. Think about every single item that you use in your home, on your computer doubling every 18 months. And our country is way behind other countries in storage and data.

So what this Bill does is give Connecticut the landscape so that data centers, hyperscale data centers can locate here in Connecticut. We've heard a lot of people today speak about why should we do anything different? Why do we have to give these incentives? And the answer quite frankly, is very simple because there is an industry standard that you have to meet or data centers will not come here. It's very simple. There's 33 other states that have data center legislation that has allowed them to attract data centers, to come to their States. And it all comes down to no taxes. Like you've heard on the building materials, adequate energy supply, land that's available and in many cases, not a host agreement with the local community.

You see other states that have developed programs where the data center, who then either sells the data center or leases it to a company like Facebook. Facebook will come in and create a STEM technology curriculum in a school district. It'll donate to a wing of a hospital. It'll give scholarships. So every state has done it a little differently. The

unique thing about this Bill is it gives the local host community should a data center decide to come to your town, an opportunity to negotiate what they need. And as a former mayor, I would have been jumping up and down for the opportunity to bring a data center to my town, to have the ability to negotiate something in many cases on land that is really underutilized or doesn't have access to sewer or water.

These data centers use gray water and they don't need access to sewer. They're a little different in building. They don't fall into what we consider on the municipal level of a large building that needs X amount of parking spaces, because it's true. Once these data centers are built, it's really 75 to a hundred people running around in shorts, maintaining the data center, but they don't need all the parking that would normally be associated with one of these very large buildings.

We've heard different numbers today about the number of construction jobs. If this Bill passes, Connecticut has an opportunity to literally create 10,000 construction jobs within a year in an area where our trades are desperate for work, actually talking to the head of the trade association in Connecticut, our tradesmen, our union workers are looking outside of Connecticut for work because there is no construction going on in Connecticut.

Now, once these buildings are up, you don't build all these buildings at one time. This is a long decade long system of creating data centers. Data centers take about 18 months to build one building. So it's a long-term game. It's not just a one-time deal. You will see continuous construction jobs. In addition to that, every 36 months what's inside the data center changes out as technology upgrades.

And during that period of time, it takes between six and eight months to make that change. Again, that's construction jobs. That's people coming in and out

to make the changes. Not to count all the ancillary jobs that will come from that. Think about all these people coming to your town, they need to go out to lunch, they need to stay in a hotel, they need to go out to dinner. If they're going to be here for a period of time, they're going to do things in your community.

I think it's important to remember that we in Connecticut have not seen great job growth in a very long time. We're very dependent on a few technologies. We're dependent on defense. We're dependent on the casinos and there hasn't been all that much more really going on in Connecticut. This gives us an opportunity to get in almost on the ground level. We're a little bit behind for an opportunity for a brand new industry. We would be the first in New England to tackle this. The first in Newington to really put forward a bill and a policy that would attract hyperscale data centers, which is the future really of what we're going to see moving forward.

If you look at what we could generate, we can generate close to we've heard \$3 million in tax revenue that could be upwards of \$50 million in tax revenue, depending on how many buildings we can get here and how many construction jobs there are. Remember, in some of the towns that some of the developers have looked at, this is land that doesn't have access to sewer. It doesn't have access to water. The state doesn't have money for the infrastructure to get it there. So these towns are really frozen in their ability to grow the grant list. If you could have a data center there and negotiate a deal with a data center, you could significantly increase the revenue coming to your municipality.

They always have to meet all the permitting standards, the environmental standards, the planning requirements of each municipality. They're not skirting that. And they have agreed going forward to

meet the EPA tier two standards for emissions. They're willing to work with us on green building. And I just would like to remind everybody, or have everybody go take a look. Virginia passed an incentive this year, they have created 541,000 jobs in data. And if you don't believe me, you can go look it up on the internet.

So one of the things that I think is important, and I just wanted to point it out when I was reading the Bill and this Bill took much longer than 60 days to get together. This Bill's been tossed around over the past year. I know the Governor has been very interested on it. I spoke with him last summer about it, and you know, maybe it's taken us this long to get it together because of the pandemic and other things that have been a little bit of a distraction here in the State of Connecticut.

But one thing that we're going to need to do to attract data centers is to make sure that if we pass this Bill today, which I'm hopeful that we will, that we stay consistent because data centers are not going to come to a state if they think is not stable with its policy. If they see a state passing something, but then wanting people to change it all the time, they're not going to take the risk. It's a huge capital investment for them. So let's try to keep that in mind as we move forward.

One thing I wanted to ask the proponent of the Bill, you don't have to stand up. It's probably a quick one is I did notice that it said that upon voting is done, it would not go into effect until July of 2021. And I was hoping that this would be upon passage. This is an Emergency Certed Bill. I would love to see that that got changed to an earlier date, because I think we could have people coming here to Connecticut sooner, but they're not going to do anything until they know this Bill is passed in its form that it is.

And quite frankly, you know, there's industry's standards and metrics that have to be met in order for them to come here. And if we modify this to a way that we think is the way to go. If it's not the way they think they need, they won't come here. And I was wondering if you could speak to the date at all and what you thought is why it can be upon passage. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Thank you, Senator Somers. Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President. That's not addressed in my notes. I'm not a hundred percent sure, but I believe that it probably has to do in setting up the office of the data center, you know, person and I just think that once we pass this and we, and the Governor [inaudible] this ball is rolling. And I think that nothing would happen much before then. Anyway, I do agree with you that there are ongoing discussions with different parties right now. We are in a very, very, very competitive environment with other states.

I would like to be able to handicap who's ahead, but I think if we pass this, we're one of three, which basically gives us a one in three chance of having it happen, so.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

So thank you, Madam President. And if I could just comment on some of the comments on the environmental issues. It's my understanding that data centers obviously cannot go down. They can't go down. They have to have power. So the backup diesel generation that is onsite is used sometimes to come off during peak hours, less than a hundred hours a year. And. The cleanest technology, German technology that is

absolutely available anywhere in the world. Is that correct?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Senator Needleman.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Yeah. Through you Madam President. And I'm sure that that is the case. And again, I want to harken back to my comments about this whole industry being leaders in trying to move us forward on the environmental justice on the carbon reduction side. And I do believe that the minute the technology is available to do something different, they will be the leaders in doing that.

I believe that for backup generation, you can always have a difficulty with batteries, at least based on known technology. But remember those, these folks pull stuff right off the grid. They're not through lines that run under trees, they're pulling from high tension lines, they need high voltage. But I believe batteries will play a critical part in peaking issues because they'll have the capacity to hold up for two hours or four hours at a time. I I've heard numbers from 20 hours a year to 200 hours a year for peak load management. And I think looking at the state's conservation and load management plan, they want businesses to be able to go down and not draw power from the grid. We just want it to be the cleanest energy possible and hopefully they will get there soon.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Senator Somers.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, Madam President, I just have one more question. You know,

I heard some discussion today about fuel cells being the backup, but fuel cells are so exorbitantly expensive at this point in time. That would be something that would make it impossible for a data center to come here, based on the metrics that they have to meet and have been established for the market. Could you speak to that please?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President. Yeah, interestingly enough for my own business, I looked at the possibility of installing a fuel cell and I think the bottom price at the lowest level, you could get is probably \$5 million. So it's great for a Pfizer location where they use that much power and they have their own power plant. Yeah. They do their own generation and they only pay for the hookup to the grid. So, I don't think it would make economic sense for that. I would hope that they would look at diesel, not diesel generators necessarily, maybe your natural gas generators, which have lower emissions. But I think that the scale really requires the diesel generation at this point.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes. I will just, -- and my comments today on, I think this for us here in the State of Connecticut provides us with a brand new opportunity. One that we have not really seen in a lifetime. One that would go on for years and years, decades to come. That could give us the opportunity, not only for job creation, but to really put us on the map. And if you look at what other states have done, not only

our data centers typically used by places like Facebook and Google who are committed to a zero carbon footprint going forward.

Although, these states may have no tax within these data farms, what you typically see, and you can Google, Google and see it yourself is a headquarter comment that is taxable. That is between three and 500 high paying jobs in that area. And if you think about what that can do to some of our cities and our towns in the State of Connecticut, it is a huge opportunity. And we do have the backup that if a town or a city does not want to partake, they don't have to, but we need to make sure that our state is in a position where we can attract new technology and this is just one first step in being able to do that. So, I rise. I hope other people will join me in supporting this Bill going forward. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Will you remark further? Senator Lesser. And Senator Lesser will be followed by Senator Maroney. Good evening, Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Good evening, Madam President, and good to see you. I rise to speak on this Bill. And at the outset, let me just say that I have no questions for Senator Needleman and he's been doing a stellar job of defending this legislation and deserves a little bit of a rest. Thank you, Senator Needleman.

When I came to the Capitol today, fully prepared to vote against this legislation. I have a number of concerns with the Bill as written. They include environmental, labor, fiscal, racial justice concerns. I found myself today in an unusual position at sometimes agreeing with colleagues like Senator Sampson, that I don't always agree with, or seldom agree with on big issues. And yet I stand

here torn because while many of my concerns remain, I am grateful to Governor Lamont and his commissioners and senior staff to Senator Looney and to one heroic colleague in particular to my good friend, Senator Christine Cohen for burning the midnight oil and making significant improvements to what had been in my mind, a flawed proposal.

I appreciate, and in no way, want to undercut the significant improvements, particularly on the environmental side to their good faith work. And yet I have some concerns that remain. We are gathered here to try to lure an industry to Connecticut that as far as I can tell, will provide few lasting jobs, but provides major costs. Those costs are to taxpayers who will be providing the industry with significant 30 year tax breaks. Go our energy grid, which will be taxed by enormous strain when we should be working to double down on efficiency. It will make it harder for us to achieve our state's greenhouse gas reduction targets. It'll tax our air quality in our environment because we will be adding these massive diesel backup generators, the most polluting generation source we have available. And we'll tax our most vulnerable communities because not only are we trying to lure these industries to our state, but we're providing them with tax incentives for them to locate in the poorest sections of our state, the opportunity zones and enterprise zones communities already fighting for environmental justice and the notion that we as a state can offload our environmental problems onto communities that have the limited ability to say now.

We are once again playing the same old loser's game of tax competition, where corporations play one jurisdiction off against the other. We're the only loser being the public and other places like the European Union, that kind of tax competition is illegal. But in American 2021, New York and New Jersey's misfortune, I suppose, could be our gain

until maybe some other bottom dwelling state comes up and outdoes.

The race to the bottom when it comes to corporate taxation has been a failure that has exacerbated income inequality and stagnant economic growth. So what are we getting in return? Local property taxes, not much in state tax dollars because of the tax breaks that I mentioned, but we do get a vague promise of ancillary benefits. Senator Somers mentioned that we may be able if we get the data centers to eventually lure a corporate headquarters, and there are some jobs associated with the ongoing operation of these data centers.

And you do want to talk about the job piece in particular, because much has been said about one developer promising a project labor agreement to the building trades. He should be commended. No doubt about it, the construction benefits are real and will make a difference for hard-working residents of this state, but I've read the Bill and there is no language about jobs or working conditions anywhere in the Bill as currently drafted. And it seems to me that if the state wants to get in the business of providing money or tax breaks to any project, decent pay and labor piece should always be part of the bargain. That's the essential compromise that underlay the Davis-Bacon Act that was passed, what 70, 80, 90 years ago. And it's long-time pass for us in Connecticut to demand that of any business that's receiving the support of the taxpayers of the state of Connecticut.

I'm going to continue to listen the debate. I appreciate the good faith negotiations that have strengthened the environmental side of this Bill. And I will reserve judgment at this time, but I want to thank Senator Needleman for his strong advocacy for the legislation. And we'll remain listening as the debate continues. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further? Senator Duff. Oh, Senator Maroney.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

We'll wait for Senator Maroney to head over to us.

THE CHAIR:

Accept the yield.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

So, I will just keep talking until Senator Maroney gets over here.

THE CHAIR:

Excellent. And for the benefit of the members of the Chamber, Senator Maroney will be followed by Senator Kasser.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Compliments to Senator Maroney on his wonderful tie, what's going on today.

THE CHAIR:

It is a stunning tie, Senator Maroney.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'll yield to Senator Maroney.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maroney. Do you accept the yield, sir?

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Yes, I do, Madam President. I rise in support of this Bill and I have no questions for Senator Needleman at this time. I just wanted to make a few comments. I think Senator Needleman spoke to our history in the state. One of the towns I represent or one of the cities I represent is Milford and in our history we have an inventor named George Willard Coy who invented the switchboard and the first switchboard was in New Haven. And so, we started as a state, again, at one point we were the most innovative state in the nation. I think we're ranked number four, but on our way back to the top, we really spearheaded modern communications and communications by telephone. And this data center Bill will help us get in this forefront of modern communications.

In real estate, they say there are three things, location, location, location, and as a state, we have a wonderful location in which this Bill will enable us to play those cards well dealt and utilize the fiber line that as Senator Needleman commented, runs between Boston and New York and attract many high paying jobs that will put us, that are critical for the success of the new economy.

So I am proud to support this Bill and I will yield my remaining time. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Maroney. And I misspoke, we will hear from Senator Hartley. Next to you will be followed by Senator Kasser. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Will the Senate stand at ease for a moment, please?

THE CHAIR:

And the Senate will stand at ease. Good evening, Senator Hartley. So nice to see you.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Good evening, Madam President and likewise yes, it is evening. Isn't it? Well, first of all, Madam President, I want to start by saying that as always, it's an honor to have your leadership here in the circle and also in the State of Connecticut, as we continue to push through the pandemic. And I'm very grateful for your many visits to my hometown.

Madam President, so House Bill 6514, AN ACT CONCERNING INCENTIVES FOR QUALIFIED DATA CENTERS TO LOCATE IN THE STATE is on its face, an economic incentive package. But actually, it's much more than that. With the passage of this Bill, we will position Connecticut to grow an economic center, an economic sector, which is in fact, the cornerstone of the 21st century economy and jobs.

In recognizing as we must, that data is the currency of the 21st century. And that data centers are central to the emerging technologies that are revolutionizing our world, revolutionizing our jobs. It is present in medicine, manufacturing, education, finance, environment, in our everyday lives, work or play or quality of life. And so it is data centers that are the engines, which power the transmission of massive amounts of data. And I guess we could say a blink of the eye, but that also is an accurate, because it's actually much faster than a blink of the eye. We are talking about milliseconds, Madam President and blink of an eye actually is because I looked this up about 100 milliseconds. We're talking a much smaller detail, a millisecond by the way is one 1000th of a second.

So it's about the transmission performance of data. And actually, that is the, the layperson's term for the definition for latency. It's about latency and

latency is the delay which occurs before the transfer of data begins. And this is where state of Connecticut's sweet spot is. This is where Connecticut's geography puts us with a great advantage with a great edge in this sector, which will help us exponentially be competitive in this new technology in this new world.

So it's about latency, how fast data is transmitted. And as many of my colleagues have indicated today and I'm trying to talk about things that maybe we haven't talked about before in today's a very interesting exchange. There are 33 States that have these kinds of structures and there are some very big players, Texas, Georgia, [inaudible] Oklahoma, Idaho. And so, it is a very, very competitive arena. And for example, it's obvious that speed and rapidity is integral, for example, to the operations, in the financial markets, in the metropolitan area.

It's really all about the movement and the rapidity of that data. So for instance, to transmit data from Texas to the Northeast, it takes about 14 to 15 milliseconds. Once again, remember a blink of the eye is between 100 and 400 milliseconds. So we are talking about speeds that are almost unimaginable. From Virginia to New York, it takes seven to eight milliseconds, but for us here in Connecticut, it takes between 1.2 to 1.5 milliseconds for those transmissions.

So, it's kind of like, you know, that old classical saying that time is money, and that matters in business and especially, in this era of technology, which we now find ourselves living. A good example probably is the driverless vehicles. They are dependent upon the rapid transmission of information, so as to calculate real time and make real-time decisions. And, you know, when we thought that driverless vehicles were going to be so often the future, but like one of those futuristic new

movies, it's not true. It's here, it's happening and it's real.

So clearly our geography is our advantage, Madam President, and it was with this in mind and also with the mission that we asked this administration, this Governor, this head of economic development, the newly formed advanced CT to market this state to be out there on the forefront, identifying, bringing to us, these opportunities. That is exactly what is before us today. Madam President, I would like to commend the Governor for acting so swiftly to position us, to capitalize on this opportunity because it clearly is an opportunity. And, you know, I listened very carefully to some of the comments of my colleagues, and the fact is that, in this universe of competition, part of the negotiations are always about what incentives. And so, in order to be in this competition, we have to equip ourselves to compete. And that's exactly what House Bill 6514 does.

And then I'd also like to point out in addition to the economic incentives, which are not as we've seen in the past, upfront, they are not at the expense of taxpayers. There is an equally important part in this package and that is the assurance, the promise of certainty. There will be up to. It doesn't necessarily have to be 30 years, but it could be up to 30 years of an exemption from any financial services levy or tax and assurance is what it's basically certainty and certainty to business and industry is what builds a business. Certainty is what businesses build on. It's what businesses invest in. And we want them to build in Connecticut. We want them to invest in Connecticut. I do want to mention that I was very concerned about, you know, the number of jobs. It is true after the construction phase, which will be significant advantages in terms of growing construction jobs, that the number of jobs to actually run such a center is not in those proportions.

However, when you look across the country in all of these other data centers, on average, the multiplier, the job multiplier runs from one to three to one to five. The multiplier for manufacturing is one to seven. So, I think that this is very, very much in the range and it also, once again, has so many other exponential benefits to the entire sector and puts us on the map that we are open for business. We are about 21st century jobs. We are about 21st century economy. So, Madam President, I wholeheartedly support this proposal. And once again, I commend the Governor for bringing it to this point. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Hartley. Will you remark further. Senator Kasser and Senator Kasser will be followed by Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. While I have the deepest respect for the proponent of this Bill and the administration that put it forward. And I do support the goal of this Bill, which is to bring business to Connecticut.

I have serious reservations about the structure of the Bill. This bill creates an incentive in the form of a guaranteed 30 year moratorium on taxes. For 30 years, these large data centers that consume enormous amounts of energy and employ skeletal staff will pay almost no taxes.

What are these data centers do while they house data, but they also act as terminals for financial transactions, most likely arbitrage trading. Billions, perhaps trillions of dollars of financial transactions. Will there be any sales tax on any of those transactions? No. Any financial transactions tax? No.

Thirty years is a long time to give an industry a free pass on taxes. And this concept has been tried before. The State of Connecticut had a practice of giving tax breaks. They gave tax breaks to companies like GE and when the tax breaks ended, the companies picked up and left. GE went to Massachusetts, employees lost their jobs, or relocated. The GE building in Stamford is vacant to this day.

I thought we learned a lesson from that that tax breaks may lure companies to Connecticut, but they don't keep them. So, what exactly is Connecticut getting in return for this 30 year tax break? I appreciate and recognize that some towns where these data centers will be located, will get some incremental property taxes. And that is important. I do not in any way discount the importance of that, but I must ask at what price.

Data centers are notorious for their consumption of energy and the energy grid in Connecticut is already fragile. We all remember the devastation of tropical storm Isaias just six months ago, over 800,000 Connecticut residents lost power. Some lost power for two weeks. Lives were disrupted. Our economy was disrupted. People were driving to public places just to get a signal. Imagine what will happen when we add data centers with their enormous demand for energy to this already fragile energy system. I shudder at the thought.

I'm also deeply concerned about how these centers compromise our commitment to clean energy. Data centers are notorious for their environmental impact. And I appreciate my good colleagues, Senator Cohen, asking questions specific to the environmental impact. And I share my colleagues hope that this very important aspect of this industry will be addressed in future legislation, but I can't in good conscience support, inviting a polluting industry to Connecticut without serious safeguards in place. And those safeguards are not yet in this Bill.

Additionally, to my environmental concerns, I am also concerned about the real economic metrics. The Bill does not have economic metrics in place. How many long-term jobs will these centers create? Yes, they will create many construction jobs maybe for a year or two years. But as soon as construction is over, those jobs are done. Maintaining data centers requires only a skeletal staff, a handful of jobs because data centers are not run by people. They're run by software. Basically, they run themselves.

So, with this Bill, I believe we're selling Connecticut short. We're competing for a business that comes at a significant cost, an enormous burden on our energy grid, air pollution, environmental impact, and no real long-term sustainable job creation.

So again, while I support the goal, absolutely wholeheartedly support the goal and intention of this Bill, which is to bring new businesses to Connecticut, I believe that we can do better. We can attract businesses that create long-term growth, that generate hundreds of well-paying jobs, and that optimize the potential of our great state.

I am concerned about setting a precedent of selling the right to pollute and giving away tax credits. Because if this Bill passes and I do hope it will be revised later with serious guardrails and metrics, but with all due respect to the proponent of this Bill and to the administration that proposed it, I regret that I can't support it in its current form until those environmental and economic metrics are specified. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Kasser. Will you remark further? Good evening, Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Good evening again, Madam President. Good afternoon still, we have a few minutes left. I rise in support of the legislation before us today, and I'll have just a few short questions for the proponent.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir. And Senator Needleman, prepare yourself.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. My questions as we both serve together on the Energy Committee, there's been much concern and much talk about the amount of power that is expected to be used to operate one or more of these centers throughout our state.

And there's been some conversation that I've heard both for and against the benefits of that or the detriment of that. Specifically, as it relates to potential impact on the transmission fee and whether that will be a help or the generation supply that we have here in the state of Connecticut. Are we able to adapt to move forward? And I think that's an important question to resolve. So, through you, Madam Chairman, I ask the good Senator, if he could have an opinion on that. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President, thank you Senator Formica. My understanding of having had conversations with the ISO that there is adequate capacity for this, and I do want to address any issues that were brought up prior to this, about the impact on the grid.

Our failures in Connecticut with regard to storm outages were as a result of distribution systems, as opposed to actual capacity markets. The failure in Texas was largely a function of a failure of generation, not distribution. Connecticut's has had successor problems with storms with regard to the distribution system, largely because we're a very wooded state.

These centers would be served directly on transmission lines because of the amount of power that they consume. And I don't believe that we would neither have enough power to handle these, nor would we be able to get enough generation and quite frankly, renewable generation online to manage this amount of capacity requirement.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. I'm not sure I misunderstood. Did you say we would not have the capacity to do that?

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

No, we would have the capacity.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

We would have the capacity. Sorry. I misunderstood. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

You know, you and I do a lot of work focused on energy and there is a lot of work on necessary to upgrade our grid and our transmission supply. These data centers use an enormous amount of electricity and they will need some backup capabilities there and that's all going to be built in.

And my reading of the Bill indicates that the negotiations for that energy will be part of the agreement that these data center owner operators would have with the host community. Am I correct in that? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President, that's absolutely the case. Largely these are likely to be developed in communities that have municipal power authorities and they negotiate directly on behalf of their customers.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. And so is this because these data centers don't want to negotiate with Eversource or utility or larger utilities like Eversource and United Illuminating. They want to get into the smaller groups is because of the flexibility and the nimbleness they may have, or just for the record, I want to kind of get this, through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President. That's an interesting question. It is largely because the way we don't regulate the municipal electric companies in the state of Connecticut, they are not subject to much of the public benefit charge that the rest of the utilities, the regulated part of the utility infrastructure is regulated.

So whenever we pass a Bill to go for green energy or energy efficiency, where we use that money to enhance the energy efficiency and green goals of the state, there's a public benefit cost to that. In addition to that, the smaller municipal electric companies are able to provide good quality service and good reliability and rapid response in the times of outages at a lower cost.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. So really the simple answer is that local municipal electric utilities are not burdened by the cumbersome additions that somehow find their way into the billing of larger utilities based on policy initiatives that are enacted.

THE CHAIR:

Sarah Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President. Well, I guess that would be one way to phrase it. I would say that a lot of work has been done to move the state forward to more renewables and to provide benefits to lower-

income people, so that they can improve their energy efficiency. The state has a lot of programs to move the needle on climate change and affordability because they tend to go hand in hand.

I would say a lot of those benefits do fall to the municipals, but the municipals don't actually fall under the regulatory oversight of PURA. So that's a great benefit to them. I do know for a fact, because I've been to a public utility -- municipal public utilities and they do provide other community benefits.

So, you know, I would not recommend obviously that the state have all municipal electric companies because I don't think it would work. The interconnections would not make sense, but the legacy municipal electric companies seemed to have a niche. And they're not under the oversight of PURA at this point.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. I may have one more question. I'll direct you to line 149. It's my understanding that this is an important competitive section where it talks about the data centers, any operator or affiliate or an co-location tenant of a qualified data center shall be exempt from any financial transaction tax or fee that may be imposed by the state on trades of stocks, bonds, derivatives.

My understanding is where these data centers are located in other states, perhaps those states are either enacting or contemplating such a transaction fee, and this would then make them less competitive and keeping those data centers, and perhaps having this language in this Bill would be more of an

incentive to move the data centers here, as well as the tax abatement over 30 years. Would that be correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you, Madam President. So, that's another great question. And I want to clarify that there are, data centers that are being built for the big cloud tech companies like Google and Amazon and Apple, transaction taxes are completely irrelevant to the equation for them. And it's the tax exemption that matters. The opportunity to attract one of the major stock exchanges or multiple stock exchanges, that's where the transaction tax matters and yes, they are shopping states to find somebody that's not going to impose that tax.

And I want to speak for a moment to the idea, again, as I said earlier in my remarks, I could debate Hamilton versus Jefferson all day long, whether we should have a single union with general rules governing every state so that states don't compete or whether the system that we have in place, which is that states compete. We live in a country where the states compete. We compete all the time. My opinions on that don't matter whether I like it or not is completely irrelevant, but I will say that's the reality that we live in.

And we need to recognize that we're in a competitive environment. And if we choose to go after businesses to locate in our state with incentives, that today do not cost the taxpayers of the state of Connecticut money. They don't cost money. We are not giving out tax breaks and cash on the line in order for you to move here. It's not a bribe. It's an incentive. We worked very hard to provide those incentives because other states around us are doing

it all the time. To us the incentives that Texas is willing to offer for the NASDAQ to move to Texas is a constitutional amendment saying that they'll never impose a tax.

We are in a competitive world, and we need to do what we need to do to try to stay competitive. Much was said earlier, and in my remarks, I did speak to this statistics about the size, the amount of growth the State of Connecticut has. I love Connecticut. I love living here. I love having my business here.

A lot of the problems that Connecticut has faced has been demographics. We've had an older population for many years. Many of our kids have ended up moving to other states. Many are moving back. So, the overall population has not grown jobs have not grown enough, but tech jobs are the jobs of the future. We need to build a tech industry in the State of Connecticut. We're trying to do with biotech. We need to do it with tech.

We absolutely need to do what Senator Osten said and respect and appreciate businesses like eBay and the TRIBE and Pratt & Whitney and the insurance industry. But that's not enough. We need to bring new businesses. And the way we're going to do that is by being competitive. This is a competitive aspect of this Bill. It's a very long answer to a very short question.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Needleman. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. From you, Senator Needleman, I never expect the short answer even to a long question. So, the point I was making is that this is not a tax that we're imposing now in the State of Connecticut, that they're getting absolved from.

This is just as you so eloquently, pointed out an opportunity to attract business. And it's another portion in this Bill that opens up a variety of businesses that can now apply for data centers, as you said, the Googles and the Facebooks, and now the financial data centers in the world. So, I don't know that I have any other questions for you, but I will make a few statements, and perhaps we can speak a little bit later. So thank you.

Madam President, I am in favor of this Bill, and I know that there's been some conversation about why give tax abatements for 30 years. Well, the number I guess, was worked out based on the financing agreement and the amount of investment that will be provided to communities here in Connecticut.

It is not though that these data centers are going to be here with no charge. There is a strong provision in this group. And you heard Senator Osten talk about the work of the Eastern Connecticut Delegation, making sure that there was strong provisions in here to protect communities that may be host to these data centers.

Excuse me. And by hosts, I mean, there must be an agreement. That the host city and the data center developers must come to in payment in lieu of those taxes that has to occur before anything gets moved forward. So, the question is, if a building that's being built is generating X number of million dollars in taxes, or would've generated X number of million dollars in taxes, but the host agreement comes together and says, we agree on paying you 2 million in a host city agreement. That's 2 million. Then most of these more, 2 million more than most of these communities are seeing now. And 2 million times 30 is significantly more than most of these agreements are seeing now.

So, I think that there are protections. I think there are opportunities. We've talked about

construction jobs and we've talked about ongoing jobs. And those aren't the real reason that we try to derive business economics, our only reason, 50, 60, 70, a hundred jobs to operate these things may not seem like quite a bit, but the draw that this data center, these data centers may have for other support vendors or other headquarters that may choose to locate here within the vicinity of these data centers, certainly is a good move forward to try to incentivize, not only the business that the data centers would create, not only the benefits to the local communities at the host center dollars would generate, but also the opportunity to grow our economic base by attracting support vendors and headquarters.

So I stand in favor of this and I would like to close by thanking the good Chairman of the Commerce Committee, Senator Hartley, who spoke of the word certainty. Certainty is what businesses need. She knows that quite well. She's been serving in that position for a long time, helping to move commerce. We need certainty in business in Connecticut, not only for those people that we're trying to attract, but for those people we're here.

And I will echo the comments of my good friend, Senator Osten, that it's more than time to move the situation with the tribes forward in terms of developing an Online Gaming Bill. We can do this. We should be able to do that very quickly. And I know that people are working hard on that, but I'm hopeful that after the conversation tomorrow in the public hearing, there will be an added incentive as this Bill passes tonight and the conversations of the benefits of what our tribal partners have brought to us over the years, as that becomes more public in the public hearing tomorrow, that we will continue to not only support this new type of industry as we have the offshore wind industry, for example, but let's take care of those partners who live and work with us each and every day and provide so much to the communities that they serve.

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

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in support of the Emergency Certified Bill and believe that data centers are an important growth aspect for the State of Connecticut, but that doesn't mean we have to trade good jobs for a good environment. It's not an either or scenario.

We can have a burgeoning 21st century economy and clean air all at the same time. And I believe that we're working to strike that balance and we have worked to strike that balance over many years, if not decades.

Connecticut is well positioned to attract the data industry. We have some of the best, if not the best. I know we have the best workforce in the entire country. We have building trades that are ready and able to get to work. We have the available real estate and we have some of the fastest latency speeds in the entire country.

So, between our productive, highly productive workforce, our real estate, our building trades people and our latency speeds, we're ready to hit the go button right away. And so, it's coming upon us to look at these opportunities as they come along and say, is this a place, is this a match for the State of Connecticut?

As a matter of fact, Madam President, we have a data center in the City of Norwalk and it's been there for a number of years. It's small but chose Norwalk

because of the intersection of our, one of our municipal electrical departments, our larger utility and the redundancy that it has on that open in that space.

And so, I understand the need and the desire for what our data centers need. They make no mistake whether they come to Connecticut or go someplace else, they're going to get built. As we said around the circle a lot, the data industry and cloud computing and cloud services are doing nothing but growing right now at an exponential factor.

And the question is whether or not Connecticut is going to be a part of that and what we can do responsibly ourselves with that. But I do believe that as I said, a clean environment and a burgeoning industry can go hand in hand. And I think that them coming into Connecticut would be a good thing for us and our clean environment.

As a matter of fact, we've talked here today about our renewable portfolio standard and the fact that Connecticut has aggressive goals on clean energy to address climate change. We don't burn coal here in the State of Connecticut. We have just procured a large amount of wind energy. We have a growing solar industry as well.

So that puts us in a place that most other states are not when it comes to how we utilize our energy and how best to address an industry that does use quite a bit of energy. But we know that there's lots of good jobs here as well. So, our job here in this building is to make sure we are balancing the need for 21st century jobs and clean air. And so, I certainly appreciate the work that has been done between our Commerce Committee, Energy Committee, the Environment Committee, our executive branch with DCD and the Governor's office and others, Senator Looney, myself and those who've had conversations with regard to how best do we position ourselves with this.

Let's make no mistake. Many other states across this nation are also looking to attract these data centers because they know that these are growth opportunity for them. And as was said earlier, Texas of all places is looking to put a constitutional amendment to not have a financial tax.

So this is serious, this is serious business, and we know that these can provide and grow some good jobs here in the state. And we've always done that. We've always invented and reinvented ourselves over many generations. We have a very strong financial services industry in Connecticut, very strong insurance industry in the State of Connecticut, very strong defense industry in Connecticut, a very strong manufacturing industry in the State of Connecticut and a very strong and growing biotech industry in the State of Connecticut.

So, the table is set. We have plenty of room for more industry to come here in Connecticut and be able to work out the questions and balance of industry and jobs, and also a clean environment at the same time.

We have always worked hard for a clean environment here in Connecticut, where other states are still burning coal. They don't have renewable portfolio standards. They don't have clean energy or conservation funds. They don't do a lot of the things that we do here or in there, maybe decades behind where we are. Remember, Connecticut was the first state in the nation to have a green bank. And now it's being replicated all over Connecticut, all over the country.

So, Madam President, I'm pleased that we're at this point, and know that we still have some work to do. I want to thank everybody, who's had a voice in this process to get this Bill to where it is today, and we'll continue to speak on this and make sure we perfect it even further. And I would urge my

colleagues to vote yes on the bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Duff. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? I would ask the Clerk to please call the vote. And before he does that, I do want to say that Senator Bradley will be voting remotely for the rest of the session. So, with that, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 6514. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 6514. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? If so, the machine will be closed. And we will now record the votes of the Senators who are voting remotely. And Mr. Clerk, Senator Anwar votes in the affirmative and Senator Flexer votes in the negative and Senator Bradley votes in the negative. So after those votes are recorded, would you kindly call the tally, sir?

CLERK:

House Bill 6514.

Total number voting	34
Those voting Yea	29
Those voting Nay	5
Absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

And the measure is adopted. (Gavel) Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 7, Calendar No. 46, House Bill No. 6515, AN ACT
CREATING A RESPECTFUL AND OPEN WORLD FOR NATURAL
HAIR.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Kushner. And we're getting
your microphone up and running. There you go.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Good evening, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

It's good to see you here. It's been a long day, but
I stand -- I rise to move passage of the Emergency
Certified Bill in concurrence with the House and
seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on a passage, please do
summarize.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'm here in support of
AN ACT CREATING A RESPECTFUL AND OPEN WORLD FOR
NATURAL HAIR. This Bill makes it illegal practice to
discriminate based on hair texture and protective
hairstyles in employment, public accommodations,
housing, credit practices, union membership, and
state agency practices.

It does so by making traits historically associated with race, including hair texture and protective hairstyles, part of the meaning of race. Under the Bill, protective hairstyles include braids, locks and twists. It also includes wigs and head wraps and hairstyles that include cornrows, Bantu knots, Afro, and Afro puffs.

It adds to the existing Human Rights Law under the jurisdiction of the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities. And CHRO has the authority to investigate claims of discriminatory practices. I have been astounded by some of the testimony we heard when we brought out this bill. It was not surprising, but hurtful to hear so many stories of workers and students and people who had found that they had been discriminated on the basis of the texture of their hair or the style of their hair.

I think particularly this year, this year, where we as a country mourned after the murder of George Floyd, this year after we pledged to be better anti-racist, this year that we pledged to attack systemic racism, is incredibly important that today we pass the CROWN Act. There will be others of my colleagues that will be able to address this from their own lived experience. And they'll be able to, I think, show us the depth and the importance of this Bill.

But I have to say that it's been my honor to be in a position on the Labor Committee to work in a bipartisan way to address racism in our society. This is probably the first, at certainly the first time in my experience, but it may be the first time in a very long time that a Bill came out of labor with a unanimous vote.

It had complete bipartisan support. And I want to say how important that I think this moment is. This will be the first Bill that we pass in this session that will be intentionally directed toward fighting racism. But I have to say, I hope it's not the last. The events of last summer, brought us together as a

nation to say that we will be better. And I think this is just one step. There is so much more as a country and as a state that we need to do to attack systemic racism.

I could give you facts and figures about the number of people that have felt discriminated against through research done by universities and policy institutes. But I think what is most important today is to recognize that while we are not the first state to pass this Bill, seven other states have already passed the CROWN Act. I believe that we will do it in a way that is better than the other states, more intentional and more directed.

And with that, I must say I've been proud to stand with my colleagues to support this Bill, to urge the passage of this Bill. And I think we, as a state will be better when this Bill is signed into law. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Kushner. And will you remark further? Senator Duff. And Senator Duff will be followed by Senator Looney.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise to support the Emergency Certified Legislation. And want to commend Senator Kushner for her words that she just brought to the floor of the Senate right now that we hope that this is not the last Bill that deals with systemic racism in our state and our nation. And yet this is the first bill and one that we hope there are many others.

We all talked many months ago after the George Floyd murder about looking at our laws and ways in which we can promote equity that we could make Connecticut a more welcoming place as is our tradition. We'll look at ways in which many times, we have policies,

or there are policies that impact people that sometimes we don't know about, or we're not always acutely aware of.

And that's why it's important for this Legislature to always be listening and acting and leading on behalf of all of our residents here in the State of Connecticut. I know that Senator Kushner and the Labor Committee along with Representative Porter and others have worked very hard on this legislation. And that, this is extremely important for all of us. And I'm very proud to be voting for this today.

I'm also proud of the fact that we are bringing this legislation out early in the legislative session, that we have this opportunity to do this now, rather than in the waning days of the legislative session when sometimes good bills get lost because of time. So this is a priority, I know for many people on both sides of the aisle of the Legislature, and again, I just wanted to thank the proponents of the legislation. Thanks Senator Kushner for her words and her leadership and bringing it forward, our caucus for making this a priority as well and for all those who are going to support the legislation today. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Will you remark further? Senator Looney and Senator Looney will be followed by Senator Winfield.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, speaking in support of the Emergency Certified Bill. First, I would want to join our majority leader in thanking Senator Kushner for her work and her advocacy and the Labor Committee on this Bill, and also for her steadfast effort to make sure that this subject was part of the agenda for this session to move it forward early in the session with the other

items that we have taken up today with the sense that it deserved his place of urgency here today. And I'm pleased that, pleased that it is.

It is also important to recognize that discrimination occurs in many forms in many ways. And that's a sense of alienation and a sense of being a fronted and a sense of being marked as unequal or somehow outside the conventional majority can be imposed on someone in a variety of ways. And some of the workplace discrimination that we have heard about regarding hairstyles in the workplace has been used as a, sometimes subtle and sometimes not so subtle way of labeling people as other, as focusing upon their differences, as a way of somewhat of a sort of opaque, but nonetheless poisonous kind of discrimination that occurs in the workplace and this will be addressing that, calling that out making it illegal.

We heard some very compelling testimony in the House of Representatives last week from Representative Toni Walker and Representative Pat Billie Miller, Representative Robyn Porter, Senator Christine Cohen about what black women have experienced in the workplace and in other settings over the years.

Our debate today will be concluded by Senator Moore who will be speaking about this Bill from her point of experience. So again, Madam President, this is an important issue. It goes back, I think, to some of the enhanced awareness to civil liberties and civil justice issues that we committed to last summer in the wake of all of the turmoil that was going on that time in the wake of the killing of George Floyd and other events that gained momentum since that time.

So, this is a manifestation of our continued interest in those issues. And the fact that, we have made a commitment that issues of civil justice and racial justice will be a focal point and a prism

through which we'll be looking at so many issues during this session. So, thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Senator Winfield, who will be followed by Senator Cicarella. Good evening, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I want to begin by thanking Senator Kushner for her work on a Bill for bringing out the Bill. I also want to thank Representative Porter who, if, you know, Representative Porter, you just know the depth of her character and how she fights back issues that we all should be fighting for, but don't always fight for. And she always seems to bring the right issue right in front of us.

And I wanted to start there because as much as I had planned on writing some things down and spending some time really thinking about the way in which I was going to say to things, I felt I needed to say that didn't happen as I felt like I needed to put that out there at the beginning, because it is because of the work of Rep. Porter that we stand here today.

And I want to talk about why this issue is important to me. And I think we focus a lot on black women as we should, but this is an issue that is beyond even just black women, it's an issue about black people, it's an issue about identity and it's an issue about whether or not we get to be who we naturally are.

And I was just having a conversation with Senator Cabrera about what my kids were born. I was telling him about how, when my children were born, I had issues connecting to them because of things that happened in my past and emotional things. But one of the things that I told him was that in the instant,

when they were born, he handed my son to me and I froze. I think I've told this before. And I froze because of some issues I had emotionally, but I also froze because I was thinking about the world I had just brought children into, and things they would have to experience.

And I think a lot of people think about this only in the context of what it is to go out into the world and work and interact with people. But I think of this a little bit differently because I remember what it was to be a young black person and be given messages about who you are and who you can appear as. Messages that I would never want to give to my own children. The messages I think we still today have to wrestle with about giving to our children, even though we've advanced.

And so, when I was a child, I remember the smell of my sister's hair being burned. I think about my daughter. What do I tell her about what is acceptable? Because I tell that young lady right now, who's three years old. She's beautiful. And that she's perfect the way that she is, but also have to wrestle with her walking out into the world.

And right now, she runs through life with all of the energy that she has, with all of the beauty that she has with her hair natural, that's who she is. It's not just what sits on top of her head. It is who she is. But I want her to be able to participate in his world fully. And so even if she runs through this world with her natural hair, there will be a discussion about what it is to run through this world with her natural hair.

And what she will have to learn, whether she makes the choice to run through this world with her natural hair or not is that a part of her is not acceptable. That beautiful and agentic young lady will have to learn that part of her is not acceptable.

And my son's going to learn that too, by the way. He's going to hear people talk about his hair, his nappy hair, and you better get it under control. And he's going to see his sister wrestle with it. And if she has, as I hope she does, she maintains her natural hair. He's going to see, because see, we don't talk about all of what it is to even maintain that natural hair and whatever state we maintain, she's going to have her wash day. We don't talk about.

Right, I'm not talking about washing your hair. She's going to have her wash day. What she struggles with, she wrestles with her hair because she figures out whether she puts the moisturizer conditioner and the oil or the oil and the moisturizer and a conditioner, she figures out what her scheme is, and those who understand what I'm talking about. This is a real thing, and other people get to wake up, get in the shower, wash their hair, walk out to be considered professional while my daughter is going to have to struggle with that and be told it's not good enough.

When there's nothing wrong with that hair 'cause it grows naturally out of her head like that. A part of you is not good enough. A part of you is not acceptable. And I think some people probably are watching me thinking, really, what is this all about? Is this really that serious? It is serious because I'm going to tell you something in this country that had been serious enough that we've actually passed laws to outlaw black hair. Sounds crazy, right.

We did it in Louisiana because black women had beautiful hair. So, attracted that they thought it would attract white men. So, they passed laws to outlaw the beautiful black hair of black women and forced them to wear these head wraps. And then they started wearing these beautiful head wraps and they wanted to get rid of those too.

So when Bill talks about the hair and it talks about the things that protect the hair, there's a reason for that, there is history for that. The way that we have talked about hair in this country is not just about the hair, but it is about the blackness of the people who wear the hair. The way that this is developed, it's anti-black. So, when we say it's a part of me, it's a part of me as a black person. And it is about being against that.

Sometimes we actually even forget our history because we didn't to stand what the history was and being anti-black has allowed us to obscure on history. So, when we talk about things like dreadlocks, some people go, well, you know, we can allow for the natural hair, but those dreadlocks, right? We don't recognize that those things even penetrate across different cultures and not just black, the Celts had dreadlocks, Germanic tribes had had dreadlocks, Vikings had dreadlocks. And certainly, we found dreadlocks in ancient Egypt. Certainly, we find it in India, Shiva.

We find it across cultures, but there's something about when it is attached to blackness that we have a problem with. And I know some people don't like me talking about dreadlocks. They now talk about locks, but I talk about dreadlocks for a reason because we need to understand the history and how they connect to some things. We might have more respect for them if we actually did.

If we understood that like the, those who came before the people who were what we call dreadlocks, there are cultures that have always worn locks. And some people say that Samson from the Bible were dreadlock, seven of them. And he took the same pledge that those that we talk about in a Rastafarian religion take, not to cut his hair and that's where his strength came from.

So there's a beautiful thing about the dreadlock and that the warriors themselves were dreaded and at

their fear of God, put the fear of God into them. And we would talk about these things differently, but we don't because we see that as something that belongs to black people.

And I'm going to tell you what he does to people, because at one point when I had more hair, I thought about because to me, seeing the way that the hair twisted and unlocked, I thought it was beautiful. I thought about growing that hair, letting it do that. I never did that because I didn't think that was something you could do and do the things I wanted to do in life.

So why is this important? It is important because my daughter needs to be able to be who she naturally is. She needs to go through that wash day and figure out what her setup is and do all of the things she does with her hair and be able to be as respected as the person who gets up with their hair wet when they find themselves at work, dripping to be considered just as professional.

And we need to do something about this because this country has also done something about these things in the past in law. We can't just look at this as long as it's just that thing about hair, because other parents don't need to be standing there or sitting there, or holding their child or whatever the case may be struggling with. How do I tell them that they are as beautiful as I know them to be, and then tell them that they have to make that choice.

And that there's something that the world will see about you and your natural hair and say, it's not good enough. So, I hope that when we vote tonight, that vote reflects that we believe that the hair that grows naturally out of a person's head is not a problem.

And I've heard a lot of people around this circle tell me how beautiful my daughter is. And I hope if

you believe that the vote reflects that as well.
Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Cicarella, will you remark? And you will be followed by Senator McCrory.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of HB 6515, AN ACT CREATING A RESPECTFUL AND OPEN WORLD FOR NATURAL HAIR. I first begin by thanking Senator Kushner and Representative Porter who I have the pleasure of serving with on the Labor Committee for their leadership on this issue.

And I want to just share a few facts as I dug into this issue, as it came before us, that I think are important for those who may be even contemplating not voting for this legislation. A survey recently showed that 80% of black women are more likely to change their natural hair to conform to social norms or expectations at work, 30% are more likely to be made aware of a former workplace policy regarding appearance. And 1.5 times more likely to be sent home from their workplace because of the way they wear their hair.

Now, Senator Winfield's comments were moving and this is good law, but as we just heard, this is bigger than us just passing legislation. This bill symbolizes a strong step forward towards equality in our state. It sends a strong message that we will accept people as they are. How you wear your hair has no bearing on your ability to do your job. It should have no bearing on your qualifications for a job maybe applying for and in so many other areas. That's what we're doing here tonight.

You know, I have a eight year old biracial niece who I love to death, and sometimes she wears her hair

with braids and sometimes she puts cornrows in them. And she's the daughter I never had. And during the protests this past summer and the George Floyd situation, my wife and I were watching her for some hours, so her parents could get some time away and they had told us, you know, turn the TV off and, you know, we want to sort of protect her. And at a moment in the kitchen, as we were making a meal for her, she turned to us with her eyes welled up and she said, Thiel, which she calls me that that's Spanish for uncle. She says, why do people hate me? And my wife and I just froze. And of course, we hugged her and we told her we loved her and that she was beautiful and that she mattered and we affirmed her in any way possible.

That's the message we're sending here tonight, ladies and gentlemen. This bill is not just good law. It sends a strong message to all the little girls like my niece and boys that they matter, that they're valued. That they're loved no matter what they look like. I urge adoption. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Cicarella. Will you remark further on the legislation that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further? Senator McCrory, we'll make sure that your microphone is on and Senator McCrory, you will be followed by Senator Moore. Good evening, sir.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Good evening, Madam and to the Governor. So, I just want to put a couple of remarks out there. I won't be long. First of all, I want to thank Representative Porter and my colleagues, Julie, for bringing this piece of legislation forward.

You know, in the African-American black community, there are certain phrases that trigger you. There is

certain words that can be said that will trigger you, whether you're African-American or not, whether you live inside our community or not. Words like we shall overcome and makes you moves. That moves you a little bit, you know, again, 'cause you know what that mean? What that, how that makes you feel. There is other phrases like who taught you to hate yourself. See that's thing a little different, that's a different thing to you. So, I'm aligned my words with some, what I've learned through education.

See back in '53, Dr. Clark and his wife, they did a study with little black and white children. And this study was called the Doll Test. In Doll Test, they lined up dolls from the lightest to the darkness and the doctors asked these child, which child was ugly, which doll will look ugly, which child was dirty, which doll looks dumb. And every last one of the children, white children, all point to the dark doll. And black children, they struggle. You could see the test. You can go Google. And they painfully, they painfully, they all pointed to the dark little girl doll. And that was done in 1953. And that led to the Brown versus Board of Education Legislation. That was designed to desegregate public schools.

That same exam, that same test was taken again in 2010. And guess what? The same results. Now some of you might say, well, you know, that happened down south when they took the test in 1953, notice same test was given to children on this topic also Springfield, Massachusetts. So, there was a universal mentality out there.

This culturally conditioning was taking place for little black girls and black people in general, that your standard of beauty didn't exist. Your standard of beauty isn't beautiful. And we struggle with that in our country. And today, we struggle with, today. So, we have a piece of legislation here that tries to correct some of the wrongs that those little black girls who struggle when like Gary spoke about.

When they go to look for employment, they won't be prejudiced because of the type of hair they have because the hair grew up off the hair and grow out. Somehow that seems to be a problem for some.

But I'll say this in closing. We have this piece of legislation today and we can send a message to every other state in this union that on this day, Connecticut will say, we're going to let our queens wear their crowns without prejudice. Thank you. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator McCrory, and it's a pleasure to call upon Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you, Madam President, and thank you for this opportunity. For me, it's sad to be here at 72 years old, have watched the Civil Rights movement to see so many things happen to know that we have to put into law, a protection for black women to be who they are.

I want to begin by telling you my story. When I was in grammar school, a teacher sent home a card to me, my mother and said hey, Marilyn, this is for you. Give it to your mother. It was a little picture of a child in a tub with hair pulls up tight in a bow going through there. That was the ribbon, a bow. Now I thought she was being nice. I liked that teacher. I didn't see anything wrong with it. But when I took it home, my mother threw it in the garbage and she was so mad. I didn't understand her anger. I thought she was jealous of the teacher because the teacher had given me this card. She said there was nothing nice about that card, but we never had a conversation about it.

So, then I go through grade school and I get to be in the eighth grade, my father passed away and there

was a beauty shop across the street and everybody was getting their hair done. I have never put a chemical in my hair in my life other than to color it. And the hairdresser wanted to straighten my hair. My mother refused to let her do that. She said my hair was beautiful the way it was. And she would not allow anybody to straighten my hair.

Now little did I know that my mother was building me up, telling me all of this time that you are fine just the way God made you. Your hair is beautiful. Leave it alone. You don't have to conform to anything else.

I fast forward to coming to the General Assembly with Senator Gomes. And at that time, he had talked about running for Senate and a woman came up to me. She said, Oh, Marilyn, I heard, I hear you thinking about running. I said, Yeah, I'm considering it. I'm thinking about it. She asked me, what was I going to do with my hair? I thought she meant that you could see the gray 'cause I had colored it red that you could see the gray. Was I going to touch up my hair? She thought that I should straighten my hair to conform to being a pair of the Legislature. And I said to her, I'm not changing my hair. This is my hair. This is the way it is. And so, she said, you are so brave. I was so taken back. I said, Brave, what is brave about that? She said to wear your own hair. I said, Well, it's who I am.

That same conversation moved me to think about why am I coloring my hair? I'm coloring it to conform to what other people want me to look like to look younger than what I am, to not be who I am. And I decided I'm never going to come out here again. And I let my hair, the color grow out and continue to wear it natural. I have been wearing my hair natural for over 20 years. And during the sixties I wore one of the baddest fro's you ever want to see. Bad.

And so, I'm confident. I know who I am. My mother trained me up to know who I am, and stand who I am, but that's not true for everyone because that woman that spoke to me, she was black. She didn't have the confidence and believing that she could be herself. She felt as though I needed to assimilate to look like everybody else up here, especially when you're the only black woman in the Senate that I need to look like all the other white women. But no, I need to represent me because I know there are little black and brown girls looking at me back in the communities, saying, well, where am I in that circle? So I have to be who I am and I have to wear my hair like this. And I have to say, I'm just as important with my hair this way as everyone else.

Recently, I have Margaret Morton's granddaughter, is now on her mentor. She goes to school in Trumbull. A teacher touched her hair to try and figure out what was wrong with her hair, that she couldn't get it straight. That was the last year. And nobody saw anything wrong with that. They said to the teacher, it was inappropriate to touch your hair. Inappropriate. Yeah. But why is she touching it? What does she think that is different from her hair than the teacher's hair?

And now today I got a call from someone who works in the Legislature that one of the large chain restaurants told the young lady, 19 years old, that she needed to hide her dreadlocks. She needed - - she had to come back to work tomorrow and she needed to wear a hat on her head. And the young lady said, Well, I don't think I could get all of my hair under hat. She told her to figure that out. Well, we're going to figure it out for her when we pass this.

So, I want to read you something. When my ancestors were kidnapped from Africa, shackled and chained to boats and brought to the United States 400 years ago. White slave owners beat us, killed us if we weren't important. They didn't give up anything to

us. They took away our African customs. They tortured my forefathers for using the names that they were given and born with and to compliment the efforts of remaining black slaves they erase the African history.

Now those are not my words. I wish I had said that. They're the words of a young black woman, Stacy Graham-Hunt, who wrote an op-ed in a local paper. And I happened to read it on Saturday. She wrote it in context of identity and attempts to force people into assimilating into European ideas and erasing our culture.

That's really the root of the problem, trying to race the culture of people who were brought here, who didn't want to come, who were forced here, language taken away, families removed. And then when we seem to get to where we know who we are, and we start to look alike trying to take that away from us.

But when is here, just here, here is never just here. It's culture. It's pride. For me, it's my crown and glory. It's the silver and the sparkle in my hair. I love it. I own it. I'm proud of it. It's so important that when a woman is diagnosed with breast cancer, one of the first things she asked her doctor is, am I going to die? And he'll say, no, you can live through this if she found it early. Am I going to lose my hair in the treatment? That's how important hair is.

Dying and hair, it doesn't matter who it is. And for black women, it really is about culture and identity, but not just for black women here in every culture has been important. For native Americans, the braid is very important, not a single braid, not a two strand, but a three strand braid that strengthens it. In Chinese culture, the braid is important and people have cut braids off of Chinese people to humiliate them in the early days when they came to the United States to work, that was their

way of shaming them. That was their way of cutting them down. And for the Jewish who went into the ovens, who went into the work houses. They shaved their heads as a way to humiliate them. When they put them in the prisons, they shaved their heads. So when they came back out into the streets, people wouldn't know that they would, where they came from. It's about shaming. It's about taking some of something away from people what it means so much to them.

And so, it is about trying to keep people down. It is about not letting people be who they are. It is about trying to get people to assimilate to another culture that may not look like you. The symbols of the braids, the Rastafarians, the Afro that came into really prominence during the sixties, during a revolution of hair. How we got to this place in 2021, that we don't accept people for their hair, for their hair, that you want to judge someone because of the style of the hair, because it's not straight. Then judge them also for brown eye, blue eye. Judge them also, if they're not a blonde. Judge them for all of those things. But don't separate black people because we have found who we are and we want to wear it with pride.

Don't let me go into a job and find out that I can't get this job. You decided not to hire me because my hair was natural. I don't think I could live with knowing that I didn't stand up for myself. If I thought there was a chance that someone didn't hire me because of my hair, because of the color of my skin.

And so, when you think about what hair means in the historical perspective and the importance of hair in different cultures, you have to realize this is more than being black. This is about people who are in the dominant culture, who want to keep people in a certain place. The real issue that's brought to this point is the desire of oppressors to deny black people and brown people their culture. Call it for

what it is a continued desire by some to be the dominant culture and disrespect the culture of others that are not aligned with theirs.

Now I know there are legislators here in this Assembly who may never have thought about the hair and its relationship to their culture, but hopefully you'll think about it now and support the legislation. But know what I know that every day there is some black person who has been denied a job, an opportunity, and been judged by the choice of their hairstyle.

I want to end my comments by who I feel is a soldier in social justice and civil rights. He's a Bridgeport resident. And this appeared as an op-ed in the Connecticut Post. I'm going to share the complete article with my caucus, so they can hear this, because this is really important, how people hide behind certain things.

So, this illuminates something that I hear often from people who think they are fighting racial justice, and these are not my words. These are his. Some politicians, non-profits and corporations are quick to use the language of equity to appear to be anti-racist all the while upholding or even widening racial and economic disparities. It is time. It is time. It is time. It is time to do the right thing and support this Bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Moore. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, would you please call the roll? The machines will be opened.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill No. 6515. Immediate roll

call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 6515. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 6515. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be locked, and I will announce the votes of the Senators who are voting remotely. Senator Bradley votes in the affirmative, Senator Anwar votes in the affirmative and Senator Flexer votes in the affirmative. And with that, Mr. Clerk, if you could tally those remote votes and please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 6515.

Total number voting	33
Those voting Yea	33
Those voting Nay	0
Absent and not voting	2

THE CHAIR:

And the measure is adopted. Senator Duff. Senator Duff, but we need a microphone for Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move for suspension and move that all items are to be immediately transmitted to the Governor's office for a signature.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, does the Clerk have Senate Agenda No. 2, please, on his desk?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

The Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda No. 2 dated Monday, March 1st, 2021.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move all items on Senate Agenda No. 2, dated Monday, March 1st, 2021, be acted upon as indicated and that the agenda be incorporated by reference into the Senate Journal and Senate Transcript.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATE BILL(S) FAVORABLY REPORTED WITH CHANGE OF REFERENCE - to be referred to committee(s) indicated.

COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN

SB NO. 92 AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TAX CREDIT FOR EMPLOYERS THAT MAKE PAYMENTS TOWARD CHILD CARE COSTS OF EMPLOYEES.

Referred to the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding

REPORT(S) RECEIVED - to be referred to committee(s) indicated.

Report - Judicial Branch - Court Support Services Division, Use of Chemical Agents or Prone Restraints on Any Person Ages Seventeen Years of Age or Younger dated March 1, 2021. (Pursuant to section 46b-1331 of the Connecticut General Statutes.) Date received: March 1, 2021.

Referred to the Committee on Judiciary.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you. Madam President. Madam President, I will now yield to any members for any points of personal privilege or announcements.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any points of personal privilege? Seeing none. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, with that, I urge people to have a safe drive home, and that we stand adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

We are adjourned, go forth and govern safely.
(Gavel)

(On the motion of Senator Duff of the 25TH, the Senate at 7:18 p.m. adjourned Sine Die.)