

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

Thursday, May 20, 2021

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will please come to order. The Senate will please come to order. And please give your attention to our Guest Chaplain, Kathy Zabel of Burlington.

GUEST CHAPLAIN KATHY ZABEL:

Please grant our hearts grace as we come together for our deliberations. As we face many needs and challenges, give us the ability to be judicious.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Madam Chaplain. And we invite the Senator Julie Kushner of the 24th District to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Good afternoon, great to see you. Mr. President, does the Clerk have any business on his desk?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk?

CLERK:

Good afternoon. The Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda No. 1 dated Thursday, May 20, 2021.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I move all items on Senate Agenda No. 1 dated Thursday, May 20, 2021, to be acted upon as indicated and that the Agenda be incorporated into reference into the Senate Journal and the Senate Transcript.

THE CHAIR:

**Senate Agenda  
No. 1  
REGULAR SESSION  
Thursday, May 20, 2021**

**BUSINESS FROM THE HOUSE:**

**INTRODUCTION OF HOUSE BILLS:**

**HOUSE BILL(S) FAVORABLY REPORTED - to be tabled for the calendar.**

**APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE**

**SUBST. HB NO. 6483** AN ACT CONCERNING THE ENROLLMENT OF CHILDREN OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES IN PUBLIC SCHOOLS AND THE ESTABLISHMENT OF A PURPLE STAR SCHOOL PROGRAM. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 8145))

**APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE**

**SUBST. HB NO. 6548** AN ACT CONCERNING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JURY SELECTION TASK FORCE. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 8781))

**APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE**

**SUBST. HB NO. 6594** AN ACT CONCERNING THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE PROCESS. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 8789))

**APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE**

**SUBST. HB NO. 6485** AN ACT CONCERNING THE CONNECTICUT HYDROGEN AND ELECTRIC AUTOMOBILE PURCHASE REBATE.

**APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE**

**SUBST. HB NO. 5307** AN ACT CONCERNING PRICE GOUGING. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 8806))

**APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE**

**SUBST. HB NO. 6417** AN ACT REQUIRING BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF YOUTH CAMPS. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 8825))

**BANKING COMMITTEE**

**HB NO. 5610** AN ACT CONCERNING A STUDY BY THE CONNECTICUT HIGHER EDUCATION SUPPLEMENTAL LOAN AUTHORITY. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 8341))

**APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE**

**SUBST. HB NO. 6495** AN ACT CONCERNING EQUITY AND FAIR LENDING. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 8631))

**COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN**

**SUBST. HB NO. 6112** AN ACT REQUIRING A SURVEY OF COURT-INVOLVED YOUTHS. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 8375))

**COMMERCE COMMITTEE**

**SUBST. HB NO. 6606** AN ACT CONCERNING THE COME HOME TO DOWNTOWN PROGRAM, THE RENOVATION OF HISTORIC MIXED-USE BUILDINGS IN THE STATE AND OUTDOOR DINING. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 8804))

**COMMITTEE ON CHILDREN**

**SUBST. HB NO. 6113** AN ACT REQUIRING THE PROVISION OF INFORMATION CONCERNING CHILD SEXUAL ABUSE.

**FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE**

**HB NO. 6629** AN ACT CONCERNING THE COLLECTION AND REMITTANCE OF THE E 9-1-1 FEE BY MARKETPLACE FACILITATORS.

**HIGHER EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT ADVANCEMENT COMMITTEE**

**HB NO. 6580** AN ACT CONCERNING AGRICULTURAL EDUCATION PROGRAMS.

**JUDICIARY COMMITTEE**

**HB NO. 6466** AN ACT CONCERNING PROPERTY THAT IS EXEMPT FROM A JUDGMENT CREDITOR. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 8201))

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**HB NO. 6420** AN ACT CONCERNING THE PROPERTY TAX EXEMPTION FOR CERTAIN MUNICIPAL VOLUNTEERS. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 8690))

**PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE**

**SUBST. HB NO. 5011** AN ACT CONCERNING THE COPYING OF PUBLIC RECORDS UNDER THE FREEDOM OF INFORMATION ACT. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 8829))

**PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE**

**HB NO. 6038** AN ACT CONCERNING THE PROMOTION OF LOTTERY WINNINGS.

**TRANSPORTATION COMMITTEE**

**HB NO. 5420** AN ACT CONCERNING DRIVER RESPONSIBILITY AT INOPERATIVE TRAFFIC CONTROL SIGNALS.

**VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE**

**HB NO. 5737** AN ACT CREATING A VETERANS AND MILITARY TOURISM TRAIL. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 8151))

Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, for our markings for today.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. For our first batch of bills and resolutions, on Calendar Page 1, Calendar 407, Senate Joint Resolution No. 47. I'd like to mark that item go.

On Calendar Page 1, Calendar 418, Senate Joint Resolution No. 48. I'd like to mark that item go. On Calendar Page 2, Calendar 419, Senate Joint Resolution No. 49. I'd like to mark that item go.

On Calendar Page 2, Calendar 422, House Joint Resolution No. 372. I'd like to mark that item go.

On Calendar Page 2, Calendar 429, House Joint Resolution No. 373. I'd like to mark that item go.

On Calendar Page 30, Calendar 394, Senate Bill 1034. I'd like to mark that item go.

On Calendar Page 15, Calendar 243, Senate Bill 1036. I'd like to mark that item go.

On Calendar Page 41, Calendar 261, Senate Bill 920.  
I'd like to mark that item go.

On Calendar Page 42, Calendar 269, Senate Bill 972.  
I'd like to mark that item go.

On Calendar Page 24, Calendar 351, Senate Bill 989.  
I'd like to mark that item go.

On Calendar Page 11, Calendar 182, Senate Bill 952.  
I'd like to mark that item go.

On Calendar Page 8, Calendar 148, Senate Bill 896.  
I'd like to mark that item go.

On Calendar Page 40, Calendar 208, Senate Bill 1004.  
I'd like to mark that item go.

On Calendar Page 41, Calendar 239, Senate Bill 1047.  
I'd like to mark that item go.

On Calendar Page 14, Calendar 240, Senate Bill 1048.  
I'd like to mark that item go.

And if the Clerk can call those items in order, that  
I marked them, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Majority Leader. Mr. Clerk. If you  
would proceed to the call of the Calendar.

CLERK:

Page 1, Calendar 407, Senate Joint Resolution No.  
47, "RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF ALLAN  
B. TAYLOR OF WEST HARTFORD TO BE REAPPOINTED A  
MEMBER OF THE STATE BOARD OF EDUCATION."

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Resolution and approval, please. Adoption of this Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Majority Leader. Will you remark further?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, this is a -  
- being on the State Board of Ed, as a volunteer part-time position, Mr. Taylor will be in his seventh term and he clearly has a lot of experience on the Board of Ed. Also serving as Chair. He does live in Hartford. His children went to the Hartford public schools and went to Harvard. He has a BA from Harvard. A GED from Harvard. He previously worked at Danbury Howard. He is retired. Was also a legislative and legal advisor to the Hartford City Council. And on a great note, he was a law clerk to the Honorable Thurgood Marshall of the U.S. Supreme Court from 1976 to 1977.

Mr. President, I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Majority Leader. Will you remark further on the Resolution? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I think we should have a vote on this Resolution, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Joint Resolution No. 47.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, on Senate Joint Resolution 47. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate of Senate Joint Resolution 47. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate of Senate Joint Resolution 47. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Members voted? Have all the Members voted? Please check your machines to make sure that your vote is properly cast. Mr. Clerk, if you will take the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Joint Resolution No. 47:

Total Number Voting	35
Those voting Yea	35
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

The Resolution is adopted. (gavel) Mr. Majority Leader. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 1, Calendar 418, Senate Joint Resolution No. 48. "RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF THEODORE M. DOOLITTLE OF WEST HARTFORD TO BE REAPPOINTED --

THE CHAIR:

I'm sorry, Mr. President.

Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you. I apologize. I thought the next nominee was Senate Resolution -- I'm sorry, you're right. Mr. Clerk, if I can just stop you right there. I'd like to place this item, Calendar 418, Senate Joint Resolution 48 on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

The item, Senate Calendar Page 1, Calendar 418, Senate Joint Resolution No. 48 has been moved for placement on the Consent Calendar. Is there objection? Is there objection? Seeing none, that item will be moved to our Consent Calendar.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Two more items for our Consent Calendar, please.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. On Calendar Page 2, Calendar 422, House Joint Resolution No. 372, for our Consent Calendar, please?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. House Joint Resolution 372 has been moved to be placed on Consent. Is there objection? Is there objection? Seeing none, House Joint Resolution

372 will be placed on Consent Calendar. Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. And the next item after that, Calendar Page 2, Calendar 429, House Joint Resolution 373, for our Consent Calendar, too, please.

THE CHAIR:

Calendar 429, House Joint Resolution 373, has been moved for placement on our Consent Calendar. Is there objection? Is there objection? Seeing none, House Joint Resolution 373 will be added to our Consent Calendar.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam (sic) President and my apologies. I thought that the one we are going to bring out was the next one. So if the Clerk can call Calendar Page 2, Calendar 419, Senate Joint Resolution No. 49.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 2, Calendar No. 419, Senate Joint Resolution 49, "RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF ATTORNEY LEONARD FASANO OF NORTH HAVEN TO BE A LEGISLATIVE COMMISSIONER."

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

The Resolution has been moved. Will you remark, Mr. Majority Leader?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I don't think I need my notes on this one. This nominee, Attorney Fasano, who obviously ably in this Chamber for a number of years, and has served as Leader, as well and somebody who is certainly very familiar to all of us. And we know can do a great job as one of the two Legislative Commissioners.

Mr. President, I think you said it best when you said, "I can't think of anyone else who would have the confidence of the General Assembly and such a high degree of trust." And we certainly know that he would be fit for the task to be a Legislative Commissioner. And we know how much he loves this building, this institution, this Chamber and how much he appreciates all that is done here. And that again, I couldn't think of anybody better to take on this job. And I urge adoption. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Majority Leader. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Good afternoon, Mr. President. Good to see you on the dais this afternoon. Mr. President, I rise in support of the Resolution confirming Former State Senator Leonard Fasano, as a Legislative Commissioner.

You know, I had the good fortune of spending probably the least amount of time, if you will, with Leonard Fasano during my entry to the Senate back in 2017. But nonetheless, I think that we are truly very fortunate to have him coming to join us in the Legislative Commissioner's Office. This is a man who spent nearly 20 years in The Circle. Has a fine understanding of the process, the way things work in the building and certainly, as our Minority Leader here in our caucus. He brings a wealth of experience.

And I think the other piece that I'd like to just call out for support is that one of things that Senator Fasano taught me and virtually all of my colleagues who had the pleasure to work with him when he was in the Senate, was the importance and value of relationships. And I know that that will go a tremendous distance in his work as a Legislative Commissioner, as things try to get figured out in that office. And ultimately, we strive to get good legislation, good bills that have been drafted back to us with all of the various ideas that we bring forth as legislators.

So, Mr. President, I urge adoption and support of the Resolution today. Thank you, Sir.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Great to see you there this -- I can't believe it's already May 20th, this Thursday afternoon. I stand in extremely strong support of the nominee before us, Former Senator Len Fasano. And it's a tremendous honor to say a few

brief words delineating what a wonderful human being he really is.

I remember when Len was first elected. He chuckled. He was marveling at the building and so many other things associated with this great legislature. He was wondering how everything would unfold before him. And in retrospect, he commented that one of the most important things on his very first day entering the caucus room was how everybody had their area that they were used to sitting in. And God forbid, somebody new would come into the caucus room and try to take someone else's place amongst the table reserved for senators. And he's say, "Really? This is how this building is?" And in some respects, yes. And in many respects, no. But it was just one of those little nuances. And he loved this institution. I think it's fabulous that he's coming back into this building in some way, shape or form.

Senator Fasano -- I have to refer to him as Senator Fasano, toward this facility, actually came up -- it's my understanding, we would produce videos, histories of the State of Connecticut and tours of our capitol building. I did indeed do that. But unlike Senator Fasano, who I believe went all the way up to the top of the capitol dome. I have acrophobia. There's just no way I'm doing that. There's -- It depends on the day. I don't even like looking over on the third floor here. Probably there's a part of me thinks I'm going to throw myself off, depending on how the day is going. But Len Fasano loved every brick, every etch on our walls, every light, and every human being in this building.

I would say Senator Fasano very much is on the same page as our good friend, the Acting President at this time, Senator Looney, or the Presiding Officer, Senator Looney, President. That there's just something running through their system, their blood, that makes them love our capitol, the functioning of the legislature, and our state government. And they

may have been on different sides of issues over the years but it was all done in collegial fashion with the utmost respect for each other's opinions. And I was actually marveled that over the years, I saw them combine forces on very historic and significant public health initiatives in recent years. And that's just talking about both these two gentlemen. I can say nice things about you, Senator Looney, at the same time, saying nice things about Senator Fasano.

I also consider Senator Fasano a great personal friend. It's easy to get caught up in ego here in this building. You know, when I first was elected, way back in 1993, somebody pulled me aside and said, "Hey, just remember you put your pants on one leg at a time and don't let this building go to your head." And luckily, I have a wife that brought me down to earth, if it ever got too much for my head. But you know, this building, you know, especially if you have lobbyists coming up to you and not giving you anything. Like some jaded members of our constituency tend to believe. Hartford is not reminiscent of Washington, DC, and I won't go in that direction. But just, yes, sir. Being fawned upon a little bit. Having nice things said about you. That can go to people's heads. And yeah, these folks want you to look favorably upon what they're pitching. A bill, a proposition, a resolution, who knows what it is? Take their side on an issue. Be their champion. And in so many respects, it's quite easy if you personally believe as they believe. Especially if it's one of my constituents and I really want to be their champion here in Hartford.

But this place can adversely affect individuals unless you're somewhat -- I wouldn't say, guarded, but mindful, that once you leave your elected office, you may not be treated exactly the same by those who are perhaps over-fawning. Or obsequious. One of our late colleagues, years before I was first elected, was talking to a freshman in the House. And randomly picked out a seat there and said to the new

member, "Oh, that's where Representative So-and-So sits. Do you know who was sitting there 20 years ago?" And the freshman said, "I have no idea." And the gentleman turned to him and said, "Remember that. Remember that as you do the People's business."

So I just think Senator Fasano, Len Fasano, will be an outstanding Legislative Commissioner. I think we're in good hands. I know he wants back in this building bad to the People's business in one way, shape or form. He's a man of vast integrity and honor. Loves his family. Loves his wife. There's a part of my heart and soul that hopes that this is not the last step on his travels in public service. That there may be other challenges and journeys beyond. But boy oh boy, what a great leader. And I've had a lot of great leaders in my caucus. We've had a lot of great leaders in this Circle. I have a great leader right now in Senator Kelly and he works strongly well with you, Senator Looney. And to each and every one of your in this Circle. I love, respect and admire your public service and how hard you work.

And to Senator Fasano, welcome back, my friend. And I'm just honored and privileged to be able to say, I strongly support your nomination this afternoon. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Thank you very much. Will you remark further on the Resolution? On Senate Joint Resolution No. 49? Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Mr. President. I stand and rise to support the nomination of Senator Fasano. I'm sure there might be a few others that will be speaking after me, but I just simply would like to say, I know as -- when I first arrived, he left the amount

of respect that not only of me but I'm positive that our entire caucus had towards Len. But I say that but I don't think it was just our caucus. I think anywhere in this building, there was such a respect for Len. And he's a guy that you looked at and you saw integrity, you saw when you heard him speak, you knew that he cared about, with passion at times. But he cared about people in general. And honest. When he'd come in and talk to us in the caucus, you knew that he was telling you what he knew or what he didn't know. He just -- It's a person I would follow any day. Any day. And I think that's what most of us when we arrived to, you know, in any organization, you look at the leadership and you decide whether or not you're going to follow, and he just -- Everybody I know and that knew him, would follow him.

You know, he began his career in 2002 and right up to 2020, he had every -- He did it. He was a Member of the caucus and then Minority Rep, and then Minority Leader. And then along with you, Mr. President, the -- being the year that we were tied, I remember the issues that he would talk to us about in caucus, and those with Senator Looney, the health care issues in particular. Helping to control health care costs and make it transparent. Some of those costs to the patients. He proposed issues here in the Capitol regarding job growth and urban development. Particularly, he encouraged the remediation of the Brownfield Property.

But I guess the thing that sticks out with me the most is when I arrived here, I felt like I was thrown in the deep end of the pool on the Children's Committee. And he just assisted me in navigating through some of the issues we had regarding what was happening in that. Not necessarily Committee, but with the DCF. And I'll always remember him for that. The care that he took in helping and guiding. And I think most will agree that when we hear the word of Len Fasano or Senator Len Fasano, you think of high integrity, value system is extremely high. An honest

individual and a person who has strong moral principles.

So I stand here before you, Madam (sic) President, to support Len Fasano with this Resolution. So thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin. Will you remark further? Good afternoon, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I also rise in support of the nomination of Leonard Fasano to be Legislative Commissioner. I am very happy that he has agreed to continue his public service.

As my fellow colleagues have already stated, it is clear that Senator Fasano's reputation in this Circle was one of integrity. One that you knew that when Len was dealing with an issue, he stayed focused on the policies that served our people so well and worked collaboratively and very openly with whoever wanted to work on the policy. He was all about the policy, making sure we had good laws. But it was also making sure, and his reputation was, that this institution, this building that we call the General Assembly and Connecticut State Senate, that it was so important. And that we needed to respect the institution. And he made sure that each of us understood that as we came up through the ranks.

I think that's one thing that uniquely qualifies him here in this -- for this position. Because what we're looking for is somebody in the Legislative Commissioner's Office who is going to be open-minded, understanding the import of this institution and to work collaboratively with all individuals to make sure that what the Legislative Commissioner's Office does is that the laws are good, consistent,

well-drafted and do what they're supposed to. When we want to bring forward a policy.

To that end, Senator Fasano I think is the ideal individual to do this. For that reason, his thoroughness, his exceptional detail and focus on detail and his ability to work across the aisle and with anyone who wanted to work, is the reason that I think he is before us today. And we are so fortunate that Senator Fasano has continued to share his service with us. He did a great job for his district, for his constituents, for our state and we're thankful that he is willing to step forward and we're very thankful that his family continues to share him with us. Thank you.

NEW THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Good afternoon to you, Madam President, also. And rising to speak not only in support of the Resolution but in celebration of the Resolution.

First of all, I want to begin by thanking Senator Kelly for bringing this nomination forward and for making it possible for Former Senator Fasano to be the new Republican Legislative Commissioner.

As was said previously, He is uniquely qualified for this position. He is someone who has served so honorably and has brought so much, I think, regard and credit to the Chamber and to the General Assembly through his 18 years of service as Senator of the 34th District. And for 12 years of that time in a position of caucus leadership. He and I worked together during those same 12 years. First, when I was Majority Leader, and he was the Deputy Republican Leader. And then later as our respective caucuses' leaders. But I've known him even longer

than that. Long before we were in our current positions as fellow attorneys practicing law with offices in New Haven. And certainly there, he was always a collegial colleague and a very active and respected Member of the New Haven Bar.

But Madam President, as was said, Len Fasano has very special qualities in that he always had a sense of what a magnificent trust it was to be selected by the people of a district in this State to represent them here in the State Senate. There is a sacred trust involved with that and he never became jaded about that. Never took it for granted. And always felt that we would be called upon to employ our best selves in the work that we do here. And that was certainly true of him every single day. It was my great honor to work with him on a number of bipartisan bills that Senator Kelly and others referred to. Most notably, having to do with Consumer Protection in health care and health insurance. Going back to 2012 when we started that collaboration with a number of pieces of legislation ever since over the last nine years. Many of which have become national models in other states.

So he loves the General Assembly. He loves the intricacy of the law. He is someone who always carefully paid attention to the language of statutes. So he is ideally positioned to the LCO Commissioner because in that capacity, we know the two commissioners, one designated by each party, are there to help ensure LCO does its mission in a completely even-handed and impartial way. We all know the LCO attorneys may many times be drafting amendments on the same bill for two senators perhaps of different parties. And the amendments may be going in two entirely different directions and the LCO, of course, has to keep confidence while working closely with both. And this building works well only when there is complete confidence that LCO is even-handed. That there is no thumb on the scale or partisanship in that Office. And Len Fasano is

somebody who I think who will continue that great tradition of making sure that that happens.

He is someone who is committed to this process, loves the General Assembly and I think it will be certainly something that he will be grateful for and welcome the opportunity to be back here and we will all be blessed by his presence back here. He was somebody who was a strong caucus leader. He could be an aggressive partisan when called upon. But he was also always willing to look for common ground, to look at issues objectively, and to debate issues on the highest level of policy.

So I am very grateful today to celebrate the nomination of my dear friend and former colleague, Len Fasano, to be Legislative Commissioner and I hope he will be there for a long, long time. Thank you, Madam President.

NEW THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to move this item to the Consent Calendar, please.

NEW THE CHAIR:

And seeing no objection, so ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If the Clerk can call the next item that we have marked.

NEW THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Madam President.

NEW THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, our next item is Calendar Page 30, Calendar 394, Senate Bill 1034. We can mark that out on PT.

Followed by Calendar Page 15, Calendar 243, Senate Bill 1036. If we could mark that PT.

And Calendar Page 41, Calendar 261, Senate Bill 920. Mark that PT. And then we'll go with the judiciary bills and we'll come back to those other bills. Thank you, Madam President.

NEW THE CHAIR:

So ordered. And Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 42, Calendar No. 269, Senate Bill No. 972, "AN ACT CONCERNING THE COST OF TELECOMMUNICATIONS SERVICES IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES." There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. This is a Bill, a Judiciary Committee Bill that deals with the issue of the cost of telecommunications, telephone calls, if you will, in our prison systems.

For a number of years, there has been a discussion about the impact of telephone calls and what it means for families to be able to make attempts to communicate with their loved ones inside. The policy basically allows for those telecommunications to be free and prohibits the Commissioner of Corrections from supplanting in-person contact because we've now made this our policy.

And it also deals with the fact that the monies that we were getting were used for certain programs so that the statute that allowed for the monies to be used is now no longer going to be in effect after the point at which this Bill goes into effect.

Madam President, there is an Amendment on the Bill. It is LCO No. 4066. I would ask that it be called and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. Could you repeat the LCO number, Senator Winfield?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yeah, you know what, Madam President? Thank you. Somehow I got the wrong LCO number. The LCO number is 8978. I would ask that that be called, that'd be great. I leave it to the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

8978, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8978. Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. What this does is it adds to the Bill we have before us. So as the Commissioner of Corrections cannot supplant the in-person visits with the phone calls that we now have, this says that some of our young people are under the custody of the Department, the Judicial Department, and that those young people, a similar action would happen that you cannot do the supplanting. I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you and the question is on adoption of the Amendment before the Chamber. Will you remark further? Senator Kissel, good afternoon, Sir.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good afternoon. Okay, so I before I get to the underlying bill, I just have some questions on the Amendment that is before us, through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Sir.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you. The supplanting issue -- Alright, first of all, it appears because I have an Amendment I'm going to call as well. But I don't believe -- especially since this Amendment being offered by Senator Winfield is 8978. And mine is 8981, which would indicate to me that his came first so I don't think this is a mechanical difficulty of meshing up the amendments, at least as far as where the lines are concerned. So that being the case, from what I can just tell -- And I was not made aware of this Amendment prior to this very second but that being the case, it appears that this is just an add-on amendment to the underlying Bill and it doesn't really go in and strike anything or add anything to what was originally before us in the underlying Bill. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And my apologies to the Senator. You know how things work here sometimes. So what this Bill does, if you will notice it is a Section 501 Amendment. We've got it all the way at the end. So it is an add-on. And what it's adding on is that the same way that we don't allow for supplanting in a department of -- under the Department of Corrections, we don't allow for supplanting for the juveniles who might be in one of our juvenile facilities. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And to the good Senator and Co-Chair of the Judiciary Committee, Senator Winfield, whom I consider a close friend, I know exactly how this building operates. And we always have a good rapport. Whether we agree on issues or not. And that's a lot to be said sometimes.

Through you, Madam President, just if the good Chair could, the notion of supplanting. Now if we're going from regular inmates in the Department of Corrections to focus on those are considered juveniles or are considered juveniles so that it's applied even-handily, but I'm just wondering, this notion of supplanting. What exactly is that getting to? Is that like one technological means for another technological means? You get so much credit for a phone call but not for a Zoom call? I'm just sort of confused a little bit by that.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you, Madam President, I think what we're trying to avoid is that we have now provided, given the cost and the inability of some people to make communication with their families, and if you agree with the policy, we have now dealt with that. I think what we're trying to avoid is that now that we have done that, to say well, we don't have to allow for you to have the visits that you would have already been able to have.

So, when we talk supplanting, what we are saying is, you cannot say, "Since we have that, then you don't get this." And that is, phone calls and this, our visits. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I appreciate that answer and that's what I thought. And again, just one last question on the Amendment. When we talk about juveniles, what age range are we talking about? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Through you, Madam President. The terms are defined in the Bill if you look at Lines 21 through 22 in the Amendment. I don't have the statute right in front of me but it defines the word "child" by referring to the statutes that we currently have on 46B-120. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Okay, that's it for my questions on this particular -- That's it for my question on this particular Amendment. It clearly expands the ambit of the underlying policy. But in my view, I would characterize it as being evenhanded upon those individuals, young or old, that are incarcerated in some portion of our correction system. While I do have concerns regarding the underlying Bill as it is currently drafted, I am going to leave it to my colleagues as I always do. But I'm going to urge acceptance or rejection of this Amendment at this time. I understand that if we are going to move forward with

this policy, it makes sense to make it evenhanded. But I do have some concerns regarding the underlying policy changes but I guess my view is that upon further discussion on this Bill, there's a large part of me that says it makes sense that whatever we do, it should be even across the board.

So again, I am not urging acceptance of the Amendment, nor am I urging rejection. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the Amendment, please signify by -- Senator Duff.

Alright, so, let us have a voice vote on the Amendment. All in favor of the Amendment before the Chamber, please signify by saying, Aye.

(MEMBERS):

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

The Ayes have it. And should be - the Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Alright, now we have the Bill as amended by Senate Amendment "A". Before I get to my Amendment, for purposes of a discussion, I just wanted a few other questions answered at this time.

So through you, Madam President, it is my understanding that the current contract that we have -- Alright, let me take a step back.

Through you, Madam President, the contract that the State of Connecticut has to my knowledge is with a third-party communications provider. And is that contract between the Department of Corrections with this third-party? Or the Judicial Branch and the Department of Corrections and this third-party? Or some other grouping of contractual entities? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you, first let me say on the contractual parts, I think that the good Senator knows that we have tried to find out as much as we could about the contract. And even at one point, when we thought we were engaged in a conversation about this, found out the contract got renewed, or rather extended in the middle of the conversations. So I may not have all the information that he wants but I do know that [inaudible] in the Department are in a contract and that the contract is been allowing for the phone calls in the system that we currently have. All of the parameters of that contract are beyond my capacity to answer the question as we stand here. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much. And I'll state -- and I agree with Senator Winfield -- that I wouldn't say

necessarily that the terms of the contract are murky, but it's not like it was readily plunked on our desks, and like, have at it and figure out what's in this contract. And actually at the time that we began investigating this matter in depth, I believe there were ongoing negotiations and iterations of what would eventually come to pass. Or which -- what's in place at this time.

So, let me approach the issue from a slightly different angle. First of all, as a predicate to this discussion, would it be accurate and to the extent the good Senator knows an answer to this, that would be fabulous as well, but the two parts to this question are: Is the State of Connecticut gaining any benefit through this telecommunications agreement? And if so, and if the good Senator knows, how many thousands, if not millions, of dollars is the State of Connecticut gaining? I'd say, if not on an annualized basis or annual basis, if the good Senator knows. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you, Madam President, the answer to the question on whether or not there is a benefit to the State, I think most people would answer that question with a Yes. There is some fiscal gain. We also use those monies for programmatic things, which maybe this is anticipating to come, have been dealt with within the Appropriations Budget in a different way than we currently deal with it, obviously. Given that those monies would not be coming in through the phone calls. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And a slightly different line of questioning, so I'm going to set aside what Appropriations has done in reallocating funds. But through you, Madam President, to Senator Winfield, prior to any changes contemplating by the underlying Bill and any actions contemplated by the Appropriations Committee, was the financial benefit of the telecommunications contract available in part to pay for, I believe, upwards of 20 to around \$36 either probation or parole officers? And I'm not quite sure it's one of those two categorizations of state employees. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Whether it's 20 or 26 or 24, I'm not sure. But the good Senator is right in the ballpark. The number at one point, I believe, was 26 but it pays for the individuals that the Senator is asking about. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much. And I apologize to probation officers and parole officers. It is not my intention to mix them up. But I think the overarching concern that I had is that there is individuals engaged in these activities, essentially overseeing the conduct of individuals not behind bars. And now getting to Senator Winfield's anticipated question. Would it be fair to state that the Appropriations Committee

consider the fact that this revenue stream from this telecommunications contract would, going forward should this Bill pass and be signed into law, not be available? And they made up for it through some other portion of the revenue pie, such that these individuals would still be employed to perform their functions in our system of criminal justice here in the State of Connecticut? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you, Madam President, I know that the good Senator is aware of the diligence of the Appropriations Committee. So that would always have been in the case, but it also happens to be the case that the Chair of the Subcommittee on Appropriations dealing with, happens to be the Chair of the Judiciary Committee. So yes, we did. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Would never have any doubts that the Appropriations Committee membership or a Republican and Democrat, if there is any unaffiliated or, you know, Bernie Sanders-registered people, that they would all be doing young people's work in addressing all issues. It's just sometimes, when we get to these difficult choices as far as allocating revenues, jobs are either not backfilled, not reinstated, some programs just cut in their entirety. And I just want to make sure that's not the direction that we went regarding this.

So that portion of this initiative is reassuring. But I'm going to get to the nub of my point here regarding this. So at this point in time the inmates are being charged a certain amount of money per minute. You know, we don't know what -- I don't know what that is, but 'x' amount of dollars, and out of that 'x' amount of dollars per minute, from the inmates' accounts, that so much now goes to a revenue stream that flows to the State of Connecticut in one way, shape or form. Either directly to the Department of Corrections' bottom line or directly to the Judicial Branch's bottom line, or some confluence of those things. But something to the State of Connecticut. And then another portion to the third-party provider of the telecommunications services. Would that be fair to say? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, Madam President, I would say that that is absolutely fair to make as a statement. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And through you, to the good proponent of the Bill, now this proposal will shift that construct, that essentially the policy, and would it be that the inmates are now going to be paying a different rate per minute? Or is it anticipated that the inmates and those utilizing these telecommunications services would not be paying anything at all? And would be

allocated a certain period of time, either by day or by week or by month or by year, I'm not sure. Such that nothing would come out of their accounts or their family members would not have to send them the money for these calls that -- And just by way of example, I, Senator John Kissel, Inmate 102, would get like a half-hour a month and how I use that 30 minutes is up to me. Two 15-minute calls, three 10-minute calls. Is sort of the direction that we're going here? So that the whole money as far as the inmates and their families go is no longer going to be out there. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, Madam President, the Bill that came to the Judiciary Committee, along with the work that the Appropriations Committee did, imagined a scenario in which the phone calls are at no cost to the prisoners. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And that sort of brings me to my point. At the outset I want to say, that I have the utmost admiration and respect, pretty much at all times for the proponents. Especially, my good friends and colleagues on the Judiciary Committee and the Co-Chairs and Ranking Members and Vice-Chairs and everyone associated. I mean, everybody's working hard for the best interests of the people of Connecticut.

I also want to state that I understand that many people could look at the current system and say it's

not fair for the State to glean a profit, essentially, from this third-party telecommunications contract that the inmates -- albeit they are incarcerated for a reason. That they committed a crime. But that being the case, people of goodwill can differ as to (a) whether the State should be making any money on the agreement, the contract; or (b) maybe they'd look at the rate as too high. If they really dug down deep and determined what that rate is.

The Bill before us moves away from that entire observation or construct and goes into a system where inmates now get free telecommunication services, both juveniles and adults, and there is no remuneration whatsoever coming out of their inmate accounts to pay for these services.

In my -- now long -- history as an attorney here in the State of Connecticut, when I first started out in my new capacity working for pretty much one client, now. Come this June it'll be 18 years for that one client. But prior to that, I was in a small private practice in Enfield, north central Connecticut. But what I found was there's a term in Latin, *pro bono*, for free and it's used if an attorney allows individuals in need to avail him or her of their services and not have to pay for it.

And there are formulas, programs, where one does *pro bono* services and there is also, if you're in a small firm and you have some latitude with the other men and women that you work with, they might say, "Hey John, if you really feel strongly about this particular matter, and what you've been bringing into the business, the firm has been 'x', 'y', 'z', and you feel confident that we can continue along that path, we feel comfortable. If you want to do extra hours or you want to work on this particular case, we look highly on that. We encourage that kind of behavior. It's good for society. It's good for the community. And we think it's just part and parcel of what a good attorney does."

Unfortunately, what I have found in real-life practice though was, while on the one hand you would get individuals the recipient of free services that were really thankful, and they wouldn't know where to receive justice unless somebody said, "I'll volunteer my services to help you through the court system, or prepare a will or help you with this title situation.", I would say the vast majority of people that you help out are appreciative. Unfortunately though, there is a minority of individuals, a small group -- certainly I don't mean minority by any racial identification. I just mean minority versus majority, a small number of individuals. But I did see it on way more than one occasion unfortunately, that if you don't place some modicum of value on the service, it gets not only taken for granted, but there's an element of like demanding that, when these individuals say, "Hop", the lawyers should say, "How high?". And it's sort of like you scratch your head and you go, I'm helping you out. I'm doing this for free. But unfortunately, some people, if you do it completely for free, don't associate a good value with that service.

Whereas, over the years, I sort of said, if you build in some sort of modest dollar value. Something that individual and the attorney agreed upon. Something probably vastly reduced from what would be a normal hourly rate, or a certain fee for a service, but something. Then all of a sudden, just that little amount of consideration, legal term of little amount of dollars sort of imbues the entire service with a value that some individual heretofore would not have given it.

So that's a long, twisted trail to get to my point that I don't think it's the best public policy to shift from this contract that the State of Connecticut currently has with this third-party vendor for telecommunications services to one that completely immunizes inmates from any dollar value

associated with any of these telecommunications services, albeit if they are reduced in time.

I think if an inmate, man or woman, young or old, feels that there is some dollar coming out of their account, that that's important. Because when -- And as we all know, the vast majority of inmates are eventually released to the general population -- not general population within the Department of Corrections but free society, things cost money. I mean, there are certain free services but most people work hard and they have to pay for their goods and services when they get released from prison. Or when they are working out in society.

So the point I'm making is, I think it's extremely important that while we have it within our desires to change the current system for folks that are incarcerated, that it's very important that the inmates realize that the services that are provided have a value. They have a dollar value and that's why I'm going to call on the Clerk to call an amendment at this time asking for a roll call on this Amendment. And the LCO number on this Amendment is LCO 8981, and Madam President, if the Clerk could call that Amendment, I would ask that the reading to be waived, ask leave to summarize this Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call that Amendment, please.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8981, Senate Schedule "B".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. This Amendment is very simple and straightforward. It would actually change the underlying Bill to effectuate the public policy change that I think is more appropriate. And more descriptive of the way individuals will be treated when they are eventually released from the Department of Corrections and they have to go out, get a job and begin to pay bills. And if they want to rent a place or buy a home or -- where do they go? Just go to a store -- It can be just a drugstore and get one of those -- so many minutes cellphone. There's going to be a price.

So what the Amendment does is that it will reduce the amount of money charged for the telecommunications services so the State would not be making any money off of these telecommunication services utilized by inmates. But the Amendment says that the inmates would pay the Fair Market Value or the cost of the services. So this notion that, hey, the State shouldn't be making money off of these inmates, off of their calls or Zoom meetings or whatever they are doing, okay. For purposes of the Bill before us this afternoon, I will accept that. But if we're going to move down that road, rather than totally supplanting the system that we have now with the free services, albeit one that's not completely open-ended and unlimited but is limited as far as time, I just think that the paradigm that we should use is one where services are equated with some dollar value.

So not only is there the notion that, hey, when I get out of prison, it could be a week, it could be a day, it could be five years, I'm going to go out and I'm going to have to pay these bills. That's sort of a good think to know. But also, hey, I may decide that if only need to make 'x' amount of calls this month, then since I'm paying for it out of whatever monies I have in my account for other things -- I think it's called a commissary or the Corrections store -- I've actually taken a tour of that and they have like pretty much everything in there that you

can imagine over at MacDougall-Walker and I'm sure other places have stuff as well. But if it's a question of, Oh, I have 'x' amount of dollars in this account, and perhaps I don't have a family or someone I need to call on a regular basis, if hold back on those calls, then I'll have more money to spend in other areas should I choose to do that. Or I can accumulate what's in my Corrections account. Conversely, if there is no downside, I'd just be making calls since they're free and who cares? Right? There's no one really I need to talk to but maybe my cousin, Al, in Ohio. I'll give him a calls 'cause guess what? It's free. And I've got 20 more minutes left for this month's account and I may as well use it.

So I think that's sort of the wrong approach that we should take. That's why I'm offering the Amendment as I indicated, Madam President, I am asking for a roll call vote on the Amendment. And would urge my colleagues to support this as a modest amendment and one that's reasonable and it doesn't supplant the entire intention of the underlying Bill whatsoever. And I think it gets the inmates to a point that's a good point in a direction that advocates want to move in that may not support my methodology, but I think it makes more sense.

And it's not like I think we need to teach inmates how the real world works. You know, that's part of it. You want them to have job skills. We have programs teaching inmates job skills and things like that. We have all sort of things inside Corrections facilities, such as getting your GED, your high school degree, you get programs on how to be a good spouse, how to be a good parent. There's lots of things where we really want inmates, when they are released, to have a leg up on the free world. And I think this is one way we could go about doing it that makes an awful lot of sense. And it won't cost the taxpayers of the State of Connecticut anything. Such that whatever was moved by the Appropriations Committee to makes sure these folks that are doing

these jobs still can do their jobs, but whatever other monies that were involved in that, can be used for other programs. Like the allowance given to those in nursing homes, things like that. Because when you start adding up the millions, and I think the underlying amount was like several millions of dollars that this overall initiative entails, I just think there's other things that that money could be used for that maybe has not been addressed by the Appropriations Budget proposal, or Governor Lamont's budget proposal, that we might all unite in bipartisan fashion and say, hey, that's a great idea. Let's all support that. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? Good afternoon, Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I rise in support of the Amendment. And the reason that I do is because I want to -- Let's take this right back to the beginning.

We have a victim of a crime who is probably going to lose financially. The police get involved. The police are paid for by the taxpayer. An arrest is made that the suspect goes to court. The court is paid by the taxpayer. This person, after multiple arrests multiple times, working very hard to get into prison, finally goes to prison. And guess who pays for them being in prison? The taxpayer again.

So there's one portion that we made the prisoner pay for. And that's paying for their phone use. And I heard you say profit. It's not a profit. We're paying for parole officers, and those parole officers are going to watch the prisoners when the prisoners get out of jail and on a release -- a

supervised release to the parole officers. So really, they're paying for their parole officers. But here, we have a common sense. Pay for the service. And this isn't a simple phone service. They are recording these calls, they are keeping track of these calls by the prisoner. There's a process to this and this is why we have a contract. But why should the taxpayer have to pay again and again and again and again?

If the person arrested wants to avoid all this, don't commit the crime. Don't break the law. Then you don't go to prison, eventually. But to expect the taxpayer to now pick up another cost. I know there's a difference between two parties here. One party is basically saying that, you know, we've got to watch the taxpayer dollar; and the other one is saying, hey, let's just spend it. But this a common-sense Amendment. One that I could actually support. Because it's not dumping the entire cost on the taxpayer again.

You know, we have what it costs to house a prisoner. It'd be interesting to know that if you took and did a study on what the costs were associated with one person and how many crimes they committed, how much it cost the victims, the police, the courts, the transport vans to get back and forth from court, then the actually housing, I bet that's a pretty staggering amount. And the taxpayers pay that. They shouldn't have to pay for this as well.

The Amendment still holds the prisoner accountable but it's keeping it at a reasonable rate: The cost of the service. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I would just rise to note my opposition to the Amendment. First, this is a Bill that had hearing in the Judiciary Committee in the form that it comes to us. Except for the Amendment which adds on making things equal. It also had hearing in the Appropriations Committee. Its monies are in the budget. And I agree, taxpayers pay for lots of things. They pay for roads. They pay for prisons. They pay for pensions of our public servants. They pay for all kinds of things. There mere fact that taxpayers pay for something means there is like someone who, whatever that thing is, including our roads, thinks that they should not be paying for those things.

The question before us is not whether or not people agree or not, although that's a part of the consideration. The question is what is the public policy? And the State has been entered into a contract that secures that we pay more than others pay for the same types of services. So this is not whether or there is a profit or not. It's that the cost is actually too high. And that's been great public policy, except that it's not been. And I think that the process that we have here to come to a moment like this where we're on the floor, we had done that. And this is the public policy that should be adopted by the State of Connecticut.

I think roll call was asked but I would ask for a roll call.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. A roll call vote was indeed ordered and so we will open the voting machines. Mr. Clerk, kindly call the roll.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Bill 972. This is Senate

Amendment "B", LCO No. 8981. Senate Amendment "B", LCO No. 8981. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Amendment "B". An immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Members voted? Have all the Members voted? Please check to determine whether your votes have been properly cast. And the Clerk will take a tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 972, LCO No. 8981, Senate Amendment "B":

Total Number Voting	35
Those voting Yea	12
Those voting Nay	23
Those absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

The Amendment fails. Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I would like to PT this Bill and to ask the Clerk the next Bill marked go.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Majority Leader. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 24, Calendar No. 351, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 989, "AN ACT CONCERNING ONLINE HARASSMENT."

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. The Distinguished Chair of the Judiciary Committee, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The Bill has been moved. Will you remark, Senator Winfield?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. There's a 'strike all' amendment in the system and I would ask that the 'strike-all' amendment be called, so that I can explain the strike-all amendment that is in the system.

That Amendment is LCO 8244. I would ask that it be called and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 8244, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. This is a strike-all, which then becomes the Bill. The reason for the strike-all in the original Bill to start with was we

have a growing issue of online harassment through electronic means and we wanted to update our laws to comport with it. So what this Amendment does, is for the crime of stalking in the first if a person is over the age of 22, and that person directs with intention of their conduct towards another person in violation of the stalking statutes, and that the person did it for the reasons of the other person who the activity is directed to, being of a certain race, religion, ethnicity, disability, sex, sexual orientation or gender, that would be stalking in the first degree.

For stalking in the second degree, if that person who was acting --

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you. Sorry about that. And if it's in the second degree, if that person is trying to cause fear, injury or death of an animal owned by a person, or the person with the intent to harass, terrorize or alarm, an individual uses electronic means, this person would be guilty in the second degree.

This is a growing issue. The Strike-All Amendment was to clean up some issues we discovered with the original Bill in the Committee. And I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Great to see you up there again. Gotta keep on my toes regarding who is presiding over the Chamber this afternoon. But our cup runneth over.

Through you, Mr. President, would it be fair to state that this Amendment becomes the Bill, essentially? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Winfield, would you respond?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. As with a Strike-All Amendment, whatever Bill was underlying is stricken and the contents of the Amendment therefore becoming a Bill, the answer to Senator Kissel's question is Yes.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Kissel, you have the floor.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. And through you, Mr. President, in looking at the Amendment, it essentially touches three general criminal categories of violation. Other than some minor technical changes between the underlying Bill and this Amendment that now becomes the Bill, I don't see any huge substantive changes between the policy shifts between one version and the other. Would that be fair to state? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Mr. President -- Thank you, Mr. President. And through you, Mr. President, to my mind, being involved in the conversations, what we were trying to do was to tighten up the Bill that left the Judiciary Committee in terms of substantive changes of course, people could disagree about this but I would concur with the good Senator. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much. And I just can't help but notice that we -- the first two portions have to do with stalking and the third portion has to do with harassment. Would the second and third portions be charges that would afford an individual to avail themselves of the previously debated and discussed and passed in this Chamber, clean slate proposal? Or that's what we called it colloquially. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I didn't know what the question was going to be so I may not answer this correctly but I believe the question was on the second and third charges. I don't have the classification but let me just answer this. If the classification was a D-Felony down -- the answer to that question would be a Yes. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. And just one or two further questions and then a generalized statement. Is the genesis of this Bill proposal -- and I think this concept has been around a couple of years or not. I know we've dealt with the advancement of technology. And I know that we've had public hearings where State's attorneys have come up. But they may have addressed different portions of this. Was the genesis of this something untoward that happened to someone here in the State of Connecticut, man or woman, that was either stalked or harassed utilizing these new technological forms that we're adding in to make sure that that's being done? And we found that you don't have to be walking down a sidewalk to stalk someone. You could be stalking them online. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. And through you, Mr. President, and I think to a degree I would have to acknowledge that I cannot have about what the individuals who have been advocating for the policy thought was the genesis in their own minds. I can say that Senator Kissel is correct that in one form or another, we've been having this conversation for actually, at this point, I would characterize it as many years. But I would also say that the Anti-Defamation League, certainly on this particular policy before us, was one of the groups advocating for it. But what was in the mind of the individual about a particular circumstance, that I do not have as information available to me. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Kissel, you have the floor.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I have no further questions for the proponent of the Amendment that becomes the Bill. I will state that this -- there is three sections. The first two having to do specifically with stalking. The third section having to do with harassment. Some individuals have expressed to me concern regarding the third portion in particular. That some of those terms are rather broad brushed and there's a concern that depending on if this came before State's Attorney or even charges were brought and then it came before a judge, whether those terms could be read overly broadly such that heretofore, law-abiding citizens might be charged under harassment for articulating positions that might, by the recipient of those communications feel are -- I won't even say rise to the level of threatening but harassing. Whereas no such malice of forethought or negative will was intended.

So we may have some murky water that eventually should this Bill become law, the courts or the State's Attorneys may have to sort out a little bit. But I think that some of those terms are probably in statute already and what we're really focusing on -- and as Senator Winfield, the good Co-Chair of the Judiciary Committee has indicated, we have been dealing with various ramifications of this for many years. And like with so many other Committees, we are trying to keep up with technology. You blink your eye and boom. It seems like just not that many years ago, I was looking for a video on my way home for my kids from Blockbuster, and you can't find a Blockbuster any more. There is a part of me that likes tactile things that I can put in machine. As opposed to trying to flick around with a clicker and

things like that. But I can't stop the march of technology and things that we couldn't even imagine ten years ago could hurt a person, now can be on the worldwide web and never to be lost again.

And I distinctly recall public hearings where we've had State's Attorneys and unfortunately, female victims -- although it could happen to a male as well, where someone like -- You know, we talk about revenge pornography, you put something vengeful on the Web and it's just crushing to the psyche and self-worth and intellect of an individual that is suffering these consequences. And how do you go back and erase it? Sometimes you can't. So what is the proper punishment for that? When clearly the intent was to harm another person.

So when you get to things like stalking and harassing, yeah. And we were talking about clean slate, I was talking. You know, you're out walking your dog in your neighborhood and it's dusk and there's shadows amongst the trees. It's a neighborhood that you feel comfortable in. I'm not saying that you're out in the woods. But all of a sudden, you see something and you see something and all of a sudden there's someone -- They're not a prowler. They're prowling you. I don't know, are they casing you to find out your pattern of behavior? Are they checking out your house or your neighbor's house? Do you feel threatened for your family? Your neighbor? Your neighbor's family? For something to get to a point where someone is convicted for a set of actions, that's really scary. Even if that person is behind bars, you're going to be worried. Because something that you thought never would happen, now is happening.

I can see the same thing happening now with the advancement of technology but all of a sudden, you thought that, you know, your kids are in the basement working on the worldwide web or you're upstairs doing Zoom meetings and things like that and then, Voila. There's some intruder. And these

intruders can be from another country. No matter what is proven or not proven, interfering or not interfering, being the victim of identity theft in one way shape or form -- my credit is not in good shape because someone -- and given where these spurious charges emanate from, probably not from this country, somehow found some transaction. And I will put a cautionary tale about lending your credit cards to your minor children. As safe as that purchase may or may not seem.

But you know, someone far away now through technology, can really harm any one of us at any given moment. And if it rises to the level of stalking or a harassment, there is ill will intended behind those actions. So if anything gets to a point where someone is convicted and people say, "Oh, what's year." Hey, you don't want to be in prison a year. You don't want to be in prison overnight. Having toured a variety of correctional facilities throughout the State of Connecticut from down in Newtown at Garner, all the way to Cheshire, all the way to Enfield, Somers, Suffield -- not a good place to be.

And so, I think it's sort of a disconnect that on the one hand, we're moving toward this clean slate proposal. But on the other hand, we're, if not beefing up the sentences regarding threatening and harassment, we're broadening the ambit to meet the advances in technology because people are suffering in ways we had not imagined just a few years ago. But it's a direction that I think, not only are we compelled to go down and pass this law, but I think it helps us meet the ends of justice.

It just makes me sad that that's the direction that we have to go. When in God's name, will men and women treat each other with the respect and dignity that they deserve? I'll probably never live that long. But I think that every good thing that we do here, helps move us in that direction.

So with that, our colleague has voted for a roll call vote. I would ask for a roll call vote on the Amendment as it becomes the Bill. I think there may be some glitches along the way, as far as definitions. But I think its overarching goals are laudable and necessary to protect those individuals who are being stalked or harassed using cutting-edge technology in our society. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I rise very briefly to speak in favor of the Amendment and because it is Strike-All Amendment, I do hope it passes and becomes the Bill. I know I don't get up often enough to speak in favor of good legislation when it comes before us. And when I saw this Bill on our schedule for today, I was a little concerned because the original language of the Bill did raise an eyebrow for me simply because of the language used, not because of the intent of the Bill. I like the idea behind this Bill which is that we are going to purposefully and thoughtfully find a way to create an environment in the digital realm that exists in the real world digital to basically let people know that certain types of behavior is unacceptable in our society. And I'm very much in favor of that.

My concern about the underlying Bill was that the language that was in there is a bit vague. And just because I have the floor and a moment, I just want to get into it briefly for the sake of having conversation with my colleagues here. One of the things that concerns me about the direction of some of the policies we are seeing in recent years is a

move towards more subjective policies that allow the Attorney General or the courts or prosecutor to make more of a personal determination about things.

One thing that's very important to me when it comes to making policy is maintaining a core tenet of this country, which is the rule of law. I think that when we move away from things being as clear and defined in our statutes as possible and more towards subjective determinations by individuals, we are moving from the rule of law and towards the rule of man. One thing that has made this country great, and we could argue over the history of America and its troubles heretofore, but we can simply see that any time we are able to put in defined terms how the law is supposed to apply to everyone, regardless of their background, it's an improvement over letting some individual subjectively determine how the law should be applied.

There have been a few bills that have come through this Chamber recently where I made the point that I didn't appreciate that. The Pregnancy Center Bill for instance, I thought is very subjectively applied. But in this particular case, Madam President, I am very pleased at this product.

I have a little concern about the word 'alarm' being used. I don't know what that really means. I think the intent to harass, terrorize makes perfect sense. To alarm, I think could be a little subjective. But compared to the underlying Bill, this is a major improvement. I think it is good policy for the State of Connecticut and I'm pleased to see my colleagues come up with this language as a final solution. And I urge my support of the Amendment and assuming it passes, the Bill, as well. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Sampson. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment?

A roll call vote has been requested on the Amendment so I will open the vote. Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. It's the Senate Amendment "A", LCO No. 8244. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment "A", LCO No. 8244.

Immediate roll call vote in the Senate, Senate Bill 989, this is Senate Amendment "A". Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Senate Amendment "A", LCO No. 8244, this is Senate Bill 989.

Total Number Voting	35
Total voting Yea	35
Total voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

(gavel) And the Amendment passes as amended.

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if we can go back to the Bill we just previously marked PT, which was Calendar Page 42, Calendar 269, Senate Bill 972.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 42, Calendar No. 269, Senate Bill 972, "AN ACT CONCERNING THE COST OF TELECOMMUNICATION SERVICES IN CORRECTIONAL FACILITIES." There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark? Senator Kissel, here we are again.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Well, there is a lot of worse things in life than being right here with all of us and doing the good work of the People's business.

Thank you very much, Madam President. Great to see you again this afternoon. I stand in opposition to the Bill that's before us. I think it's got a laudable goal. I think there is much merit to be said that we would like to change the underlying policy. I want to commend Senator Champagne for, I think, brilliantly articulating the fact that taxpayers if part of the funding paid by the inmates is then channeled towards of the cost of employing parole officers that are charged to monitor and oversee, to some extent, released inmates' compliance with their release terms, that it's all to help the public safety. And so, it's not really an -- And I appreciate this correction from Senator Champagne and I'll take it as a refinement in correction as to how I would characterize this. It's not really a profit to the State of Connecticut because it's still being used in that criminal justice system to help protect the public safety.

That being the case, I will harken back to what I stated in response -- or to try to garner support for the Amendment that I put forward. I just think it's a better policy shift to have inmates pay the Fair Market Value of the costs of their telephone calls or other telecommunication services, even if those services are provided by a third-party. That's the way the real world works outside of the Department of Corrections. That's what I would suggest the vast majority of our constituents have to grapple with, whether it's a gas bill, an electric bill, a telephone bill, you know, Cablevision bill going up, getting gas for your car, paying for the bus, school books. I mean, you name it, you know.

We go home sometimes at 4:30 in the morning or later, sometimes earlier, from this august Chamber, and our wonderful colleagues on both sides of the

aisle, if your home is anything like mine, there's a pile of mail there and it's always nice when you find something that's not a bill. That's the cost of living in a free society and have the wonderful amenities and necessities.

We've all gone through times where we have to make ends meet. I know I have and I understand right now and, you know, you try to trim out the things that are luxuries or they get fewer and fewer or held more dear. But there is just some things you have to have to get by, and they are clearly necessities. And when the necessities start pinching you. I understand these are difficult choices and I think telecommunications, using a phone, whether you just have one of those portable cellphones that you don't have to pay a certain charge or whatever deal you get. I think they sell them -- I don't know, I see on CSI stories and stuff like that. They get these like one shot cell phones or a very little amount.

Okay, I guess you can get that and just use it for what you need. But there's a cost, right? There's a cost. And so to sort of put into the notion within someone who is incarcerated, the idea that, hey, I get a half-hour every month. Or I get an hour every month, or I get 10 minutes today, it's not really the real world. It's not the way it works. So I'd rather have more of the system that we utilize in our corrections facilities mirror what actually transpires outside of the Department of Corrections, such that whether an inmate's -- And by the way, it's very difficult to get into a halfway house to sort of ease your way back in.

In fact, we've had bill proposals in the Judiciary Committee where some inmates want the ability to petition to stay incarcerated for a certain period of time so they can get some kind of transitional housing or something like that, because they really want to succeed and they say, "Hey, you put me on a bus or a van and you point off --" And it doesn't have an urban area, it could be a suburban area. It

could be a rural area. "But if you just plunk me off with the clothes on my back and just, you know, a little bit of money in my pocket, I'm going to have a really hard time succeeding." They just may not have the safety net or the family structure or the loved-ones or the friends or anything like that.

So yeah, that's sort of like we all want law-abiding tax paying happy citizens here in the State of Connecticut that can live work and raise a family. But I think that to the extent we change -- in the Department of Corrections, we should change such that if we had this opportunity, make it more like the world that we all have to exist in where services and goods have a price. And we have to go out and work or somehow get the wherewithal in a lawful manner to provide for ourselves and those whom we love.

So for that reason, with the utmost respect to my friend and colleague, Senator Winfield, the good Co-Chair of the Judiciary Committee, and those advocates and proponents of this reform proposal, I personally think it moves in a positive direction in many respects, but it doesn't reflect the policy change that I think is right within our grasp. And it's our opportunity and we're missing an opportunity. And for that reason, Madam President, I will be voting, No. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I rise in opposition to the Bill as written. And my opposition comes from exactly what I said here before. The taxpayers should not be saddled with this cost in addition to all the other costs that they have been saddled with because somebody decided to violate the law.

I have a question for the proponent of the Bill.  
Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Sir.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you. As far as the phone calls are concerned,  
is this a cost that will have to be paid back by the  
prisoner upon release?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, there is  
nothing in this Bill that requires on the part of  
the prisoner to pay back whatever that cost would  
be. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Madam President, sorry. Thank you, Madam President.  
I wanted to verify that. Because there is a law out  
there that says, you know, if the means is ever  
assessed, that they would be paying back for the  
time they spent in prison. In fact, there is a  
gentleman right now in my district going through  
this. He co-owns a house that he lives in with his  
brother, and because his brother did prison time,  
the State is coming after the house as a whole.

So we make them pay back if they have the means for  
their time in prison that the taxpayer has paid. But

we're not going to make them pay back for the phone calls. We're not going to charge them for the phone calls. So this is literally a freebie for the prisoners. A freebie for the prisoners at taxpayers' expense.

And then I heard somebody say that we already budgeted this money. We planned ahead and we budgeted this money. Well that money could probably go to some good programs to help prisoners get themselves on their feet, to help prisoners learn a skill, rather than giving them something free that they never have to pay back.

I guess I just keep going through this over and over. And all the laws we keep passing to help those who decide to commit crimes in this State. And how hard it is to go to jail. When you get to jail, you can do programs to get out of jail early. And now, we're going to pay for their phone calls. Or I'm sorry, the taxpayers are going to pay for their phone calls. The hardworking overtaxed number one in the nation in many areas, taxpayers of Connecticut, are going to pay for the prisoners' phone calls.

I have another question for the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Sir.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, through you, Madam President. Have we taken into account prisoners who may make more telephone calls because they are now free?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President, to the poser of the question.

I'm not sure what the question he's really asking. I think during the course of this conversation, we turned this question backwards, forwards, upside down. So I think just about everything has been brought up.

I think during the course of this conversation, we've turned this question backwards and forwards upside down.

So I think just about everything has been brought up at one point as a reminder to everyone involved. This is a conversation, at least in this form that has taken place over the last four years.

So at some point, every question has been asked and whether people agree with it or not. This is the policy that we've arrived at.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And I haven't been compensated part of any of those conversations in the past, except what I've heard of the Judicial Committee, and I've only been here for just over two years.

So basically, it was a simple question. Have we taken into account how many -- are there going to be more hours of phone use throughout the year because

they're now free and the prisoners don't have to pay for them?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President, this Bill doesn't prescribe the manner in which those phone calls are doled out, that's -- there's policy on that. And or can be.

So does the potential exist? I suppose depending on the policy. Sure. But this is, as we suggest, we are not talking about people who are absolutely free to do what they want when they want.

So it's a little bit difficult to answer that question in the absolute.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And the current contract is, if I remember correctly, it is going from 21 cents a minute down to seven cents a minute or 17 cents a minute/

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Through you, Madam President, as I suggested earlier, in response to Senator Kissel, I don't have with me the ins and outs of the contract.

Other than what the contract means to the conversation. The pieces of this Bill don't deal with the contract itself.

And so I did not bring the internals of the contract with me.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

I was just making a point that this was seen as a hardship and I wanted to point out if it is 17 cents a minute, I believe that for an hour, it's \$10.20.

And you know, if they're limited to a half hour, an hour, two hours, this is not something that would -- that would break the bank on many of the prisoners.

But when as a collective, it's a burden on the taxpayer. And I have a problem with that. And that is why I'm going to vote no.

The taxpayers pay enough for those who wish to violate the law, they shouldn't have to pay anymore.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further on the legislation before the Chamber?

Senator Winfield?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

I just want to restate my support of this Bill. And obviously, because I'm a proponent of the Bill, that would be true. But I think it's important for us to recognize what has happened. And yes, maybe \$10 an hour would not break my bank, but for some people would destroy their bank.

And yes, there are people who come out of the system and then have to pay back. And it's not just because they have a house, I have people that I talk to all the time who have to pay back because they've gotten a job. And now they're determined to have the means to start paying back when they haven't even gotten on their feet.

Look, the point is that we have a system that has made it difficult for families to connect with each other. And this legislature for the last almost half a decade has been having a conversation about this in the Judiciary Committee on the Appropriations Committee.

This is the policy before this date. And I don't think that whether you vote for this or against it, it necessarily says anything about who you are. But I do think we have an opportunity to deal with that issue, to make it more possible for these family members to talk to each other, to be able to have communications that are critical to who comes out of the prison.

I think that's important for us to remember, because those people are going to be walking amongst us. And if those people are left inside of our prison, they're left on their own. They'll have to deal with all of the things you have to deal with in the prison, and we could take care of this and we don't know how to -- I don't get that.

But again, as an individual, I don't take anybody's vote to mean one thing or the other. But I think sometimes there's value in doing a thing that's not just about the dollars, and this is one of those issues.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield.

Will you remark further?

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Speaking in support of the Bill, I want to thank Senator Winfield for his effort on this.

This has been pending for a number of years. In fact, the first person, I recall, who raised the issue in the inequity of it a long time ago was then Representative Anne McDonald when she was Chair of the Finance Committee.

She had a friend in Stamford, who had a son, who was incarcerated and was talking about exactly how much it was costing the family to keep in touch with the son with all of the collect calls between Somers and

Stamford that were going on, and that's 20 years ago.

So the issue has been pending for a long time, Madam President.

And as senator Winfield said, one of the things that we have seen in all of the sociological or criminal justice, the studies that have been done about recidivism about successful reentry to the community and rehabilitation is that those prisoners who are able to keep in close contact with their families, while they are incarcerated and are able to keep part of the social network of their family, their extended family are much more likely to not be isolated, not be alienated, and not be likely to return to a life of crime when they come out of prison.

And are much more likely to successfully rehabilitated, be able to have a community contact necessary to secure housing and employment.

So maintaining this kind of contact and not making it a barrier because of cost is really part of the therapeutic process we have of dealing with prisoners and trying to increase the odds that they will successfully reenter society.

So I consider it a good investment for that purpose and part of the process of rehabilitating prisoners.

Also, Madam President, the reality is that most of the prisoners in our system come from the cities like Hartford, New Haven, Bridgeport, Waterbury, New Britain, Norwalk, Stamford and Danbury.

Those communities alone make up the overwhelming majority of incarcerated people in the state of Connecticut.

And almost all of those communities are at a considerable distance from where the prisons are

located. Prisons most likely being in northeast Connecticut.

So many of those families are very poor. Many of them are not able to travel to visit their incarcerated relatives because they are so far away on other ends of the state.

So the only lifeline, the only way to possibly keep in contact is to have as frequent phone conversations and phone contacts as they possibly can.

And for that reason, madam President, I think this Bill facilitates that. And I consider it a good investment of therapeutic policy to help reduce the kind of alienation and detachment and sense of isolation that so many prisoners feel when they come out of the system, and making it more likely for the odds to be against them in terms of quickly reentering it.

So Madam President, I support this Bill as a good investment in our campaign against prisoner recidivism.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney.

Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the Bill before the Chamber?

If not, I will open the machine and Mr. Clerk, would you kindly announce the roll call vote?

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

Immediate roll call vote on Senate Bill 972 as amended, has been ordered in the senate.

Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Bill 972 as amended.

Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate Bill 972 as amended.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 972 as amended.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted?

Have all the Senators voted?

The machine will be locked.

Mr. Clerk please announce the tally on the Bill.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 972 as amended.

Total number voting	35
Total number of voting Aye	29
Total vote Nay	6
Absent not voting	1

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

The legislation is adopted.

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President would the Clerk now call Calendar Page 30 Calendar 394. Senate Bill 1034. Mark that go.

Followed by Calendar Page 15 Calendar 243. Senate Bill 1036.

Followed by Calendar Page 41 Calendar 261. Senate Bill 920.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff.

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 30 Calendar No. 394 Senate Bill 1034. AN ACT CONCERNING MINORITY TEACHER RECRUITMENT AND RETENTION.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon, Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Well, good afternoon, Madam President, how you doing today?

THE CHAIR:

Just very well. Thank you.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

That is a wonderful great day outside. Great day inside.

Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage.

Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Absolutely. This is Bill titled Act on minority teacher recruitment retention, and that is exactly what this Bill does.

This Bill has a couple of sections -- oh, I'm sorry, before I go that far. Madam President.

This Bill has a multiple section. It also has an Amendment that I also want to speak on in a minute.

But it requires and creates a pathway for individuals who are currently working in our school districts. They might be employed as some terms para-professionals, acting teachers or adjunct teachers, things of that magnitude.

But these are individuals who are known within the school district who demonstrate a great deal of cultural competency, and competency in the field of education.

And what we want to do is create pathways for these individuals to go into the field of education.

The studies have shown that in this country that all students, all students, regardless of your race, culture, or creed, learn better when they are taught by a diverse teaching population.

And that's something that we do not have in the state of Connecticut.

So what we're trying to do with this piece of legislation is create a pathway so we can have more students being exposed to multiple teachers in a classroom who may look like them or come from a background they are.

Because at the end of the day, what we want to see happen in our state is make sure all our kids are being educated at the highest level.

And like I said earlier, the research shows that all students' academic levels are lifted up when they taught by a diverse teaching population.

And unfortunately, we do not have very diverse teaching population in the state of Connecticut.

So that's basically the overall view of it. I'll speak a little bit about Section 1. It talks about the program that we're creating. It is a great program. We put the resources in place and basically putting our money where our mouth is.

Madam President, I am sorry. That's a surprise -- I move acceptance.

THE CHAIR:

Excuse me, Senator, would you like to have a move an Amendment? Because I know that you mentioned earlier that you have one. Are we on that yet?

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Yes. Yes, absolutely.

THE CHAIR:

Okay. So why don't we have -- if you would give us the LCO number. We will have Mr. Clerk, call that for us.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Madam President. The clerk is in possession of LCO No.8546. Move adoption in that extent. Move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Okay. So the Amendment, Mr. Clerk, if you would please call that.

CLERK:

Yes, LCO No. 8546. That would be Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

And Senator McCrory, you have moved adoption of the Amendment. And please do summarize, sir.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Absolutely. This Bill has -- this Amendment Act speaks to one of the things that we did last year in regards to the approval of the black and Latino Studies course.

We want to make sure that course is that is going to be taught and being taught and by approved state board of education.

And also, we have on Amendment a five or six. There's a section in there that we require multiple measures of continuity and mastery when you want to be certified.

So Madam President, at this point, I will actually move for adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Excellent. So the question is on adoption, will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber?

Good afternoon, Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Good to see you this afternoon.

Madam President, I rise in support of the Amendment. I do have a question or two for the proponent.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

Senator McCrory, prepare yourself.

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, through you to the good Chair of the Education Committee.

Senator, in terms of Section 501 of the Amendment talks about conducting a study of multiple measures, which I know we just briefly -- you provided a brief explanation of.

I'm just wondering if you might be able to provide a little more detail as to what we're going to be asking SDE to be studying.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Absolutely, Madam President.

So this Section right here asks that -- so currently in the education system in the state of Connecticut, in order to become a certified teacher, you must pass what they call a Practice Test. Practice 1 and Practice 2.

Once you get to the Practice 2, if you're not successful, you go back and take the test over and over again. And that is the only measure that we use in the state of Connecticut to determine whether you can be a teacher in the classroom.

That's the only measure we use, if you can pass a test that speaks to nothing about how your ability to relate with students, it speaks to nothing about how your ability to rate the parents. It speaks to nothing how your ability to do the election, it speaks to nothing to about how you build a relation.

It speaks to nothing of that. The only way we're saying that you can successfully teach in the state of Connecticut, is pass this one assessment.

And what we want to do is to broaden the IRIs and say that, instead of just using that one assessment to determine whether you can go in that classroom and teach, we're going to look at other forms of assessments that we can use as a pathway to determine that you are qualified individuals to go in that classroom and teach.

And I will personally speak to this because myself being a 30-year educator, it took me an entire year

to pass an assessment to determine whether I can actually qualify to teach in the classroom.

One year, I wasted a whole year of my career, just trying to pass a test, which had nothing to do with my ability to teach.

And I'll tell you this, when I lost that year, the children in the state of Connecticut lost a year, because I know I didn't need a test it to determine whether I could teach, I knew I can do it.

And I think that test was just a roadblock, which has been used for years to prevent people who want to go into further education.

And I put my record up against any education mistake. That test didn't determine whether I could do it, my ability that I showed in the classroom turned out that I was successful.

So Madam President, through you, that's what we're trying to do with this piece of legislation.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President.

And Senator McCrory. I appreciate your explanation. I guess I would go -- add a couple of comments to that in that I too, took those same exams many years ago and spent a large part of my time in that year getting ready for them.

So just so I can make sure that I'm exactly clear through you, Madam President, to the proponent, and to the good Chair, where it's essentially with this Amendment to the Bill in this section added, we are

allowing for more measures and more points of interaction with our potential teachers in terms of their evaluation and not relying solely on one mechanism.

And this would, again, through you, Madam President, this would allow for, ultimately, and I think this is the goal of the -- not only Amendment, not only the Amendment, but the underlying Bill, to open up opportunities for teaching for more people in Connecticut.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Through you, Madam President.

I absolutely concur. This is what we're trying to do. Again, as I spoke earlier, what we're trying to do with this piece of legislation is to provide pathways, more opportunities for our kids to be exposed by teachers who are -- look like them.

But not just that the research, the research shows that all our kids, all our kids are lifted up when they taught by a diverse population.

And if we know the research, we should follow the research and therefore all our schools will get better quality education in state of Connecticut.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President.

Again, I think the good Chair for the answers.

Madam President, I as I stated when I stood up a moment ago, I rise in support of the Amendment and I urge adoption.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber?

Will you remark further on the Amendment?

If not, let me try your minds.

All in favor of the Amendment please signify by saying aye.

MEMBERS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed?

The Ayes have it.

Will you remark further on the Bill as amended?

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President.

It's always a great time for me to be able to have a colloquy with Senator McCrory.

I think the children of Connecticut are blessed to have someone of his caliber and his background to be the chair of the Education Committee.

And I always look forward to hearing his comments on whatever we're talking about educational issues in the state of Connecticut.

And they will -- but I did have some questions, Madam President, through you, to Senator McCrory, on one part of the Bill, and I may just maybe need a little bit of understanding.

It was regarding the residency program. And my initial read through it -- and I was confused. Let me tell you what I thought and then hopefully, you'll correct me, that it was applicable to Alliance districts, I have Alliance district in my Senate district, and that they would -- 10% of their ECS money would be sequestered held aside unless they participated in this residency program.

And residency doesn't necessarily get to live there. But it says that you have to hire a teacher or hire somebody, an individual doesn't necessarily have to be a teacher at this point.

They have to be employed for about 10 months in a school district, or they have to come from a Regional Education Center. So it'd be a charter school, I believe, or magnet school.

Now, I was a little confused on that, because what happens when this becomes law? If the school is already staffed appropriately, they've already got all their positions filled. And they're subject to a 10% hold-back of their monies. How does that affect them? And is that right?

Especially now, if some school districts and in particular the one that I'm talking about, you may see a decline in student population. So the district's doing all they can just to hold the staff that they have.

So through you, Madam President, Senator McCrory wouldn't mind explaining that a little bit better to me. I'd appreciate it.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Absolutely Madam President. So let me explain this. First by the teacher residency program.

It's actually a program that actually started last year to the Capital Region Education Council and what they did was take -- and they use their own funds.

And what they did was basically identified 10 -- I think it was 12 individuals and they put this into this -- they put them and created this program, where they are continuing -- they work during the day in their present job as they may be a para-professional, they may be a coach or they may be an assistant teacher.

So they currently work in a job and on the weekends and at night. They go through the program come certified. So they help them get certified.

So initially run by Craig now, to was so popular, all 12 individuals -- so popular, popular that now we want to extend that program not just having for the Hartford area to Craig by expand to all up Alliance, where they can create these program opportunities for all school districts across the state of Connecticut.

So that's why we need the resources for it. And again, it was very successful. And I believe like 95% of engineers that had to go through this program are minority.

They don't have to be. But clearly these programs -- the attentions on this program, they identify people of color being in the program.

So that's how the program works. How is financed 10% of the Alliance, this is ECS money will be used for this particular program. It's not cheap. It's not a cheap program.

But we saw that if we -- again, the goal is to put teachers of reverse the virus teaching public in front of we saw that we've held 10% of their money, so they use these dollars for things that is manageable.

If we use 10% of their increase. And for this program to fund this program. Now, if all the positions are filled in a particular school district that individuals brought through that program do not necessarily have to work for the school district that they came from.

So for example, we have someone from Hartford who went through the program, they couldn't find a position in Hartford, they can go out and get recruited by Sainsbury's or any other school district where they get picked up.

And I think about this, when these individuals have come out of this program is not the Alliance districts that go after them first, it is the school districts and the communities where there's not a lot of diversity that actually pick up these students. So you get a double bang for your money.

So that's how the program is initially run. And that's how the program is financed.

Through you, Madam President,

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory. Thank you.

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Thanks, Senator McCrory. Once he started talking about it, I remember [inaudible] talking about how successful that program was.

And I think there's either 15 Alliance districts in the state or 2025, somewhere in that number, as I recall correctly. 10% of that will be held back to for this program.

Now, if the initial program was only 12 participants, I don't know if that was a pilot program. How many persons do we anticipate being allowed to go into this program?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Absolutely, Madam President.

Currently from estimates, my last update was we currently have right now in the second Wave of the program, over 65 teacher residencies going through a program right now.

And that is three times. That's three times the number of teachers of color that are produced to our state school system currently.

I'm going to say that slowly. This program right now is tripling the amount of educators of color that the state of Connecticut produces in all their state universities and colleges alone.

So we will never get to a number of successful people of color, who are just going to wait on state colleges and universities to do it. It doesn't work that way.

Most people of color who go into the field of education they normally don't go through as their first profession. It is normally not their first profession.

What they see and what they realize was happening to their children and children in their community. And they make a pivot and go with your education, i.e. myself.

Madam President, through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, and through you, Madam President, the 66 and the 60 individuals that are currently involved in the program, they all came from Alliance districts, I assume, or they could apply. And then - - So tell me a little bit about how that works. If the Alliance wishes are hold back, and then if the Good senator has an idea as to -- I know, you gave him some examples. Some may be coaches, some may be para-professionals. What this class of 2020 is comprised of.

Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Excellent question. So the individual does not necessarily have to come from Alliance district, they can come from any students, they just have to have the need and wants to be an educator.

So let's say for example, there was an individual out there who lives in a non-Alliance district, but they see this program they want to be a part of it.

Yes, they can apply. There are qualifications for you to be in this program. There's certain qualifications in order to be in it. And it's the qualification that this must be able to do to execute program.

So yes, you do not have to live or work in the Alliance district to be a part of this program. You just have basically be sponsored by a school district, for example.

So again, there might be someone working in let's say, West Hartford currently right now, there is no one working in West Hartford. They apply for this program. The expectation is, of course, West Hartford is going to put up some of the resources for it, you expect that that person will come to this program, go back and teach in West Hartford. That's the idea behind the program.

Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Through you, I guess my last question to Senator McCrory is, if the Alliance districts are responsible for a hold back, calling it a whole back of sequestering of funds from their ECS formula. Do they get first dibs I guess, if you will from the students who say, "Hey, we have positions available, you know, it's our money that's paying for it. So we want you to come to my school."

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

That's an outstanding question.

Through you, Madam President.

Exactly. You would think that if this -- Alliance district sponsor, I can use the sponsor, but if you have an Alliance district, you're really not sponsored, the money is already there for you to pay for.

But if you're coming from outside an Alliance district it's like I said, the expectation is, yes, you want to go back and teaching that non-Alliance district. But yes, also those Alliance districts, they need those students too. Because their student -- I mean, their teaching population is also [inaudible].

So I always think that if, for example, if an individual came through the crack program, they were going to crack and they went through the program,

that's what it takes. Crack's going to try to get first day, but at this day, you are a free agent.

You are not able to go to any of you out there and find out what's the best deal you can make and go do it at any day. I mean in the classroom.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

I thank Senator McCrory for answering my questions. I look forward to this particular class of young professional, I won't say young because they could be whatever age they are. They just want to be teachers.

And that's what a great motivation to be to be. To want to be involved in that profession.

Thank you very much. That concludes my questions.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos.

Will you remark further?

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President.

And I enjoyed the dialogue just now between Senator Witkos and Senator McCrory.

I do have a few more questions that I would like to ask just for some clarification before we ultimately call for a vote on the Bill.

So through you, Madam President, to the good Chair. I'm not sure if we -- and maybe I just missed it. But I'm not sure if the question was answered, regarding whether or not all districts will be required to participate in the residency program?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Thank you.

Through you, Madam President.

Another very good question. No, all school districts are not required participate in the program.

But like I said, the research is showing in the state of Connecticut that all school districts are looking for a diverse population.

I cannot foresee a school district saying I don't want that program, because I don't want that teacher. But it's up to them.

But I don't see that as a major problem.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President.

And I thank the Senator for the answer.

In terms of -- and that makes perfect sense. I would expect that there would be some increased interest in this beyond just the Alliance districts.

And we've actually have seen some increased interest in my district and actually in my hometown.

The next question that I have through you, Madam President is with respect to the cost of administering.

I know that there is a provision in the Bill that allows for, as we spoke to a moment ago, allows for some monies to be held back for Alliance districts and then applied to the cost of that.

So if a non-Alliance district is going to participate in the program, and again, I know there's also around -- let's see, it looks like around lines 54 forward that non-Alliance districts can apply for a grant.

What do we anticipate if we if we know at this point what the cost will be for participation in this program?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Through you, Madam President.

Another great question through you, Madam President. So therefore, if the individual is coming from an

Alliance district, there's no cost for that individual for the program.

Again, the resources that were used for the increase in the Alliance is pretty much pays for the individual that's coming from an Alliance district in that in the program.

However, if an individual is coming from a non-Alliance district, we also were wise enough to realize that this cost for this program is about \$60,000. And we know that schools district are strapped.

But we don't want to give school district like any excuse not to get into a program like this, for all the reasons I mentioned earlier.

So we were wise enough to set aside a pot of money so we can do a deal. You can go after the grant to pay help pay, subsidize the cost of this program, if you were not in an Alliance district. So that's what those dollars are for.

Trough you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory.

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President.

Thank you again to the Chair for the clarification.

So I do note that in, in the Bill on lines 58 through 61 inclusive, it does say that the Commissioner may, within available appropriations award a grant to a local or regional Board of Education.

So we're saying that the cost is about 60 \$1,000 for participation and that the non-Alliance school district would apply for a grant back to the Commissioner for coverage of that expense?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Through you, Madam President.

Absolutely. And the reason why it costs so much, we have to realize most of these people are mature, they have jobs. They have to stay in those jobs. And they have to work every day to take care of their families. So we understood that. So that's why it's important for them to continue to work through the day, and go through this program at night and on weekends.

That's the only way you're going to attract people into a program like this. You have to be creative.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Again, thank you, Madam President. And I thank the Senator for his further clarification.

I do have just a few more questions if I may. In Section 3, which is also brand new. We speak about a collaboration between the Commissioner of Education The president of the Connecticut State Colleges and

Universities and the Dean of the NIAC School of Education at the University of Connecticut, jointly developing a plan to assist local and regional boards of education and promoting the teaching profession as a career option to high school students.

And then it goes on to say that the plan would include but not be limited to developing partnerships, etc.

My question is who -- I guess I guess we know who's developing the plan? And is there a deadline? We have an effective date with passage of July 1 of this year.

And I'm just wondering if there's a deadline for that group to get together and to prepare those materials that collateral material, I would call it in a in a marketing world to get that ready for distribution?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SEENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Very good question. So this section speaks to the fact that one way we will continue to build our network of students is we have to promote, we have to promote education as a worthy career path for students who are in high school.

Unfortunately, the reality is, many students do not -- Especially students of color, they do not see teaching as a vehicle for them because of the experiences that they receive in the various schools.

So therefore, they were really, really, really turned off by the teaching profession.

So what we ask that DDS school and other schools' education is create a program create a pathway, create opportunity, so that we can encourage those young people who are coming from those, those systems, those systems that prevent them to be successful.

And I will say this, it pains me to say that, but I was at a conference one day, and a young man came to -- I think he was from Bridgeport, and he was in this program like this, because this is not the first program, we've had similar programs like that.

And someone asked him when he was in college, would you want to be a teacher? His response was, why would I want to go back and return to the scene of the crime? Think about that. Why would I go back and return to the scene of the crime? Because that's the type of experiences these teachers -- these young people have had in the system.

And the only way to change that if you go back yourself, and be the educated, education that you did not have.

So that's what we want UConn to do. Is to prepare a pathway, a program to encourage and inspire those individuals who had a negative experience themselves to go back in that classroom and be the person you know, that those children need.

So that's what we actually do. We do not have an end date on here, because this is all ongoing, it will ever be ongoing in education.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, I can tell you that I, first of all, I appreciate the answer. Senator McCrory.

And I can tell you that I am very inspired when I am traveling throughout the district and other parts of the state, and I interact with high school students who tell me as an educator, myself, I don't currently teach in high school.

But I'm always deeply inspired when I have young people that are in high school that come up to me and tell me they want to be teachers.

Because I think that teaching is one of the -- in addition to public service like we all do in this circle, for better at work better or worse at times. Teaching is one of the really profoundly rewarding ways that an individual can give back to a community, to a school system that helped prepare them for the rest of their life.

And you know, I would argue that it is the -- and I've said this before in this circle that the charge of the Education Committee to me is more important than any other of the committees in the legislature because we are empowered and given the responsibility for making sure that we're doing right by our public schools and all of those children that are in those schools.

Madam President, a couple of more questions, if I may.

The -- later on in the in the Bill around Section four, we add a requirement for a development of a video training module.

And I'm wondering if the good Chair might explain to me what the intent of the module is and what we expect to accomplish with that video module?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Through you Madam President, what section are you referring to, you said section four of the Bill?

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Through you, Madam President.

Yes, I am looking at around lines 141.

Through you Madam President,

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Oh, yes. Section four speaks to what -- it requires the State Department in Education in consultation with certain [inaudible] to make a video training about, addressing implicit biases in hiring. Yes, let's speak to that.

So what do you see in the state of Connecticut, although we have a huge teacher shortage of teachers of color in the state of Connecticut, you do find there is a population of individuals who are currently certified in the state of Connecticut who are people of color, and they cannot find a job?

I'll say it slow. You have certified individuals in the state of Connecticut who are people of color, and they cannot find a job to work, yet we had teacher vacancies all over the state.

So I'm not the smartest man in the world. Well, I got a little sense. But more important, I got common sense. So I'm going to let you think about why aren't these individuals working?

If you have a shortage, and you have a need, and you have candidates, but somehow when they go to the interview, they can't get the job. They can't get the job.

Sound like this story that I heard all my life? Clearly, there's some biases there. So we want to try to educate those who are making decisions about who going to go in our classroom.

So that's the, and, sir, we'll develop this video module to train those individuals who are making decisions who are going to be in our classrooms and for our children. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator for your explanation. And, you know, I -- we were Senator you and I worked together on getting the original minority teacher recruitment Bill passed on a bipartisan basis here and a couple years ago.

And I think that, you know, your comments, and your concern about why we need to create such a training video are valid, because there is apparently some problem that still exists.

And if this video is intended to help address that, then I would say that that is the right direction that we are, we're heading in.

The Bill goes on -- so that that video initially in that section would be used for the training of basically human resources, personnel within our school districts, those that are involved directly in the hiring of potential new teachers into the district.

There is a further provision in the Bill, if you can just bear with me for one second, regarding the application of this same video to the continuing education that goes on in in service training with teachers and staff within the districts.

And I guess I'm -- I guess I'd like to understand if this video is intended to be used for hiring purposes and to address what is a bias in hiring. What is the need for sharing that with the entire district going forward?

Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator, McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Through you Madam President.

That's a very good question. So again, Section 4, they create the video but more importantly, it requires beginning of school year 2023 that each employee involved in the process, complete the video training.

That's the most important part, you can create the module, but you got to require it in trained individuals, and that's what we're doing in 2023.

And that's the beginning part of the process. First, you start with who's making decisions, about who's going to be in that classroom, and you train them how to be -- because we all have biases, we all have biases.

The fact that we do have biases should not prevent individual their opportunity. So you start with the person who's making decisions about the classroom, and then what you do, if you're serious about biases and training people? You start training entire staff, because everything starts from the top down.

So you train the hiring person, and then you start to train the staff if you really want to see change.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President.

So essentially, we're looking to extend the awareness that will come from the training of the HR, the human resources, hiring individuals in the district to all employees of the districts that we have, we have a widespread application.

So as I as I read the -- of the video for training to make awareness of the issue of bias and within the hiring process, and then within the district itself.

So Madam President, as I started, when I stood up a few moments ago, I support this Bill. I think that this is an important direction for us to continue in as we work towards the goal that we establish with

some legislation a few years ago, in increasing minority teacher recruitment in Connecticut.

The Education Committee has through its leadership, which has remained actually, curiously enough pretty stable through a number of different election cycles.

We have kept this as a priority for the Education Committee. And I think we will get closer to addressing the problem, where, you know, if we if we understand the data that comes to us from the State Department of Education, about the number of teachers who are certified and ready to teach today, you know, classroom ready, that are minorities that are not being hired, that this will help to address that.

And I'm a firm believer and have told a story in the past, in Committee and in public hearings, about my personal experience as a student in a public school system here in Connecticut at a very young age.

And Senator McCrory, you'll remember my telling the story, where I had a teacher who was a person of color, in the first grade and this was a, not something I'm sure that that I necessarily appreciated at that moment as a five-year-old.

But certainly, and this is a long time ago, because it was a long time ago that that I was in first grade.

But it was something that that I remembered, and it was something that that I thought was actually important and a value because I think that there's no reason why today in all aspects of what we're doing that we should be restricting or making it more difficult for someone to who is qualified and has met the requirements for certain types of licensure or careers, like a teacher, and Connecticut does a very good job at that, of

restricting them because of their race or skin color.

So I stand in full support, and I urge passage.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further on the legislation?

Good afternoon, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President.

Madam President, when I was sitting in the caucus room, I wasn't able to hear the exchange between Senator Witkos and the Chairman of the Education Committee.

So if I might a few questions around the area of how this is paid for and the grant.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Absolutely, no problem through you, Madam President.

And first of all, I will say that before I forget, because sometimes I get forgetful, I want to say our Education Committee works extremely hard on a bipartisan basis to get things done.

You would -- if you notice our vote counts, they normally unanimous are very close to, because we want to make sure that education is not political. Education should not be political.

So we don't have the antagonistic, I want to use the word, relationships with our colleagues. We're here to get the job done, because we're here to make sure our children are properly educated, all our children.

So back to the question, how is going to be financed. So 10% of the Alliance districts' increasing funding each year will be held back for the attentions of this particular program.

At the end of the day, we all know that the most important person in a child's life in the education system is the person in front the classroom, and we know that if we get better, more diverse teachers in the classroom, the Alliance districts will benefit but not only just the Alliance district, all districts.

How is paid for again? 10% is held back, the individuals apply for the program. If they apply to an alliance district, the cost of the program is paid for.

It's paid for because the funding is there from the Alliance districts. We also understood that this is not just the Alliance districts issue, it's a statewide issue.

So a part of that 10% will be set aside for grant opportunities for those individuals who are coming in from a non-Alliance district, want to be an educator, but they're not from Alliance district, but they are coming in through the Alliance districts, and the support for this program can come from the state of Connecticut to help underwrite the costs for the program, if you are coming from my non-Alliance district. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So if the town of Litchfield were an Alliance district in the year 2020-2021, so this current budget year, their grant from the state of Connecticut was \$490,000.

The 10% is 10% of the 490 or 10% of some growth beyond 490 that might occur in the next year? Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Through you, Madam President. Very good question. So explanation is, let's say, for nine hours, my math skills -- let's say it's 5000, right.

If next year, they get increase to 600,000, 10% of that increase, which will be 100,000. I mean, 10% of the increase from 500,000 to 600,000, 10% of that will be held for this program. Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Right, so for communities that are in the middle of a budget process right now, the effective date of this Bill would trigger the 10% hold back in this fiscal year that's being discussed, or in 2022, where they don't even have any idea how much money

they're getting in additional resources? Through Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Through you, Madam President. So this -- not this particularly for next year. So what we have seen in ECS funding every year since I've been here, we have grants where you have your traditional ECS funding, and then you have some special grants for Alliance district that where they also get extra funding.

So therefore, I can I have never seen a situation where funding was actually cut. If anything, it was stated saying at the same rate, so I cannot foresee a situation where actually school district will be losing money, this program will actually cost the money.

We always get increased ECS and we always have if we don't get -- if there's no increase, it is no 10%. Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So not a question, just a statement. I am not sure whether there is a community that is one of the communities that we either froze as part of the ECS formula or actually began to reduce part of the ECS formula because population hadn't been addressed for quite some time.

But following along with the assumption that what the good chair is saying is true. Communities that

are currently going through the budget process if they if they are building a budget based on some numbers that is not yet fact.

And I would argue that no community should be building a budget on a presumption that they're going to get more education money, given the circumstances we're in where no one knows whose budget is going to get approved.

This would be extra money, extra money that is intended to deal with education. And I would argue that the purposes for which this money would be sequestered, held back, dedicated, is to try to further the purposes of education.

It's not being held back so that I can, you know, in some community they can pave a road for it, it's -- I think it's the Chair who said that these are, these are areas that for a long time, communities have struggled perhaps, to try and find new ways to educate children or get educators in front of classes.

I think there was a period of time when we actually put in place a program where we took -- we created an opportunity for people to apply if they were coming out of corporate America.

And we thought, hey, you know, an engineer, who else better to put in front of a class on engineering that an engineer?

And so I kind of see this as the same concept. Except it is maybe Fuller. It is intended to be not only that in terms of the academics, but it's intended to be as Senator McCrory, if I can refer to him that way has so eloquently said, if you want to change the system, especially if the feeling is why would I go back to the -- to the, what was it? To the location of the crime scene, the crime scene of the crime.

My daughter is an educator. And when she came out of college, she went to work in an urban community in the state of Connecticut. That was her choice. She wanted to work there. She's continued to work there because she sees that as an opportunity.

And so I too rise in support of the legislation. I think the variability in what the budgeting may be is future budgeting that is intended for education. And I would think that it's within a tolerance level that almost any community should be able to deal with at this point in time. So thank you. Thank you to the Chair of the Education Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner.

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

Senator McCrory.

THE CHAIR:

Just one thing, I want to go back to what Senator Miner said he makes a very, very good point, when he said that his daughter came back intentionally wanting to work in that environment.

She went through her college experiences, she passed her assessments, and she intentionally want to go there.

What you're seeing what you haven't seen in the state of Connecticut, especially when our pre service teachers are, they're not getting that same experience.

So they're only getting their practical training in certain communities. So therefore, when they come out of school, and they can't get hired in that particular community.

They have to take a job somewhere else where they not may not want to be there, and it doesn't fit their needs.

But however, you pass the test. So let's determine that you're going to be a good teacher and that's why we made that other modification, using other assessment measures to determine whether you are successful if you want to work in that area.

So thank you Senator Miner, thanks to all the other individuals who asked question today. And Madam President, if there's no objection, I will accidentally Bill be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

And seeing no objection and checking out in various rooms if there are any objections.

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

I'm sorry, the question is on Consent?

THE CHAIR:

Whether we should put this item on Consent.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Madam President, I would like to ask for a roll call if we could.

THE CHAIR:

And a roll call has been requested. So I will open the machine. And Mr. Clerk, would you please call the roll on this Bill?

CLERK:

Yes, Madam President.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered on the Senate. This is Senate Bill 1034 as amended.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 1034 as amended.

Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Bill 1034 as amended.

Immediate roll call vote.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted?

Have all the Senators voted?

The machine will be locked Mr. Clerk Please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1034 as amended.

Total number voting	35
Total number voting Aye	34
Total voting Nay	1
Absent not voting	1

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

And the legislation is adopted. So Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Can the Senate stand at

ease for a moment?

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President for another item for our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President, calendar Page 15. Come to 243 Senate Bill 1036.

I'd like to place remarks on that calendar.

THE CHAIR:

And so ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And will the Clerk, please call the next Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed to call the next item Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 41 Calendar 261, Senate Bill 920. AN ACT

CONCERNING PUBLIC PRIVATE PARTNERSHIPS.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon, Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President.

It's great to see you today. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committees favorable report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage.

Will you remark?

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

The clerk is in possession of an Amendment LCO number 9004 I ask that the clerk please call the Amendment and I'd be given leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. Can we have that LCO number one more time, please, Senator?

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Absolutely, Madam President, the LCO number on the Amendment is 9004.

CLERK:

LCO number 9004 Senate schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

Thank you, Madam President. I'll speak on the underlying Bill in a moment. But let me just briefly summarize the Amendment. First, I want to thank my colleague, Senator Somers for her partnership on this Bill.

This really has been a bipartisan endeavor. And I think that those are of course the very best Bills that we pass in this chamber.

This Amendment makes the following changes to the underlying Bill, it sunsets the public private partnership authorization on January 1st of 2027.

It also limits the public private partnership law to department of transportation projects. And it should be noted that the Bill is quite long, but largely -- the Amendment is quite long, largely because it makes numerous technical and conforming changes to account for the fact that we are limiting the P3 authorization to DOT.

It also adds new provisions that limit the use of consultants on public private partnerships. These provisions are similar to those that apply under current law to projects undertaken using alternative construction methods.

For example, Madam President, it requires the DOT to make best efforts to perform development and inspection work on public private partnerships with in-house DOT employees and to eliminate the department's dependency on outside consultants.

Finally, Madam President, this Amendment requires DOT to submit reports to the Transportation Committee in consultation with representatives selected by collective bargaining units annually on the P3's projects progress, but also six months after the project's completion.

In short, Madam President, I think that these will be the most transparent transportation projects in the state of Connecticut subject to more oversight than they would be perhaps anywhere else in the country.

I will speak more about the need for the underlying legislation in a moment, but I will -- I'm happy to answer any questions that my colleagues have on the Amendments -- on the Amendment.

And I want to thank once again, my colleague, Senator Somers for her partnership on this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And just to be clear, you do move adoption, correct, Senator?

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Excellent. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Senator Somers?

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes, good after -- almost good evening, Madam President, and I rise in support of this Amendment.

This, as Senator Haskell has mentioned, is a bipartisan effort to make sure that this particular Bill with the public private partnerships, as you have heard, has great oversight.

And will avail the state of Connecticut to enter into agreements while providing protections for our state employees and certain areas that we are just

not necessarily trained and are capable of doing and help to move transportation projects along. So I'm in full support. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Good afternoon, Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Madam President, a couple questions the proponent of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Sir. Senator Haskell prepare yourself.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President through you to the honorable Chairman of the Transportation Committee.

It's my understanding that an earlier version of this Bill are eliminated or the important role of the state contracting Standards Board and reviewing and approving public private partnerships that does the Amendment language, protect the state contracting standards?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

I thank my colleague for his question.

Yes, the underlying protections in place for public private partnerships all of the many guardrails that

Connecticut has enacted, by the way for good reason guardrails against corruption, guardrails to make sure that there's not only copious reporting, but to make sure that it's actually in the financial best interest of the state.

All of those guardrails remain in place, and the one that he mentioned is not impacted by the underlying Bill or the Amendment and that's the provision that makes sure the state contracting standards Review Board has the authority and actually the responsibility to review every potential public private partnership and make sure that there is not outsourcing of potential work that could be done by in-house DOT employees.

THE CHAIR:

Thank You, will you remark further? Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Madam President that the Amendment language preserves language in the underlying Bill regarding eliminating the existing requirement that a P3 be a revenue generating project.

The Bill before us will therefore allow Connecticut to enter what are called availability payment, public private partnerships, which are long term contracts where the private sector is allocated the responsibilities of designing, building, financing operating and maintaining the facilities of our projects.

Are you familiar with an availability Project P3 in California known as the Presidio Parkway project that went over budget and passed it scheduled date? What protections are in place to ensure that something like that does not occur in Connecticut?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell?

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

I thank my good colleague for his question, Madam President. Yes, I am familiar with the Presidio Parkway project, this for those who aren't familiar I did the harm caused by previous highway expansions in the 60s and 70s.

It utilized a public private partnership to execute what was a really cost what is a really complicated project at the state and local government frankly, didn't have the experience to manage.

That being said, there are P3s that are across the country that are -- have worked really well and those that have run into challenges.

I think that in Connecticut, we have truly what is the most reviewed and examined process whereby the Department of Transportation would have to meet multiple thresholds review by the Legislature review by the Executive branch before moving forward with a project like that one.

The good Senator, though, did mention availability payments, and I wanted to provide a little bit of clarity as to what those are.

So as he mentioned, this Bill removes the revenue generating requirement under our current P3 authorization.

Here's the problem, Madam President is you and I know well Connecticut does not have tolls or user fees on our highway and without a revenue generating requirement, we simply weren't able to move forward on any P3s.

Now there aren't major transportation projects in the state of Connecticut that generate revenue other

than perhaps a parking garage here or there, massive tunneling projects, the Waterbury Mix Master, the I-8491 intersection simply weren't eligible for public private partnerships because they didn't generate revenue.

That is that precludes us from participating in and using tools like availability payments. Availability payments, essentially involve a private sector partner, providing money upfront for states as an alternative or more frequently as a supplement for bonding.

It's important to note, I think there's no transfer or leasing of state assets, no privatization of state work, the state pays back these private sector partners through installments.

It results in more projects and speedier completion of those projects. And along the way, our state gains access to specialized technology and expertise that may only be available in the private sector.

I apologize to my colleague for the long answer, but I think that the oversight is critically important in this Bill. But I also think that we need to modernize and adapt our P3 authorization to pave the way for what is working well in so many other states, which is the available availability payment model.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I also thank you -- I thank, through you the gentleman for his answer, and it's okay if he gives a long with an answer, we are in the Senate, I think that's okay, here.

And one last question, if I may, through you, Madam

President.

For many years, DOT has produced cost effectiveness evaluations that show a significant savings if work currently done by outside consultants were done instead by in-house state employees.

Does this put Connecticut in a position where it cannot capitalize on those potential savings? Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. No, it certainly does not the legislation actually, I should say the Amendment that's under discussion LCO 9004 actually requires that as I mentioned briefly, the department of transportation needs to make their best effort to hire and utilize in-house DOT employees where such expertise is available.

However, in informal conversations with the Department of Transportation, I understand that the sort of work that they envision pursuing through a public private partnership might be the once in a century historic projects, the I-8491 intersection, the Waterbury Mix Master massive tunneling endeavors, that perhaps we don't have the experience right now, within our DOT workforce.

However, an important provision of this Bill actually requires that there be some level of let's see.

Yeah, it actually requires that consultant agreements related to public private partnerships include provisions that provide for the training of DOT employees in bidding and managing P3s.

So I think that there are strong protections in place for the problems to which the good Senator is alluding.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

No, I just thank you, Madam President. I just wanted to thank the gentleman for his answers and his willingness to work with a variety of state holders on the Amendment language in the underlying Bill and I stand in support of the Amendment and if it's adopted will support the underlying Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

MEMBERS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed?

And the eyes have it the Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Legislation that is before the Chamber? Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Now that the legislation has been adopted, I did want to provide

my colleagues with a little bit of context as to why I support this Bill, but also why I really view it as a priority for the Transportation Committee in this 2021 legislative session.

It's no surprise to anybody in this building that Congress, our National -- Federal delegation is debating a historic and transformative investment in our country's roads, our rails and our bridges.

And whatever iteration of President Biden's infrastructure plan actually becomes law, there is the potential for 1000s of jobs to be created, providing a pathway towards a greener and safer and a more connected future.

This is, of course, welcome news in Connecticut. We all know, we talk about it frequently in this circle that we've got decaying infrastructure in this state.

It happens, our economic development it hampers our quality of life. And pretty soon after this infrastructure package passes through Congress, Connecticut is actually going to be in the position of competing against other states for our fair share of federal funding.

Now, there's no question that Connecticut has major needs, we've got more than 350 structurally deficient bridges.

I represent a community that relies on the Metro North train line, a train line that's gotten slower over the last 50 years not faster by nearly every metric, we're moving in the wrong direction.

But we are at risk, Madam President of missing out on critical funding, if we don't rise to the occasion, and embrace innovative financing.

Right now, we typically pay for infrastructure,

improvements through bonding, and that that's perfectly fine.

To the extent that we're willing to ask our kids and our grandkids to pick up the tab but since bonding in Connecticut is limited, so too is our ability to tackle major projects.

I mentioned earlier in this conversation, projects that will cost hundreds of millions of dollars, perhaps Billions of dollars to projects like the Waterbury Mix Master, the I-8491 intersection, one that's near and dear to my heart of the movable bridges on the New Haven line bridges that are so old, that our trains actually by federal regulation have to slow down as they cross over them.

Something that not only slows down our Metro North trains, but actually every train in the Northeast Corridor or even the Amtrak trains, because those bridges are so desperately in need of repair.

Now those repairs happen once in a century. And they are incredibly expensive. It is going to take us ages to make those investments and to see those improvements under our glacial status quo.

Now, thankfully, innovative financing tools like available availability payments, which I mentioned earlier, are an option for supplementing bonding.

There's no transfer or leasing of state assets, no, no privatization of state work where it isn't necessary, and the state pays back the private sector just like they would on a Bonding Agreement.

This results in more projects, and it results in speedier completion and along the way, our state gains access to that specialized technology and that specialized expertise to help bring our infrastructure into the 21st century.

Now I started, Madam President by talking about

President Biden's infrastructure plan and what does any of that have to do with President Biden's infrastructure plan?

Well, the US Secretary of Transportation Pete Buttigieg has made very clear that his administration is actually rewarding states that take advantage of innovative financing opportunities.

Already, federal grant reviewers are who are charged with distributing, for example, the infrastructure for rebuilding America grants or the rebuilding American infrastructure with sustainability and equity grants.

They are asking states to demonstrate how are they being innovative, how are they being innovative and in financing projects? How are they partnering with the private sector?

Unfortunately, Connecticut's outdated public private partnership regulations, they hold us back. Our Department of Transportation is prevented from partnering with potential private sector investors, and it just leads to slower project completion and more cost on to the taxpayers.

If we want Connecticut to be a competitive applicant, for the American jobs plan for money from the federal government to improve our infrastructure, then the legislature needs to pass SB 920 and I asked my colleagues to support the Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes. Good evening, Madam President I to rise for

many of the reasons that my good colleague Senator Haskell have explained so eloquently.

As far as the federal dollars are coming into the state of Connecticut, I don't really honestly see this as innovative. I think this is something that is way past due, we should have been doing this for years and years.

And I am in full support to allow the DOT, to be able to have options and enter into agreements with private companies that are willing to help advance the state of Connecticut and their transportation needs.

And I fully support this bill. And I'm hoping that my colleagues in the circle will also. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

I had to get into a wrestling match with the microphone, Madam President.

Madam President, I've listened to the good Chair talk about the importance of this legislation.

And it's my understanding, currently, the legislature would have to vote on a funding mechanism for one of these private public partnerships if it were to be done through tolls, or fees, such as on the Mix Master in Waterbury, that he's referred to probably no less than five times.

So if I could through you, Madam President, am I correct that this, this bill in and of itself, can't count on tolls or fees for the repayment of debt on the Mix Master?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I appreciate my colleague's question. I would point him to line number 267 through 269 of the Amendment that's been adopted, that specifies in no event shall such a fee extend to the imposition of tolls on the highway this state unless such tolls are specifically approved by the General Assembly.

Perhaps one day we'll get to have that fight on the Senate floor. But it's certainly not the fight we'll have today.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, I can't remember how old I was when I bought my second house.

But it was a construction loan. And I remember going into the Torrington Savings Bank and saying to them that this is what I wanted to do.

And I was told that they would think about it. But they very clearly, in part of that thought process, established whether or not you could construct the home for the amount that I had established, and then match my income to repay that debt.

So as an individual that's gone through that process, when I hear someone talk about financing,

the Mix Master and not providing the dot connections. I'm a little worried.

Now maybe we are going to get a check from the federal government. Maybe it's not going to come in an 80-20 grant and I don't know whether the new concept under our new President is in the format that we're all used to.

But I am a little concerned when the references are made to large capital projects having to do with a highway that there isn't something tangible.

Good the gentleman gives me something tangible today that wouldn't require another vote of the legislature to repay the debt on a reconstruction of the Mix Master in Waterbury?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Sure. Thank you, Madam President.

I thank the good Senator for his question.

So perhaps there's a miscommunication here, it's not as though the state won't be on the hook for the repayment in the availability payments scenario that I that I outlined earlier.

The issue is given the limitations and the amount of bonding that the state can pursue, we simply don't have the capacity to take on those larger projects.

And I mentioned a Mix Master a few times because that's one that many of us are familiar with, as we drive to work in this building.

But take the walk bridge down in Westport, Connecticut, a bridge that's over 100 years old, desperately in need of repair, forcing trains on Metro in order to slow down, there would be no revenue generation there either.

But through a mix of perhaps some federal grants that we win through demonstrating innovative financing, through bonding, which will still surely be required, and also through public private partnerships, taking the form of availability payments, we would be able to tackle those larger projects a little bit sooner.

And if I haven't answered the good Senator's question, let me be more direct in saying that the state will still certainly pay back these private sector entities in the same way that they pay back bonds.

And of course, the only difference, I suppose would be that we would gain access to specialized technology and expertise available in the private sector.

I don't think that really, we're talking about any revenue generation requirement. In fact, this Bill specifically takes that requirement out.

Instead, it helps the state tackle major projects a little bit sooner by availing ourselves with more options other than simply bonding.

I hope that answers the good Senator's question. But I'm happy to try my best to answer further if not.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

I thank the good gentleman for his attempt.

So minor construction, bids on and receives the bid to fix the Mix Master.

At the end of that process, I can assure you minor construction wants to get paid.

If we don't have the money today, under our current ability to finance that debt, and tax under our current taxing structure to pay for that debt, how under this new program, with some guy named Miner ever expect these going to get paid for the Mix Master?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Well, Madam President, my understanding is that the Department of Transportation would pledge resources from our special transportation fund to repay that.

Look, there's no private sector partner that's going to engage with the state of Connecticut on any project unless we are able to show solvency in our transportation fund.

And I think it's a larger and longer discussion as to how we --how we improve the long-term prospects of that special transportation fund.

But that really isn't contemplated in this Bill. Again, so far, under our current authorization, we've never been able to attract a private sector partner, because there's a revenue generating requirement. And there's some of the most restrictive P3 language of any state in the country.

This legislation isn't a guarantee that we're going to have a private sector partner come forward and partners with us on a massive infrastructure project, like the ones we're discussing today.

But it brings us a little bit closer to that possibility. If right now, Madam President, we've got two hands tied behind our back, this Bill would free one of them.

And I think that that's worth doing.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

Thank you, Madam President.

And I thank the gentleman. I think my visual, my explanation of my personal experience in financing a home is on point.

If I said to Torrington Savings Bank, give me the money. I know my monthly check isn't enough. But we'll figure it out. I don't think I'd have built the house I lived in for 23 years.

I don't think the bank would be solvent. Because if they made the same mistake with me that they would make with everybody else I can tell you, a relatively conservative lending institution would not exist, and they are great people.

This sounds to me based on what I'm hearing is, don't worry about it. We'll figure it out.

If this was purely limited to a train station, and the construction of that project, and some state and federal tax credit for being involved in that project would be sufficient plus whatever the state wanted to throw in there. Sign me up.

If it was a parking garage, that doesn't require

this body to come back and vote on whether or not the person that constructed the parking garage, charged \$2 or \$20 to park for the day. Sign me up. Because they're on the hook for it.

But it sounds to me like we're going to pass a bill. And I don't quarrel with the Chairman's presentation that we have yet to be able to figure out a way to finance these large capital infrastructure projects with regard to transportation. I don't quarrel with his opinion.

What I am worried about is we're saying, don't worry about it. Don't worry about it. We're going to get a check from the federal government. We've got money in the Connecticut bonding line.

And those two things together aren't going to be enough. But we'll figure out that last piece. That's the part that has me concerned about what I've heard so far.

This isn't about someone getting an add-on to unemployment, that we're not sure how we're going to get paid. We don't know how the federal government's ever going to put that money back.

This isn't about federal resources paid during a pandemic, to try and help people get through. There's no plan as to how it's going to be repaid. It's all debt.

And given the conversation we've had about tolls, given the conversations we've had about transportation in general, moving to non-fossil fuel energy, which would pay no fuel tax.

I got to tell you; I'm concerned. I liked the idea of private public programs. I've been a supporter of them for as long as I've been in the legislature, I think. But this is a leap of faith. An absolute leap of faith.

Unless somebody could connect the dots, and maybe I am thick, I think the last gentleman that stood right here said maybe I don't quite understand when I post a question.

But I mean, I think I do understand that the -- you have to be able to connect the dots, we have to be able to connect the dots.

And if we can't connect them, how do we get to yes, that's my concern.

And again, is somebody that has financed houses, cars, education, you got to connect the dots. And this seems to me that it's got a gap in it somewhere.

And if the gap is, you know what? You're right. But next year, we're going to come back and we're going to vote on tolls. I understand. I'm willing to vote on this bill that way, I no problem voting on that bill this way.

But somebody's got to connect the dots.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Well, thank you, Madam President. I certainly appreciate the thoughtfulness of the good Senator.

I just want to respond, you know, essentially, this is a bill focused on looking at what's working well, in other states.

Florida, Virginia, Pennsylvania, many other states have found that availability payments, which is one

of the P3 models that I mentioned earlier, are quite useful for non-revenue generating projects. The alternative, of course, is just to bond the money. But that's more expensive.

If there's another option that's on the table. From I would love to hear it. But I just don't think that there is and why is this less expensive than bonding will largely because when the Department of Transportation goes to market, for bonds, they need to show that they've got twice as much money in revenue for the STF as they plan to pay in debt.

It's an extremely conservative coverage requirement. But it makes bonding all that much more expensive. This would essentially shift the repayment costs away from the debt services line item, and instead, move it over to the Department of Transportation.

So again, I don't think that it in any way contemplates revenue generation, this Bill is all about taking the revenue generation requirement out of it, and giving the Department of Transportation a little bit more flexibility in terms of Yes, they're still going to pursue bonding, certainly, and that bond is still going to have the coverage requirement.

It's expensive, but perhaps to supplement that we could pursue the less expensive availability payment model that has worked so well in other states.

And I also just want to push back very briefly on the notion that that this Bill in any way says, trust us or we've got this covered.

As I mentioned earlier, this Bill requires more transparency and input from the General Assembly from various departments and agencies within the executive branch from the Contract Standards Review Board than any other transportation project in the history of the state.

If we are to see a P3 it will be thoroughly reviewed and reported upon to the general assembly to the Governor's Office to DECD, to DAS, to many other agencies.

And there are a lot of provisions that require each of those or many of those actors to consider financial viability to consider the impact on state finances.

So I don't think that this is the end of the conversation in terms of the input that this body and this government will have on P3s. I think that it's really only the beginning if we're to move forward in what has worked so well in many other states.

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further? Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Thank you very much for the recognition.

I rise for the purpose of offering an Amendment. But let me just say a couple of words. Before that.

I appreciate the conversation. I just heard from my two colleagues. And I'm very respectful of both of their positions and comments.

And I don't think I could have choreographed my Amendment any better based on their conversation, because suppose I agree with my dear colleague, Senator Miner, when he says that, we need to connect the dots about how this process will work.

To me a public private partnership is a very broad term, it can mean anything from pure privatization, where the government is essentially outsourcing some sort of project, to a private entity to do something all the way up to something much more, what I would

consider to be sinister and corrupt in the way politics is sometimes done, where we're using and hiding the activities of government in the form of a private entity.

And we've seen some examples of that in recent years, which concerned me.

I want to say I appreciate Senator Haskell pointing out that the purpose of this legislation is not revenue generation. And I guess that's the focus for which I'm standing here, Madam President.

I want to make sure that if we do engage in this type of public private partnership, that it's quite clear, we're doing this for a specific project and finding a way to use available funds to make that project happen.

But we don't want to impose ongoing costs, fees, tolls or taxes on our constituents.

So I have an Amendment. It's LCO 7562. I asked the clerk call the Amendment and I'd be allowed to summarize it.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7562. Senate Schedule "B".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This is a very straightforward Amendment.

It would add after the last section, a relatively short paragraph that reiterates a point that was mentioned that already exists in the Bill that says that "In no event shall such fee extend to the imposition of tolls on the highways of the state unless such tolls are specifically approved by the General Assembly."

And the new language that is added is, "And after the cost of constructing the facility are recouped. Such fee is an amount equal to the cost of operating and maintaining the facility."

In other words, it will not -- the charges, the parking fees, or whatever might be used as a mechanism to generate the funds for the project, they will end at the time that the project is completed and any ongoing fees will simply be for the maintenance of the structure and not for revenue generation. As was previously stated.

I think this is a good Amendment.

I urge adoption, Madam President, and I'd ask for a roll call vote.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Samson.

And we will have a roll call vote.

Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber?

Senator Haskell?

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I thank the good Senator for his thoughtful comments.

There's a -- in my view, a fundamental flaw with this Amendment, which is that nonprofits don't exist in infrastructure -- in the world of infrastructure.

Even the bonds that we get from Wall Street have to earn a profit have to be repaid with interest.

There's no -- if this Amendment were to pass, there is no construction company in the country that would participate in a public private partnership in the state of Connecticut.

If the good Senator is aware of any private entity that performs any service for government without receiving some sort of fee or interest for doing so, I would be interested in hearing it.

But short of that, Madam President, I think that I would ask that my colleagues reject this Amendment because it would continue to preclude the state of Connecticut from benefiting from many such public private partnership.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Forgive me getting up a second time. I just want to clarify that I don't believe this Amendment precludes any construction company from making a profit.

They would be bidding on the construction project and the -- you know, as a public private partnership, and they would continue -- you know, they would finish that project this. This simply says that once that bid and the cost of the project is completed, which would include their profits,

that no additional fees would be incurred in the future.

And I hope that's clarifying and enlightening.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further on the Amendment?

Will you on the Amendment?

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President.

Well, I was not going to say anything, because I'm a proponent of, you know, private partnerships.

But, you know, everything I've read, and I've seen, always tie the pipe partnership, public partnership to a project.

And so I'm listening to Senator -- Senator Miner and his concern, and I'm listening to the Amendment here. And I'm a little bit -- I guess, I want to ask the proponent of the bill, is, are there any projects that you have in mind that it seems like we are giving an open, I guess, they are giving DOT, the ability to enter into almost any type of private public partnership. And I'm concerned about that type of authority that we're giving him in this piece of legislation and tying it with tolls in that.

Listen, you've given me the ability to, you've given me the authorization to enter into a private partnership. And I'm going to go ahead and do tolls.

Through you, Madam President to the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And first of all, thank you to the good Senator for his thoughtful questions. So as was previously mentioned, in this debate, the legislation, the Amendment that has been adopted specifies that no tolls may be enacted under a public private partnership without the explicit authorization of the legislature.

I also want to push back respectfully on the notion that we are given in any way the Department of Transportation free rein to pursue public private partnerships.

The existing guardrails in place and Connecticut guardrails that have, by the way, as I mentioned earlier, been so restrictive that they've hereto for prohibited any public private partnership, or require more transparency and input than any other transportation project in the history of the state.

And if we don't trust that the Contract Standards Review Board will do their job or the Department of Economic and Community Development, if we don't cross trust all the various actors to verify that this meets the best interest of the taxpayers of the state of Connecticut. Well, the good news is this very legislature will have an opportunity to hold a hearing on any such project.

So I guess to answer the good Senator's question most directly, I don't have a particular project in

mind, I've mentioned a few major needs that we have in the state of Connecticut from fixing aging bridges, of which we've got 350 in the state of Connecticut, speeding up our rail line, which is so crucial to economic development.

But it is really at this point going to be the job of the Department of Transportation as well as potential private entities to determine which projects might meet the very stringent requirements and guidelines set forth by our existing statute.

And I would -- I would just emphasize that this Amendment is long only because it goes through the many, many guardrails in place and changes the word agency to department because we are limiting this to the Department of Transportation.

So as you go through the Bill, you'll actually see just how many hurdles and a public private partnership has to go through hurdles by the way that I support, they protect the state against corruption and ensure that the very best interests of taxpayers are represented.

But we in no way are given free rein to the Department of Transportation in this Bill.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell.

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you.

So every project that I've been involved in, I know what I'm what I'm going to be constructing. And then I go to a bank, and we work out the terms and

conditions of what needs to be what I what my obligations are.

But I don't hear that taking place here. There is no project in front of us. I have a concern about that. Because I think we by the time you get to a public hearing, the way that this is being set up, or at least the way I understand it, is the project is going to be -- it's out of the gate. You've already got everything into play.

You're going to -- it's a more of a formality at when you get to the public hearing. And there's some things that might get tweaked from there.

So you made a comment earlier about that, that the cost of this, you know, we've been, we're limited in our bonding STF amount.

I think it's not a \$1.9 billion a year that we bond. But the payment of that, you're saying that it's going to come out it should we enter into a private public partnership is going to come out of the budget of the DLT.

And that's what I heard correctly. So if we're not able to do it with 1.9, how are we going to expect it to do it with a new project that's being funded by a private public partnership?

And we're going to be taking it out of the DOT budget? I don't get that.

So we got -- so where's the revenue going to be? And if you if you mentioned, you know, we have numerous bridges to repair or to rebuild. So can we expect a toll or cost to repair going across that bridge going forward?

I know that I'm throwing a couple different things at you right now. But I'm sort of trying to put the pieces all together. It's all right, we can't afford it over here to 1.9. But we're going to ask a DLT,

who is pretty much stretched out in their budget, regarding their annual budget that they have to operate with.

I don't see how we're connecting all this.

Through you Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

And Senator Martin, I'll let Senator Haskell answer that question, but we are on Senator Samson's Amendment.

And when you started off, I thought you were going there.

But Senator Haskell please proceed, and then we'll go back to discussion on the Amendment.

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President.

I will do my best to answer the questions put forward by my colleague.

First of all, I think that there is perhaps a fundamental frustration in this conversation that we can't talk about specific projects yet.

I've mentioned various needs in the state of Connecticut in terms of our infrastructure, but the Department of Transportation, it can't actually approach private sector -- potential private sector partners, without the statutory authority to do so.

And under our current very restrictive system, they're there, they're simply not entertaining those conversations. So this would allow those conversations to begin, but it would hardly

automatically set them in process given all of the various approvals that are required.

Now, I think it's helpful though, and my favorite part of this job is looking at 49. Other examples, examples to follow and examples to avoid, there are really helpful examples to look at a public private partnership that have worked well to the benefit of taxpayers and helped approach transportation projects with a bit more expediency than we do in Connecticut.

Some of those examples can be found in Pennsylvania, with no county government, many waterways, Connecticut, and we've got a much higher than average number of bridges that the Department of Transportation is responsible for.

And, sadly, very often those bridges become structurally deficient without us taking action.

Now, the Pennsylvania Department of Transportation actually entered into a bridge bundling program under a public private partnership to design and in fact, finance over 500 bridges in a single project.

Interestingly, it's considered a national model to follow and to address the significant backlog of state of good repair projects in a given portfolio.

Another good example, is Florida and the city of Miami. They used a public private partnership for a tunnel in the Port of Miami because they just would never need to replicate that sort of project again.

So there was no existing expertise within the department of transportation to do that, the Florida Department of Transportation to do that project, and they didn't have the cash flow to support upfront financing.

So the tunnel techniques were used through availability payments that came through the private

sector, and they paid back those availability payments over time through the public private partnership model instead of their bonding.

And that brings me I think, to the good senator's overall question, which is if we can't do it through bonding, why would we try to do it through public private partnerships?

Bonding is simply a -- we will still bond shortly. But our needs are tremendous. And bonding is only one way to fund infrastructure when other states are using all the tools available to them. And I'm not just talking about public private partnerships.

Madam President, I'm also talking about the federal grants and loans that come once we demonstrate an ability to finance projects through innovation.

Bonds are more expensive because of the coverage requirement which we have in Connecticut that is conservative that when we go to Wall Street in pursuit of bonds, we have to show that we've got more than enough twice the revenue required to repay those bonds within our special transportation funds.

Availability payments are less expensive. And I'm not saying that we're going to finance any major project in the state of transportation through availability payments alone. But I'm saying that the needs are so tremendous. We've got to use every tool in our toolkit.

In fact, we've got to put more tools in our toolkit, we've got to unbind, at least one of the hands of our Department of Transportation so that we can continue to bond, so that we can use availability payments, and so that we can be a highly qualified and appealing applicant for federal dollars.

I hope that answers the good Senator's questions. I might have missed one or two in there.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Haskell.

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, I believe that I was addressing the toll issue sort of in a different way. Because if you start looking at these private public partnerships, and construction or the new construction of a road or a bridge, there has to be some type of revenue source in one way or another.

So that's why I posed that question, but I'll let others comment on too.

So, well, thank you, Senator Martin. And what we'll do is we will ask if there are any more remarks on the Amendment that is before the Chamber.

Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, I think this Amendment makes it very clear.

If there is a program, if there was a plan, if that financing package contemplates future revenue generated by tolls, let's have that conversation now.

Let's get it out on the table, let's make it clear that at the end of the day, when the Mix Master is finished, all the bills around the table, everyone's emptied their pockets all their pocket, change their

savings account, pledge their future income. And we're still short. That may be where we are. That may be what this comes back to.

Again, I think if we were talking about non-transportation related or non-highway related projects, this would be a non-conversation for most of us.

I think the Amendment just makes it clear. After the project's finished, after the payments are made to pay for that project, it's done.

The contractor is entitled to a profit. The contractor is entitled to the interest on that expenditure during the time that the project is being done.

But it's not designed to require future payment. It's not yet contemplated.

And so I think the Amendments a good Amendment, I would urge passage, and then we can vote on the Bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner.

Will you remark on the Amendment that is before the Chamber?

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

I rise in support of this Amendment.

And following up with the same premise that was shared by Senator Miner, when you're looking at public private partnerships, the private entities

that come in want a clear picture of the relationship they are going into.

These are business people looking for clarity, and transparency.

And for us, what was cited earlier is a clarification on revenue sources that may be forthcoming or anticipated from the legislative process.

And why not put that out into the open to really create a transparent dynamic?

Because when you look at the troubling challenge of how public private dynamics work, there is always the next tag.

There's always the next question about policy changes.

And that's why businesses, private businesses are reluctant to get into these business dealings. Because there is no consistency there is no transparency.

So I support this Amendment because it truly allows us to go into any agreement.

It allows viable business partners, private business partners, to say, Alright, I know exactly what the set of expectations are.

The set of books and transparency of where the money is, and go from there into an earnest business dynamic.

I think one of the biggest challenges if you talk to businesses is they have no idea where your governmental sources are. And we have no consistency.

We don't have any innovative ideas beyond additional

taxation and tolling.

So perhaps, if we're truly looking to get into a dynamic relationship, on a P3 relationship, perhaps the state should step forward and say, these are the viable measures that you can rely on, not for a future potential revenue to be.

So I urge support, I want to thank the proponent for raising this as a business person. Those are the standards for any business relationship you want to get into, to be sure that if you're in that partnership, that the partner you're going into business with has a set of financial revenue books that you can trust, not anticipated earnings.

That's been one of the biggest troubles. And I've seen it in my legislative career and seeing private public dynamics fail.

Because when one party does not meet up to the standards, the project sits at a standstill.

And if we're going to go back to taxpayers of this state, because the state has not demonstrated its ability to be truthful, or projecting of incomes and Being Earnest and transparent. That is where the problem is.

So I urge support of this Amendment.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further on the Amendment?

Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes. Good evening, Madam President.

I do rise in support of this Amendment. For a variety of reasons.

I would just like to say that I do think that this is a start, it allows the DOT to enter into public private partnerships that we have been constrained and unable to pursue to the state until this bill passes.

I would just like to say if we are going to enter into a public private partnership, especially in this particular field, I don't think there's any transportation, private company that's going to enter into an agreement without having the full due diligence of knowing what the expectations are at the end.

So I do have great faith that if anyone wants to enter into a public private partnership with us here in the state of Connecticut, that we will certainly be able to show how we are going to support it, how we are going to repay them, and what the entire landscape looks like in that particular contract.

I think what this Amendment is trying to do here is simply saying after the contract, for whatever it is, let's say it's a parking garage is completed, you know, myself as a business person I have already put into the costs my profit.

But when that is paid for that the private partner is not looking at this deal as something to have this continual revenue stream coming to them as continual royalty or profit going forward.

And I do believe that this Amendment does add grade credence to the fact that we're going to enter into agreements, we have to have the financing, whether it be from federal whether we bond from it, along with a private partner, who knows what the contract is.

But at the end of the term of that contract, just like you are paying off your house at the end of that term. He's he or she who has entered into the agreement would not be benefiting on the backs of our taxpayers here in the state of Connecticut to get this continued revenue going forward after the project is paid for.

So I do fully support this Amendment.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further on the Amendment?

Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President.

I rise in support of the Amendment and for a question for the proponent of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

I'm going to ask the Amendment question first, and then I'll have a few for you later.

Thank you, Madam President.

Good afternoon, Senator Sampson.

Your Amendment seems very clear that it just says that any revenue generated sufficient to pay for the

project once received, the amount of the revenue or the cost, then there's no longer need to collect any revenue?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Samson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and I appreciate the question from the Deputy Minority Leader. That is absolutely correct. Although there is the ability to continue to collect the cost of operating and maintaining that facility, I would just point out that the proponent of the Bill is fond of using the term "guardrails". That is exactly what the Amendment proposes to do, is to create the ultimate guardrail for us. What this underlying Bill is going to do, through you, Madam President, is going to enable the Department of Transportation to begin entering into contracts essentially, and some of those contracts do have the ability to create fees and taxes on our constituents. What I am afraid of, Madam President, is that if we do not put this guardrail on now, then they could create a project that has ongoing fees, tolls or taxes on our constituents. This Amendment is not designed to make it, so simply once the project is done, that revenue generation ceases, except for the potential for ongoing maintenance, etc., which I think people would understand, through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. I appreciate that answer, and I was concerned as I

read the strike all Amendment that now is the Bill almost to be amended or not. Lines 105 to 107 in that previous Amendment says that the Department shall not submit a project to the Governor for approval, etc., solely based on the amount of potential revenue generated by the project. So Madam President, I think that this Amendment realizes that there is an opportunity within the underlying Bill to generate revenue from these projects and simply as that there is a stop gap, but once it is paid for, good idea to generate the revenue to pay for it; but once it is paid for, then the revenue stops other than what we heard saying being the maintenance etc. So for that reason, Madam President, I rise in support of the Amendment and think it works well within the context of the Bill as amended.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? I believe there was a request for a roll call vote on the Amendment, so we will open the machine. Mr. Clerk, please do call the roll call vote.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. This is Senate Bill 920 Senate Amendment "B". Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 920 Senate Amendment "B". Immediate roll call vote in the Senate, Senate Bill 920 Senate Amendment "B". Immediate roll call vote.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Senate Bill 920, Senate Amendment "B"

Total number of voting	35
Those voting Yea	12
Those voting Nay	23
Absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

(Gavel) The Amendment fails. Will you remark further on the Bill before the Chamber? Yes, indeed. Will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Happy dinner time. And we are, we are commenting on the amended Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, indeed we are.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. Through you to the proponent of the Bill, and, and I appreciate the advocacy of public-private dynamics and, and the P3 vision of being able to leverage the incredible talents in private businesses you have with the incredible capacity and needs within our state government. That being said, I just have some particular questions in regards to how this strike all Amendment would work. So through you Madam President, is there any minimum dollar amount for the projects under consideration in this Bill? Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and I thank the good Senator for his questions. I will, I do not believe there is any minimum dollar amount contemplated in this legislation. I, again, we only in this Amendment seek to change a very small number of things, one of which is the Sunset Provision extension to January 1, 2027. And the other is removing the revenue generating requirement. We are inserting some protections and also requiring some additional reporting. But there is an underlying P3 statute that is, is implicated only because it has been extended, that is not in any way changed. And in my reading of that underlying P3 statute, which thankfully, was passed before I arrived in the legislature; so I am sure it was labored over by some of my colleagues. I do not believe that there is any minimum dollar requirement. Thank you, Madam President, through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I want to thank the, the proponent of the Bill for his answer. I do not believe I saw any either. And so with that said, if I may refer to Section 8, line 305 into 311. Could the good Chair of Transportation explain to me why there would be a shell requirement to either having a prevailing wage requirement or a project labor agreement. Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President, and, and thank you Senator Hwang for your question. So I do not serve on the Labor Committee, but my understanding is that

the prevailing wage applies if the state or town is putting out a contract for a public works project with a cost of at least \$100,000 for renovations, \$1 million for new constructions, new construction projects. Projects that cost less than those amount, of course would not be subject to the prevailing wage requirements. If this legislation has adopted a public-private partnership in which a private entity is putting out the contract for a project, it would not be covered by the prevailing wage law, so it would then be covered, it would then require a project labor agreement and if the good, if I heard the good Senator correctly, I think his question was why, and it is simply to make sure that we are paying adequate wages and attracting top talent here in the State of Connecticut to improve our infrastructure, which I am sure we all agree is one of the most critically important endeavors of this historical moment. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

I absolutely concur. It is a critical moment and our infrastructure is extremely important. Through you Madam President, is it a federal or a state existing statute requirement on those that was just cited? Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Again, I am venturing slightly outside of the cognizance of the Transportation Committee; however, my understanding is that the existing prevailing wage requirements are a state law. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And if I may, just for the indulgence of the proponent to get a better explanation if indeed it is either a state or a federal law to have a, a prevailing wage requirement, but in, in the cases of the dollar amounts that are less than what was cited by the good proponent of the Bill. What was the requirement, and why was the requirement to have a PLA agreement? Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

So my understanding, Madam President, through you, to the good senator; my understanding from the Department of Transportation is that they envision the use of public-private partnerships for massive projects, projects that probably do not need repeating today. I do not think that they are envisioning P3s for the use of small dollar improvements. That being said, obviously, the prevailing wage requirement would apply to any project that cost over a million dollars. The Project Labor Agreement, I guess, ensures that in, in the event that a smaller project is pursued, workers would be treated fairly and compensated adequately. I hope that answers the good Senator's question.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. We always try in this Chamber, and I appreciate the good Chair's answer. And, and, I, I think the key for me is, perhaps what is focused here is the large projects of transportations nature exceeding a million dollars in, in large capacity. But I do know many municipalities that would love to engage in, in public-private dynamics for smaller projects, perhaps a, a school track or any kind of endeavor. From my experience, there was one example in which a, a community had someone that was willing to volunteer and donate significant money to build a new track. But unfortunately, they would be bound by prevailing wage, even if it did not apply from a dollar amount that was just mentioned here, or to, to be required to be placed into a PLA agreement. So is there any consideration for projects that do not fit that scale to really foster public-private partnerships in a real dynamic way, not simply looking at large scale projects, but for our local municipalities, that could also use a P3 dynamics to be able to leverage it. It seems through this statute in this language and this requirement of, of having either prevailing wage or a PLA agreement, we would be indeed requiring any size project to have either of those two, which perhaps may not be relevant with large projects like I said, but perhaps on small community-based projects, this statute would actually create a potential increased burden on those communities. Were there any considerations for projects that do not fit that? Because right now, under those lines in Section 8, we are requiring any public-private dynamic to have either of those two in place. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, I certainly appreciate the good Senator's thoughts on this matter; however, it is really not contemplated by the Bill that, that any municipality would be engaging in public or private sector partner for example given a track improvement. This is limited to the Department of Transportation, of course, the state agency, and it is limited to transportation projects exclusively. So while it may be a valuable conversation and one which I would have to study up on surely since it falls outside of the cognizance of the Transportation Committee. I would say that the legislation before us is, is much more narrow and the reasoning for the language that we see in line, what is it, roughly 307 to 311 is the Project Labor Agreements ensure that there are not labor disruptions along in the course of the project, and that of course drives up the cost for taxpayers and, and delays the, the benefit for our constituents.

So that is I think the impetus for the language, although again I was not here when this particular statute was drafted. All that this Bill changes about the underlying P3 authorization is the word "agency" to "department" because we are limiting our, the scope of these public-private partnerships to the, to the Department of Transportation for infrastructure related projects. Thanks Madam President, thank you, Madam President, and I hope that answers the good Senator's question.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further?

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I want to thank the good Chair for answering the question and put it into context that relates to this Bill and, and the scope of this Bill. For me, I, I just wanted to thank for that information, but also clarified for legislative intent that is indeed covering a, a

narrow area of agency related and, and large scales Department of Transportation, and would not be applicable to any public-private dynamic partnerships that, that may ensue in any of our local communities and local projects.

So I just wanted to be able to point out. I thank the good Chair to making that clear as a legislative intent that it does not affect local communities and may consider public-private dynamics. So I, I thank the good Chair for this information. And I appreciate any endeavor that we have as an organization, as a legislative body, to create and channel our private entities to collaborate with public interest and, and public infrastructure improvements. Thank you, Madam President. I want to thank the good Chair for his time as well.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hwang. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise for the second time to speak on the Bill. So if I understand the gentleman's response to Senator Hwang, even though the threshold is a million dollars, if there was a private partnership project, let us say for a box culvert under a State Road, and it was a \$750,000 project, it sounded to me like that project would now fall under prevailing wage, even though it does not under the state statute. Am I right? Correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I guess, I appreciate the good Senator's question. I might need a little bit more clarity on the, the hypothetical situation here; but under a public-private partnership, a private entity is putting out the contract for a project, it sounds like in this scenario. In that case, it would not be covered by the, by the prevailing wage law. But of course, under this statute, which we are not substantially amending, but really only changing the word "agency" to "department", it would be subject to the project labor agreement. That is my read of the legislation, if I am understanding the good Senator's hypothetical correctly.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

So, through you Madam President, I think Project Labor Agreements are one part of what we are talking about in prevailing wages and other. Project Labor Agreements, I think in large capital projects have been shown to save money and provide continuity. And so large firms, I think would prefer to bid on those projects, because they provide the totality of not only the design, the engineering, the construction, the management, the whole, the whole deal. And in those circumstances, maybe that is the delta, maybe that is, maybe that is the circumstance under which the gentleman believes there is enough additional revenue in a project that someone might forego that revenue in an effort to get the big project and maybe finance it, and that is where that other additional piece comes in terms of what is being contemplated here.

I think I understood the gentleman to say that this had really nothing to do with municipal capital projects. And that is the circumstance where I think most of us have, have faced somewhat of a dilemma,

not that we are opposed to Project Labor Agreements in circumstances where they make sense, and not that we are opposed to prevailing wage in circumstances where it makes sense. But towns often feel like they are, they are overpaying for small projects because prevailing wage or Project Labor Agreements knock local construction companies, local project engineers out.

Madam President, I do like the notion that we want to be creative. I do like the notion that maybe there is another way to finance these other than this historical appropriate money and kind of appropriate payments. And that is the pot of money that you deal with, that on an ongoing basis that is what we have been able to cobble together to take care of our infrastructure.

For the last year-and-a-half, even though COVID, when I drive from the 30th District to Hartford, I drive by the Park Road area. And there is a large capital project going on the Park Road area. It is a large capital project that it has been contemplated for some time. It is not, it did not just materialize over the last year-and-a-half. The notion was that something was going to happen there at least a year ago, maybe two years ago. I might even suggest that it is on a map somewhere, and that it is conceivable that as a plug and play, it could become that piece that is missing; the piece that is missing from the infrastructure conversation we are having. I am hoping that is not true. I am hoping that the maps that we have shown the taxpayers of the State of Connecticut that have clearly laid out where proposed tolls were going to go, including the one right around the American School for the Deaf, is in fact not going to be a plug and play after the passage of this legislation.

I am not saying it is, I am not saying it is guaranteed, I am not saying I have ever inquired to the Commissioner of DLT. But what I am saying is for the last year-and-a-half, I have driven through that

stretch of road, and it was on a map and it was contemplated to be a toll gantry, and we have had a long enough conversation here today, where I suspect somebody other than Craig Miner, who has asked that question in that caucus room for a year-and-a-half, I would be in a position to put the Commissioner on the Department of Transportation on the record as to whether that in fact is what the proposal is there. Is it a plug and play toll gantry location? Because that in fact would finish, that would take care of this gap. Because some of the states that have been talked about here today with this type of a financing plan have in fact paid for those through fees and through tolls. And yes, in Connecticut, it would require it to come back. We would have to vote on it again. But that would finish the conversation. I am hoping that that happens in the next couple of weeks. Thank you.

Thank the gentleman for his explanations of what the project agreements are and what he hopes this to be, and I do not quarrel at all with that. I think that is the intention of people that have looked at these private-public partnerships, because maybe it could work. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? I will open the voting machine, and Mr. Clerk, please announce a roll call vote.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate; Senate Bill 920 as amended. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate; Senate Bill 920 as amended. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate, Senate Bill 920 as amended. Immediate roll call vote.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate; Senate Bill 920 as amended. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate, 920 as amended.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Senate Bill 920 as amended:

Total number of voting	35
Total number of voting Yea	25
Total voting Nay	10
Absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I want to remove an item from our Consent Calendar please, and then mark it go.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I would like to remove Calendar Page 15, Calendar 243, Senate Bill 1036 from Consent and like to mark that item as go and if the Senate could stand at ease for a moment, please?

THE CHAIR:

And the Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Would the Clerk call the item I just mentioned as an expo please?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 15, Page 15, Calendar 243, Senate Bill 1036, AN ACT AUTHORIZING THE BOARDS OF EDUCATION TO PAY TUITION TO ANOTHER BOARD OF EDUCATION FOR THE PURPOSE OF ENROLLING ITS ELEMENTARY SCHOOL STUDENTS IN SUCH OTHER SCHOOL DISTRICTS.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Well, good evening Madam President. Nice to see you again. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee Favor Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Yes, Madam President. This Bill allows for Board of Education to tuition out the K8 students to schools and other towns in lieu of operating their own elementary schools. It also encourages and allows school districts to tuition out their high school students to other districts. And finally, the third part, is Bill requires local Board of Education that do not maintain a K8 school or any other combination

of these grades to designate a school in another district for their students to attend with State Board of Education approval. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark further on the legislation before us? Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Good evening Madam President. I rise in support of the legislation before us. This, this Bill does address an issue that has been brought forth by, by constituents in some of our smaller towns in Connecticut. It is accent, as the good Chair has already summarized, it is essentially extending what was already in place regarding allowing students to go out of their, their local jurisdiction, if you will, for education to high schools and extending that now through, to now include K through 8. So I think this is a good Bill, and I urge passage. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Berthel. Will you remark further on the legislation before us? Will you remark further on the legislation? If not, I will open the voting machine. And Mr. Clerk, would you please call a roll call vote?

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. This is Senate Bill 1036. Senate Bill 1036. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Bill 1036. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate on Senate Bill 1036. Immediate roll call vote.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been noted in

the Senate, Senate Bill 1036. Senate Bill 1036,  
immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1036:

Total number of voting	35
Total number of voting Yea	35
Total voting Nay	0
Absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

(Gave) And the legislation is adopted. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, as  
another item for our Consent Calendar, please?  
Calendar Page 8 Calendar 148, Senate Bill 896; like  
to place that item on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered. Can you repeat that please?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar Page 8, Calendar 148, Senate Bill 896.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And as another marking.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you. On Calendar Page 41, calendar 239, Senate Bill 1047; can you that item as PT?

THE CHAIR:

Well do that, so ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and will the Clerk call the next item please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 11, Calendar No.182, substitute for Senate Bill No.952, AN ACT CONCERNING ENERGY STORAGE.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Thank you, Madam President. It is so nice to be here tonight, and so nice to be in the building with my colleagues. I would like to move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report on passage and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

I will. This bill is about energy storage. It is one of the critical elements of moving to a more renewable future. We know that wind and solar energy are intermittent power sources and the only way we can make them more reliable and resilient is by propagating energy storage batteries throughout the system. This Bill sets out procurement authority to be laid out through PURA and it will allow for thousand megawatts of battery storage over the next nine years.

So, also Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an Amendment, LCO 7906. I ask the Clerk please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO 7906, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

And Senator Needleman?

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Do I move adoption of the Amendment, I ask that the, that the reading be waived and seek leave of the Chamber to summarize?

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption, and please do proceed to summarize.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Thank you, Madam President. The Amendment adds storage for hydro power, nameplate capacity of not more than hundred megawatts, and it strikes Section 4 from the Bill. Again, this, this Bill along with the Amendment allows for procurement of a large amount of battery storage, and we all know that battery storage is required for a more resilient renewable grid. So with that, I yield to my Ranking Member who has been a great partner in moving this energy agenda ahead, all the renewable energy agenda, including this. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, and Senator Formica, do you accept the yield, sir?

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

I do Madam President. Thank you, very much, and good evening, to you. Thank you, Senator Needleman, I appreciate it. I stand, Madam President, in support of this Amendment. And in for purposes of clarification, Section 4 was a reporting requirement for municipalities. I believe why do not I ask the good Senator to clarify the reporting requirements so that we have that on the record as to why we are removing that section.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Through you Madam President, yes, I apologize for forgetting that. This was a reporting requirement for the local EDCs that has been struck, stricken from the record from the Bill itself, they will not be required. We would hope that they would try to keep on track with the grid at large and make sure that they move to a more renewable future, but we do not want to overburden them with additional reporting requirements.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator Needleman. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Needleman. As a former Chairman of the Water and Sewer Commission and a local municipality, I understand the need for less reporting and not more when it is, when it is redundant. So Madam President, for that reason, I stand in support of this Amendment and urge my colleagues to support it as well. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Will you remark further?

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

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

THE CHAIR:

I think we have to accept the Amendment.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

I am sorry, we need to vote on the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Yes. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Senator Duff, I think we can do a voice vote on the Amendment. All those in favor of Amendment "A" LCO No.7906, indicate by saying aye.

MEMBERS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Any opposed? Any abstentions? The Amendment is adopted (gavel). Senator Needleman. Senator Needleman, do you have anything on the Bill as amended?

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Nothing beyond what I said, I believe Senator Champagne.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne, do you have comments, sir?

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I have a question for the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Needleman, please prepare yourself. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you. Is any part of this bill going to cause any rate increase through Eversource?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator Champagne. Senator Needleman.

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, I do not know. I believe that renewables along with battery storage are the future. We do not price energy here. Energy is priced by the market and it depends on the market price at the time.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator Needleman. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I do have concerns that any, any new legislation involving electric storage, whether it is anything that it will increase the rates on Eversource. I am, I am just going to make that known. I believe in having the storage. I just needed to get a little reassurance and obviously, I did not get it, but I am okay. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Champagne. Senator Needleman. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

It is like musical chairs. We are up and down, we are not sure when the music stops here, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

I can see that Senator.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in support of the Bill. And just to comment a little bit on some of the, what I have heard around the circle with regard to this Bill is, energy has come a long way. In the short seven years that I have been here, it has changed incredible. Energy generation has gone from specific baseload requirements, as we know here in our great State, were anchored by Millstone station, which its

nuclear power provides 45% of our baseload and natural gas and other 45%.

Madam President, you know very well in your district, that renewable energies are beginning to make up more and more of the energy generation here in Connecticut.

Intermittent sources, that is what renewable is. When the wind does not blow and the sun does not shine, we are not generating any energy. So that is where the next effort should be put, is a way to maximize that intermittency of the renewables. And that is where storage comes in. Storage and new batteries have been around for a little bit of time. It is just that they are not at this point. Practical and affordable enough to really have an effect and a positive effect on ratepayers and a positive effect on maximizing the storage of intermittent resources.

So Madam President, this Bill purports to begin the process of introducing battery storage to Connecticut, to maximize the opportunity for energy generated by wind and solar here on land and perhaps offshore wind, which is being developed or contemplated to being developed off our coast. So Madam President, for this reason, I am in support of the Bill. I am hopeful that it does its job, provides storage and energy efficiency, but it also helps to stabilize energy costs for our constituents. I do not know that it is going to lower costs in the short term, but hopefully in the long term, it will begin to stabilize and maximize the use of our powers, which I believe to be in the best interest of the ratepayers in the State of Connecticut. So for that reason, I urge adoption. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator Formica. Senator Needleman?

SENATOR NEEDLEMAN (33RD):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, Senator Formica said those things very eloquently, and he is absolutely right. Connecticut has been a leader in renewable energy propagation and this is a key element of that. We need to move forward; we need to have a resilient grid. And battery storage is going to provide that as we wean ourselves off of fossil fuel.

The pricing is interesting thing to have a conversation about, because pricing does not necessarily take into account the entire lifecycle of an energy source. As we know, different energy sources have lifecycle costs that are very different than the price that you pay in the moment. We believe that overtime, batteries are being brought down in price, and incentivizing them is a critical element in moving us forward. So with that, Madam President, if there is no objection, I ask that this Bill be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator Needleman. Is there any objection? Is there any objection? Seeing none, so ordered. Senator Duff (gavel). Yes, go ahead. Mr. Clerk, please call.

CLERK:

Page 40, Calendar 208, Senate Bill 1004, AN ACT CONCERNING DENTAL AND VISION INSURANCE COVERAGE FOR CHILDREN, STEPCHILDREN AND OTHER DEPENDENT CHILDREN.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President, good afternoon. Will stand at ease for a moment, please.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I would like to yield, actually the Clerk did call the Bill. I yield to Senator Lesser please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Senator Lesser, will you take the yield?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

I will Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue sir.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on passage and adoption. Please continue sir.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an Amendment, LCO 8993. I ask that the Clerk please call the Amendment, and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No.8993, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser, please summarize.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Although this is a strike all Amendment, perhaps I can confine my remarks to the specific changes made by the Amendment, which simply conforms the underlying Bill to another Bill passed by this Chamber last week, Senate Bill 1045, regarding how long 26-year-olds can stay on their parents' health plans, and it is a conforming change and reflects what this Chamber has already adopted. And so Madam Chair, I urge adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. Will you remark? Will your remark? Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It is good to see you up there.

THE CHAIR:

Nice to see you too.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Happy dinnertime. Thank you. I, I am familiar with this Bill. And through you Madam President, just some questions to the proponents of this Amendment to get a better understanding.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Lesser, prepare yourself please sir. Please continue.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you very much. And indeed, this Amendment addresses Senate Bill 1004, and it did have parallel similarities to a Bill that we did address earlier in the Circle, Senate Bill 1045. Now, this strike all Amendment parallels, if I recollect many, if not identical to the language of 1045; but just simply adds dental. Through you Madam President, could the good Chair verify that, and, and explain further detail, the rationale why we had to create a parallel language to the previously passed language in 1045. Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President, and through you to the Honorable Ranking Member of the Insurance and Real Estate Committee. This issue was brought to our attention by the legislative Commissioner's Office, advising us that if two versions of a Bill, each modifying the same section of the general statutes were to pass the House, there could be conflict in terms of how to interpret it. And so based on the fact that 1045 had already passed the Chamber, it was in our judgment based on the advice of the LCO Attorney that we conform the two, so that yes, some of this language is duplicative to 1045. But the purpose of the Bill which I hope to get to after the

Amendment is adopted, is not about what was in 1045, but rather to expand coverage to dental and vision insurance. Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. Through you Madam President, and, and I appreciate the good Chair's clarification. And, and the reason I wanted to raise that for legislative intent and for people to get the assurance that there was no misrepresentation or any ill intent in crafting a, a Bill that is virtually identical to a previously passed Bill. But in this case, I do not know if the good Chair articulated, even though similar and identical in language, it did expand coverage into the area of dental and vision. Would that be correct, through you Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, Madam President, that is in the underlying Bill, and it is also in the Amendment. I can talk about it now or we can talk about it after adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you Madam President, since this is indeed a strike all Bill for a very small Bill. But if the Chair could indulge in and articulate the rationale for the identical language, but indeed adding dental

and vision insurance coverage. And, and we will, I will ask also a second question related to that as it relates to the age extension that is identical to Senate Bill 1045. Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. So there is two questions in that? Thank you very much. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, you will recall that when we debated 1045 just a few days ago, we made a number of decisions; one, we clarified that a child, for definitions of insurance statutes. So you know, our laws allow children to remain on their parents' health plans up until age 26. Well, that includes a child, but it also includes a stepchild, and it includes another dependent child who happens to reside in the household or otherwise be a dependent. And so that was a clarifying language change that we made in Senate Bill 1045. And then additionally, we made changes to how long a child could remain on their parent's health plans. Under current law, they are kicked off on their 26th birthday, and this would allow it through the end of the plan year. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. And, and I appreciate that clarification. It is important, because even though it was similar, the, the, the new addition of two additional coverage is important. But through you, Madam President, to the good Chair for additional legislative clarification, is indeed, what happens

if a child before 26 or to the anniversary of that age for coverage should get a job and get health insurance, employment, get employment and get insurance coverage. What would that do, and does this new strike all language considers, consider that happening? Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. And thank you, through you, to the Honorable gentleman for jogging my memory and reminding me. Yes, that yes, another provision of Senate Bill 1045 reflected in the Amendment before us, does allow a child to remain on their parent's plan even if they are offered employment. And that was something that I think is, brings us into conformance with the Affordable Care Act and ensures that a child does not lose a health insurance coverage for, you know, if they, if they were to take a summer job for instance. Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator lesser. Senator.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And as a parent of a soon to be college graduate, I hope every single college graduate in this [inaudible] care gets the job of their choice. Through you, the addition of dental and vision insurance; is that part of the current existing coverage that we mentioned and discussed in 1045, or is this an additional area of health coverage, particular to dental and vision that did not, that was not previously covered? Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, that is new language.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Is it a new language? Is it a new coverage? Maybe I should have clarified, new coverage in the area of dental and vision insurance that was not previously considered either by federal statute or by state statute? Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

I am not sure what the gentleman means by new coverage. Current, under current law, health insurers are required to extend coverage to a policyholder's a child up until age 26. That language does not apply to vision insurance and to dental insurance. But it would if this Bill were to pass. Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator Lesser. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. And that is a point of clarification that I was looking to make sure for legislative intent. I look, I, I rise in support of this additional coverage. But make no mistake about it, it is important for us to understand that as we in this circle and in this General Assembly, contemplate health insurance costs, and, and managing the cost of it. What we have, are doing in this Bill is adding two additional area of coverage, in addition to one that is required by federal or state statute previously approved.

So we are looking to add dental and vision insurance for our students or children under 26 years old, and, and that would be an additional obligation that would be impacted, potentially in policy costs. So I, I just wanted to make sure for a point of clarification indeed and I will clarify the question. We are adding to additional area of health coverage that did not previously exist in this Bill in the area of dental and vision insurance? Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. It is my understanding that under existing law, a dental insurance company or dental insurance plan, and a vision insurance plan, are required to cover dependents up until age 18 of their child. And under this Bill, it would be up until age 26. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, and, and the good Chair actually helped me in a better understanding. And for those that may be listening in and, and understanding. This is not in an additional new coverage, it is an expansion of an existing coverage; that is important to note, because we are extending an existing coverage, as the Chair just clarified from 18 to 26, or when that individual is able to obtain a job and their own insurance. So it is important as we look at and be able to, to support this legislation to understand we are now, we are not adding new coverage, we are simply extending existing coverage by statute. So I want to thank the Chair for clarifying that, even though it is, it is, it is a Bill that has only 46 lines, the devils in the details and, and through our dialogue and the good Chair's explanation and clarifying exchange, I, I, I look to get more clarification legislative intent, which I hope we have accomplished here. So with that I urge support in an extension of existing coverage in the area of dental and vision. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. Will you remark? Will you remark further? Seeing none, we will take a voice vote on the Senate Amendment "A" LCO 8993. All those in favor, indicate by saying Aye.

MEMBERS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Any opposed? Any abstention? Motion carries (gavel). Senator Lesser, will you remark further?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in support of the Bill as amended. I want to thank the Chamber for lending its support. I also want to

thank Senator Looney and our democratic caucus for making this legislation a priority Bill for the last few years.

You know, when the Affordable Care Act was passed, it made a huge improvement in the lives of people across this state and across the country. And one of the most important things that it did was that it extended health insurance coverage to young adults. Those are folks with limited income, who often are the most likely to go without coverage. And in fact, in the Insurance Committee, we heard testimony that that is true, not just for, well, let me, let me, let me hold on for one second. Those young adults were, had their lives changed by passage of the Affordable Care Act, being able to stay for medical insurance purposes on their parents' health plans to age 26 by which time hopefully they have employer sponsored health care, they are on their feet, certainly and able to have the coverage that will continue throughout their adult lives.

But for whatever reason, during the passage of the Affordable Care Act, other forms of important health insurance, not medical, but vision and dental were not included. And so what we heard in the Insurance Committee was a testimony that there was a real problem in the state; a huge health equity problem, a problem where young people because they are cash trapped or are going without. And we also heard about major health problems that can be caused by the lack of continuity of care. So this Bill would ensure continuity of care. It would ensure that young people in this state throughout their young adult years are able to stay on vision and dental plans, that this will help close a huge healthcare gap that currently exists.

It is the right thing to do, Madam President, but it is also a cost-effective thing to do. Because in addition to hearing real stories of hardship and hearing about the dangers of untreated dental issues, and how that could have catastrophic health

events. We also heard some fiscal arguments. We heard one argument in particular, that each dollar spent on preventative care for a young adult in this state saves \$8 to \$50. In emergency medical treatment, that will happen when, when someone does not get the routine dental care that they need.

This Bill will make a real difference. For folks all across the state, it will help close the healthcare gap. And my hope is that by making sure that the age group that is the least likely to have vision or dental insurance, has that continuity of care; that will result in more overall healthcare being provided for them and reduce long-term healthcare costs. And I urge Members to support the Bill as amended.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator Lesser. Senator Hwang. Senator Looney, do you want to go now, sir?

SENATOR LOONEY (117TH):

I will yield to Senator Hwang if he has additional comments.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

I want to thank the President for time, for his, for his indulgence. And I just wanted to follow up on this underlying Bill as amended and, and I want to follow on the comments made by the good Chair of the Insurance Committee. Indeed, I do want to compliment the, the Senate Democrats for their initiative and effort. But it is also important to duly note that it was truly a bipartisan support that Republicans supported this initiative as well. As you can see in the Insurance Committee, it was unanimous. So I

think it is important, as I said many times, we discussed the issue of, of healthcare and, and, and insurance access and, and maintaining cost considerations.

The question in the queries that I made to the good Chair earlier in regards to the amended proposal addressed those concerns to be sure that this is an extension of coverage, not a new addition. That may be an additional cost. But that being said, I, I, really is, it is important to note, it was bipartisan in this approach. And I do not know if I caught that in the, in the good Chair's commentary, but I, I do want to emphasize that truly, as reflected in the Insurance Committee, it was a true bipartisan initiative.

But also the beauty of this Country is the fact that we do allow diversity of viewpoints. We do allow advocates that can speak and advocate for entities and that is the beauty in my belief in our caucus that we afford that. That being said, I think the second component of the good Chairman's statement was that we do have an important need, because of the difficult marketplace of young graduates, like I said earlier, I will have one; and the challenge that so many of our young graduates under the age of 26 are residing at home, either caused by the pandemic or the lack of economic opportunities. It really creates an opportunity for me to, to emphasize not only do we have an important responsibility of providing the coverage that was articulated here to our young adults in the area of dental and vision, but it is also incumbent on us, as I said earlier, that the coverage would expire if a young individual got a job, if they had an opportunity to create careers and jobs and opportunities for business and growth. That may be another problem that we need to emphasize here. It is not just simply the idea that we can provide a necessary resource and support and health coverage for those that are unfortunately stay at home or do not have a job.

Perhaps, it is also important to note that we want to work toward creating opportunities for businesses and, and individuals to create opportunities to get a job. So perhaps that may be a parallel in the articulation that the good Chair talked about in regards to healthcare coverage. But another opportunity that I want to emphasize is perhaps we should also talk about preserving jobs, such as the 28,000 jobs that the insurance industry provides in the State of Connecticut, and the numerous business entities that it fosters.

So again, I, I want to emphasize. I support this bill. I understand the importance of this Bill. But another component, in addition to a bipartisan support of this Bill, is the fact as we stated earlier in my exchange on the Amendment, an individual at under 26 that has a job that can stay in our state and career, and build a career path may be another goal that this Circle and the General Assembly can aspire to as well. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. Senator Looney [inaudible] Senator Sampson, so I am not certain if he wants to say that or if you would like to make closing remarks or?

SENATOR LOONEY (117TH):

I would yield to Senator Sampson.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And thank you very much to our esteemed Senate President. I do not

even have this Bill before me, Madam President. But I did review it earlier in a caucus with my colleagues. And I would just like to say a few words about insurance mandates in general, because that is what is before us today. It is a major frustration of mine being in this, this job over the last decade, and having a lot to do with legislation and insurance. All of us, regardless of our party affiliation and our backgrounds, we want to see people have the best quality of healthcare possible; there is no question about that. And we also want to see people have access to the best possible healthcare that exists in the world. And I think overall, we actually do a good job of that, particularly in this country and even more particularly in this state.

The thing about it is that we have to measure each decision that we make here completely, and we need to not just highlight the positive aspect of each one of these policy decisions. There is also a negative aspect of some of these policy decisions.

In this particular case, it is cost. Every time we create another requirement that every insurance policy is going to include an additional coverage or an expansion of an existing coverage, obviously that costs something. You are telling the insurance company, you are going to be exposed to more claims; and yes, consumers are going to have that additional protection and coverage. But I think we failed very often to ask our constituents whether or not that additional coverage is worth the additional cost to them. And consequently, we have been adding insurance mandates, as long as I can remember, and driving up the cost of insurance. I would also say that this is a dangerous path that continues to essentially create a marketplace that the actual consumer has very little control over.

The way I envision healthcare and insurance would be a situation where everyone has transparency, has their eyes open about what their options are, and

ultimately, they have the ultimate choice. I wish we lived in a world where consumers actually knew what the cost of that healthcare product was going to be, whether it is actually services in a hospital or seeing a physician or a specialist, or the cost of their drugs up front. And they made those choices, knowing that they had an insurance product and what that coverage was to cover for it. If that transparency truly existed, Madam President, we would see an entirely different world. But that is not the way our healthcare and insurance marketplace work. The average consumer has no idea really what things are costing, they are relying on the fact that they have an insurance policy that they pay a premium on, and the fact that the government, the state government here is producing laws, determining what the appropriate coverage is, what the appropriate care is, in some cases. And I believe that is dangerous and it is causing our insurance premiums to continue to rise and to rise over time to the point where it becomes unaffordable. And we have seen the consequence.

In recent years, we have seen the advent of high deductible health plans. This is for no other reason that insurance companies could no longer afford to provide the coverage that consumers could actually afford, unless they started instituting significant deductibles to mitigate those costs. And that is unfortunate. And the number one thing I have been after in this legislature when it comes to the subject of healthcare insurance is consumer choice; the ability for a consumer to know what coverages are on their policy and to choose which ones they want, and what they are willing to pay for with their eyes open. We do not do that though. We say you must get all of these coverages and you must pay for all these coverages. And I believe that is a mistake.

So this Bill is more of the same, Madam President, it's just another additional coverage, which it is very easy for folks around the Circle to say, oh,

look, what we are doing, we are making the world better and people are going to have this new advanced, wonderful coverage; and that is true. But I would much rather have a situation where a consumer would say, what is the cost of adding this additional dental and vision coverage? And I can check the box yes or no. That is the world I want to live in, Madam President.

And for those reasons, I am going to vote no on this because I believe we have too many insurance mandates already. I believe insurance premiums cost too much. I believe the way we do insurance in healthcare and the way we build for it, only encourages the cost to continue to rise because there is no cost containment because there is no transparency. When we want to get serious and address those things, then we can make good policy. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator. Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I would like to rise if I might for a second time in support of the Bill, and I want to first acknowledge a very good point, I thought made by the Ranking Member that this is in fact a bipartisan working was, a lot of bipartisan work went into this Bill in Committee, and hopefully again on the floor here tonight. And it was a point that was well taken. I want to thank the Senator for his, his good point.

I also want to respond to another comment that I think is well taken, that we have to be mindful of passing insurance mandates requiring insurance to do something, because certainly that has the potential to raise costs. What I would say though is, in this Bill, this does not do that. In fact, it does the

opposite, it contains costs. And that is why it is such good policy.

If a young person, 18 to 26, cannot go to the dentist, because they have lost their dental insurance. Their dental needs do not go away. Generally in my experience, talking to folks in my district, I do not get the sense that people go to the dentist too often for the heck of it. And in fact, the testimony that we received in the Insurance and Real Estate Committee was one of hardship. We heard that emergency dental care is the third most common reason where young people go to the emergency room. Think of the cost of going to the emergency room.

We heard from people. We heard from a young man who had to take out student loans to pay for emergency dental treatment. Now, I am not sure you can do that or you are supposed to do that, but the young man did that. We have heard from folks who had to discontinue important orthodontic and dental treatment simply because of the cost. And at some point, in their life, they may very well be in an employment situation where they are eligible to get dental insurance. But at that point, the damage is already done. Because we know what the science says, which is that prevention is important.

This is cost effective. Every dollar spent in prevention as I said earlier, results in \$8 to \$50 in savings. This will save money, this will contain costs, this will expand coverage, it is the right thing to do; but it is also fiscally responsible and I urge Members to support it.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator Lesser. Senator Looney, this is the third time is the charm, sir. I believe you may know speak sir.

SENATOR LOONEY (117TH):

Thank you very much Madam President. I am speaking in support of the Bill. I do want to thank the, the Insurance and Real Estate Committee. Senator Lesser has been a champion on this issue for a significant period of time. And I know that saying Senator Hwang was instrumental in helping to advocate it in Committee and it is very good to see that we have a, a bipartisan effort on this.

As the Chairman said, this really is a, is a cost-effective Bill because we all know that the most expensive medical treatment is emergency department treatment. So if someone has been developing a toothache and has no dental care and puts off and tries to with the pain as long as he or she can, and winds up in the emergency room with a severe abscess, and perhaps that abscess may cause an infection that may travel into the person's system; all of a sudden, it involves not only emergency room care, but also potential hospitalization. And then a mushrooming expansion of the cost that could have been cut off early on if the person at the first sign of the toothache was able to go to a dentist and get it taken care of before it, it cascaded into something far more serious. That is the kind of thing we are talking about here.

The same thing with vision care. Someone may have a, a vision problem that becomes, that they try to ignore and try to live with, and all of a sudden when treatment is sought, it is because there has been that a significant narrowing or blurring of vision and all of a sudden there is a serious problem that, that has to be treated on an emergency basis.

So we know that there were reports that in prior years that whenever coverage has been expanded. We know that there are a lot of people who do seek care for the first time and I remember speaking to a number of ophthalmologists a few years ago that when there was a time when, when expanded eye coverage

had become available, they said there were a surge of people with severe cataract problems and other problems including glaucoma, who came to their offices. Glaucoma and cataracts are usually a problem of, of older people. But serious problems can occur in younger people as well as, those between 18 and 26. So this really is a cost-effective way of, of expanding coverage, making sure that people are, are not in a situation where they are so afraid of the cost, that they wait until they cannot wait any longer and they have to seek the most expensive emergency care.

So again, this is part of our, our piecemeal, step by step approach to address gaps in systems where they, when they, where they occur. Obviously, this problem would not be ever dealt with completely until we have universal coverage for everyone. We have to fight these issues one at a time. But this is an important advancement. And again, I want to thank the Committee for bringing it forward this year. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much Senator Looney. Mr. Clerk, if you could call a roll call vote on this legislation.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. This is the Senate Bill 1004 as amended. Senate Bill 1004 as amended. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate, Senate Bill 1004 as amended. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, could you please call the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1004 as amended:

Total number of voting	35
Total number of voting Yea	34
Total voting Nay	1
Absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

(Gavel) The bill passes. Mr. Clerk, do you have; Senator Duff?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, on the next item, Calendar Page 14, Calendar 240, Senate Bill 1048; I would like to mark that item PT.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. We have a new list of markings.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar Page 10, Calendar 167, Senate Bill 141; like to mark that item go. On Calendar Page 20, Calendar 317, Senate Bill 1070; like to mark that item go. On Calendar Page 18, Calendar 286, Senate Bill 1075; like to mark that item go. On Calendar Page 14, Calendar 238, Senate Bill 1046;

like to mark that item go. On Calendar Page 22, Calendar 334, Senate Bill 1083; like to mark that item go. On Calendar Page 9, Calendar 161, Senate Bill 1020; like to mark that item go. On Calendar Page 26, Calendar 368, House Bill 6321; like to mark that item go. On Calendar Page 25, Calendar 362, House Bill 6503; like to mark that item go. On Calendar Page 5, Calendar 112, Senate Bill 393; like the mark that item go. On Calendar Page 24, Calendar 345, Senate Bill 1023; like to mark that item go. On Calendar Page 7, Calendar 133, Senate Bill 194; like to mark that item go. Calendar Page 4, Calendar 77, Senate Bill 700; like the mark that item go. On Calendar Page 41, Calendar 267, Senate Bill 658; like to mark that item go. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk, if you could call the first item on the Agenda, sir?

CLERK:

Yes, Madam President. Page 10, Calendar 167, Senate Bill 141, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE TO STUDY CANCER RELIEF BENEFITS FOR FIREFIGHTERS.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Senator Kushner, if you could hold one second? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I apologize to the Clerk. Could we stand at ease for a few minutes?

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, would the Clerk call the first Bill that we marked go?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 10, Calendar 167, Substitute for Senate Bill No.141, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE TO STUDY CANCER RELIEF BENEFITS FOR FIREFIGHTERS.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Good evening Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This is a Bill that will establish a task force to study cancer relief benefits for firefighters. And I think that since we are bringing this Bill out tonight is only fitting to acknowledge the passing and the funeral today of a firefighter, Ricardo Torres, Jr. in New Haven, and while we all mourn his death, and his death was not a direct result of; obviously it was a direct result of the fire, not of having contracted cancer. It does really underscore that the people we rely on to protect our homes and to protect our cities and our communities are taking on such a great risk, and one of those risks is cancer.

We know that firefighters when they are putting out fires are exposed to noxious fumes, poisonous black gases, and known carcinogens.

A few years ago, a group got together from this General Assembly, and worked out the details in how we could take care of firefighters who contracted cancer. And a great deal of work was put into that and the result was very positive and it had bipartisan support. And that was a few years ago. And now, we have come to learn that there are still some outstanding needs of firefighters who contract cancer, especially needs for their families. And so, this Bill will establish a task force to study cancer relief benefits for firefighters. And in doing so, will study the need to examine the adequacy of Firefighters Cancer Relief Program, established already under Section 7-13J. But it also will look at the feasibility and implications of providing Workers Comp and other benefits including death benefits to firefighters who are diagnosed with cancer, acquired as a result of occupational exposure.

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an Amendment, LCO No.8279. I would ask that the Clerk please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No.8279, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the Amendment and ask that its' reading be waived and seek leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption. Please do summarize.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This Amendment adds to the task force, our Ranking Members of the Committee of Cognizance. So this is now going to be a 14-person task force and including the Chairpersons and the Ranking Members of the Committee of Cognizance having to do with labor, which of course is the Labor and Public Employees Committee, and that is the only modification of the underlying Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Very good. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the Amendment, please signify by saying aye.

MEMBERS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Oppose? The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Good evening Senator Sampson.

SENATOR SAMPSON (16TH):

Good evening Madam President. I stand before you in support of the Bill before us. I want to thank the Chairman of the Labor Committee for her description

of the Bill, I think she did a great job in describing the very important legislation before us. I am also extremely thankful that she took my recommendation with regard to the Amendment that was just passed, modifying the makeup of the task force. I am very pleased by the Amendment, and I am also very pleased by the Bill. I regret that we could not get a little farther in this process than a taskforce this session, Madam President, but this is a very good Bill that will ultimately allow us, I think to make positive decisions that will benefit the heroes in our communities across our state that work as firefighters, and I urge adoption for my colleagues. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

My mic was not on. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Senator Kushner.

SENATOR KUSHNER (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I just wanted to thank my good, the good Senator, my Ranking Member from the Committee for his words about this Bill. And I too agree, I had hoped we could get farther, but I do believe that having a taskforce gives us the opportunity to really make sure we get it right this time. So I am very pleased that we are able to do this Bill and I think it is wonderful that we are doing on a day when we can honor firefighters throughout our state. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, I will open the voting machine and Mr. Clerk, if you would please call the roll?

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in

the Senate; this is Senate Bill 141 as amended. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 141 as amended. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Senate Bill 141 as amended:

Total number of voting	35
Total number of Yea	35
Total voting Nay	0
Absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

(Gavel) And the measure is adopted. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President, for some markings please.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you. On Calendar Page 18, Calendar 286, Senate Bill 1075, we are going to mark that item PT.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Page 41, Calendar 267, Senate Bill 658, kind of mark that item PT.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And some items for our Consent Calendar, please.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 25, Calendar 362, House Bill 6503; like to mark that item for our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar Page 24, Calendar 345, Senate Bill 1023; like to mark that item for our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar Page 4, Calendar 77, Senate Bill 700; like to mark that item for our Consent Calendar please.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And Clerk, please call the next Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 20, Calendar No.317, Senate Bill 1070, AN ACT ALLOWING ADVANCED PRACTICE REGISTERED NURSES AND PHYSICIAN ASSISTANTS TO ISSUE HOME HEALTH ORDERS.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Abrams.

SENATOR DAUGHERTY ABRAMS (13TH):

Good evening Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR DAUGHERTY ABRAMS (13TH):

Yes, Madam President. The Clerk is in possession of LCO No.9002. I ask that the Clerk please call and I be given leave up the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No.9002, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams.

SENATOR DAUGHERTY ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR DAUGHERTY ABRAMS (13TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. This Bill allows Pas to certify, sign, and otherwise document medical information in several situations. Certifying a patient's health condition or related information for purposes of insurance coverage, certifying a disability or illness for continuing education waivers or extensions for various health professions and entering into written protocol based collaborative drug therapy management agreements with a pharmacist to manage individual patients drug therapy.

Under existing law unchanged by the Bill, each PA must have clearly identified supervising physician who has final responsibility for patient care, and for the PAs performance. The function of the physician delegates to the PA must be implemented in accordance with the written delegation agreement between them. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Will your mark further?  
Good evening, Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Good evening Madam President. I rise to support the Amendment. Although the Amendment does delete, actually the title of the Bill which is allowing APRNs and PAs to write home health orders, it does incorporate in statute, the name of physician assistant where APRNs are listed. This does not change their scope of practice; it is simply just identifying them in statute so they can perform and work up to their scope of practice to their full capability. This will help ensure that when the scope of practice is reviewed by our hospitals, they can see in writing now in statute, all of the things that PAs can do under our law; however, are not called out in statute. This has been close to two years in the making and we have full support from the Connecticut Medical Society. And I urge everyone to vote for this Amendment. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Good evening Madam President. I have a couple of questions for the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed sir.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Or the Amendment. Thank you very much. Under the original Bill that was proposed, Senate Bill 1070, it was an act allowing advanced APRNs and physician assistants to issue home health orders. Is that still in the Bill or has it been removed?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams.

SENATOR DAUGHERTY ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. That portion has been removed and is being put into a different Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Why would you draft the Bill with that in it, strip that out, put something else in, and move it to a different Bill? Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams.

SENATOR DAUGHERTY ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The Department of Public Health wanted to put the original Bill language into their revisions Bill, which is House Bill 6666, and therefore this Bill was open. So we took the language that we had in our Senate Bill 1083 that spoke to this issue with physician assistants and put it here so that we could also add to it Section 1, which further clarifies that they are only allowed to be acting as physician assistants under the direction of a physician. So we took that opportunity to just make sure that that was as clear as possible. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. So if I understand Senator Abrams correctly, this will have a clarification for a definition that is going to be applicable to where this the, the issuance of orders and, and clarify it in the Department's Bill, if you will. Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams.

SENATOR DAUGHERTY ABRAMS (13TH):

Let me say this again, just to make sure I am being clear. The original language that was in 1070 is taken and being put into the DPH revision Bill. We wanted to, as we talked about this issue with physician assistants, as the good Senator said something that has been worked on for a couple years now, and we were quite sure did not do anything to increase their scope of practice. However, there were some people who were concerned about that. So in order to address their concerns, we took it out, put it in this, in this Bill and made very clear in Section 1 that they would still be working under a physician supervision. So we wanted to take that opportunity to put that language in to alleviate anybody's concerns that this would be any kind of an extension of their scope of practice. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. I just, I am always, you know, I focus whenever it appears that homecare may have to wait. And so I want to make sure that it does go to the DPH revision Bill, and that that Bill

moves accordingly. Because I think this is a good initiative, both the, the strike all, I mean, that is a clarification that needs to be made. But I also think that the PA and APRNs issuing home health orders is also a very good policy that needs to be advanced. And so I think your, your clarifications, were well done and I thank you for that, and I thank both Senator Somers and yourself for bringing forward the, the strike all to clarify the, the language with regards to APRNs and PAs. I have no further questions Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kelly. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Abrams.

SENATOR DAUGHERTY ABRAMS (13TH):

Madam President, I just want to assure my good colleague that I too agree that the original Bill itself, giving APRNs and physician assistants, the ability to issue home health orders is very important, important to our Committee and so we, we will be following through with that. So thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, let me try your minds. On favor of the Amendment before the Chamber, please signify by saying aye.

MEMBERS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Will

you remark further on the Bill as amended? Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. I would just like to reiterate what my good fellow Senator has indicated, having the ability to write home health orders, although it is not in this Bill, it is not another Bill, we both have this as a top priority for public health. It will provide great access to the citizens of Connecticut that are seeing either in APRN or a PA as a primary physician, as we have a shortage of those in the State of Connecticut.

And again, the language here does not expand the scope of the physician assistant, it merely just codifies their role in statute. Because without that, some particular hospitals are not allowing these PAs to work to the top of their scope of practice. And we worked with DPH and others to really clarify in Section 1, the exact terminology of what a PA is and that they have to work in a supervisory role or a dedicatory role with an MD and I am hoping that we can have full support of this within the Circle. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somes. Will your mark further?

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I would like to ask that this be put on the Consent Calendar if there are no objections.

THE CHAIR:

And are seeing no objection, or Senator Formica, would you like a roll call vote?

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

May I ask to stand at ease just for one moment.

THE CHAIR:

And the Senate will stand at ease. Senator Abrams.

SENATOR DAUGHERTY ABRAMS (13TH):

Madam President, we would like a roll call vote please.

THE CHAIR:

And a roll call has been requested, so we will open the voting machine, and Mr. Clerk, kindly call the roll.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, is Senate Bill 1070 as amended. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 1070 as amended. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate, Senate Bill 1070 as amended. Immediate roll call vote.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate; Senate Bill 1070 as amended. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate, Senate Bill 1070 as amended. Immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1070 as amended:

Total number of voting	35
Total voting Yea	35
Total voting Nay	0
Absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

(Gavel) The measure is adopted. Mr. Clerk?

CLERK:

Page 14, Calendar No.238, Senate Bill No.1046, AN  
ACT CONCERNING LONG-TERM CARE INSURANCE.

THE CHAIR:

And good evening, Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Good evening Madam President. Madam President, I  
move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable  
Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, Madam President. Madam President, about 25  
years ago or 30 years ago, we had a new industry  
emerge, the long-term care insurance industry  
attempting to solve a problem, crisis in the growing  
cost of long-term care one, that was leaving  
families in poverty, people losing their homes as  
they were struggling to pay for vital nursing care,  
but also one that was leaving a huge impact on  
taxpayers, because Madam President, as you know,  
when families do not have the resources to pay for  
the cost of long-term care, those costs do not

disappear, most often they are picked up by the public, by the taxpayer in the form of Medicaid.

The long-term care insurance industry emerged offering a way out and telling people that they could buy an affordable product that would ensure against nursing home care or other long term care costs. Many people took them up on that offer. And unfortunately though, that was for many folks, a very bitter surprise. Because while rates were initially affordable, we've seen skyrocketing rates year after year after year after year.

The exact reason for that initial underpricing is debated. There are some folks who say that it was just a series of unfortunate assumptions made initially about what the actual price of these products were, or they assumed interest rates. They assumed what the cost of care would be in the future. They assumed how many people would cancel their policies, when rates went up. They made a bunch of assumptions. But every single one of those assumptions, Madam President, was wrong.

And the result is that many families, many seniors in the district that I represent and in districts around the state are finding that their long term care policies, long term care insurance policies are increasingly unaffordable. And that's causing heartache. It's causing stress. It's causing real hardship for folks. I've heard from many of the folks who sit around the circle, I've heard from Senator Slap. I've heard from Senator Anwar, I've heard from constituents all across the State who are in this mess, and who have done everything we could have asked. They are putting money away in the event of nursing home care that many people are not putting away. They are doing the right thing and yet

they are being faced with increasing unaffordability of long term care insurance.

I would like to tell you, Madam President, we have a magic solution to this problem. We do not. But we have what is in this Bill is an attempt to make a dent into the problem by solving a couple of really critical problems that I've heard are problems that people are facing day in and day out.

Under existing law, Madam President, insurance companies cannot raise rates by more than 20% in a year. If they do so, they have to phase it in over three years.

But Madam President, there is a loophole in that law. Because while they must layer it on over three years, they have multiple bites at the apple, they can come back the next year and request an additional rate increase and the following year and request an additional rate increase, layering one increase on top of another. Working with the Connecticut Insurance Department, this Bill would end that practice. And it says you get one bite at the apple. You cannot come back within that three year period, asking for another rate increase.

Second, many people who are stuck in unaffordable long-term care policies are looking for more affordable alternatives. The emergence of homecare over that span has made more affordable options available, there is an assisted living, that's an appropriate option for some folks. Some folks are over-insured and looking for more affordable options.

Unfortunately, in some cases, the industry has steered people into junk alternative plans. And this

Bill would task the Insurance Commissioner with coming up with standard benefit plans that are affordable, that work for folks, that will give them the care that they need, so that when you get a rate increase that causes your eyes to pop, you can look at what your alternatives are and look for better options.

Ultimately, this is not a Connecticut problem. This is a national problem. And that's why the Connecticut Department of Insurance is working through the National Association of Insurance Commissioners on a national solution to this issue.

There had been hope, a decade ago that long term care insurance would have been addressed in the Affordable Care Act. And unfortunately, it was taken out along the way. But we need a national solution to this national problem. It's a fiscal problem for the State. It is a pocketbook issue for families all across the State. It is something we need to get our hands around.

This Bill does not fix it. I don't think anybody would pretend otherwise, that will hopefully address some critical consumer protection issues. And with that, Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an amendment LCO 8470. I ask that the Clerk please call the amendment and then I'll be granted leave for the chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

And Mr. Clerk --

CLERK:

LCO No. 8470, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

And Senator Lesser?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Madam President, there were sections of the original bill that related to the Attorney General, they came back with a fiscal note from the Office of Fiscal Analysis.

This Amendment would strike that the striking the fiscal note and hopefully allowing the Bill to pass. I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. And the question is on adoption of the Amendment before the Chamber. Will you remark further? Good evening, Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Good evening, Madam President. And good evening to the Chair of the Insurance and Real Estate Committee. On the discussion related to the amended offering.

Through you, Madam President, I see that we are looking to strike section five and its entirety. The good Chair cited it as a fiscal note consideration. But I want to refer for legislative intent. The testimony that was submitted by the Attorney General's office, who cited that section was unnecessary and their current legislation in the area of the uniform application— Indulge me, I don't know the exact technical term but the letter speaks

for itself where the Attorney Generals specifically asked that, that section five be stricken because it was duplicative and it also engaged the Attorney General in their purview in which the Insurance Commissioner had the expertise and oversight.

Through you, Madam President, I wanted to double check and verify with the proponent of this Amendment, if indeed that is the additional information as well, through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, Madam President, the Senator is correct that the language paternity AG was removed. Some would argue that it's unnecessary. I don't know that it was unnecessary but I do know that it had a cost associated with it. And it's that cost that I think is the genesis for this Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. Nonetheless, the section is removed. And I support that on this Amendment for whatever the reason it may be, either it is fiscal, which is always important. But I also want to respect the viewpoint of the State's top legal Attorney in that respects that he felt that was necessary.

And again, I think it's a compliment to our

Insurance Commissioner and its department for the good work that they do in regard to that.

The second point as relates to the Amendment, but also the overall context of the Bill, I guess I'll wait to continue the discussion because I want to stay germane to the Amendment. So, through you, Madam President, I urge support of this Amendment. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, let me try your minds, all in favor of the Amendment, please signify by saying aye.

(Members):

Aye.

And the ayes have it, the Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill before the Chamber as amended, Senator Hwang?

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, and to the amended bill and I'm grateful for the removal and the feedback from the Attorney General's office in removing section five. But I also wanted to follow-up and compliment the good Chair in his lengthy description in regards some of the premises of the Bill.

But I also want to be able to offer the fact that the current rising rate of long-term care insurance is a significant policy concern, as well as a fiscal

and long-term health insurance, health care coverage concern for many of our residents in the State of Connecticut.

But I also recognize the fact that these rates of increase are a market reaction, a market base of incredibly unexpected costs that have arisen that impact the pricing of the policy.

And what I also wanted to make sure that in some respects, perhaps there may be bad actors in the industry. And I think the good Chair cited some of the incidences or some of the premises of bad actors that leads to the premise of this Bill.

But I also want to make note for the record that there are many good insurers that had every good intention to provide a very important product such as long-term health insurance, long-term care insurance, and recognizing that the marketplace and the cost of providing health care has increased at a rate that is unsustainable and unmanageable.

That being said, the components of this Bill that looks to address some of those cost increases, that a burden our residents in the State of Connecticut is particularly in regards to that if insurers are filing premium rate increases of 20% or more for an individual or a group long-term care policy, what mechanism in this Bill does it offer to maintain that 20% and the length of time in which that rate may be prorated? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and through you to the Senator from Fairfield, the Bill ensures as current law does, in fact, that any increase of more than 20% be phased in over a period of three years.

And as I mentioned before, it then prevents that company from coming back for a second bite at the apple or a third bite of the apple, says you can come back in three years and request another increase. And I will make— this is an aside, and I know I need to respond to the Senator's question, Madam President, but what we are relying on is the Connecticut Department of Insurance because I think nobody around this circle wants any rate increases. But they have a right under the law to demonstrate what their costs are, what the insurance is a regulated product. And so they are submitting a proposed rate increase to the Insurance Commissioner. And rate increase would be granted by the Insurance Commissioner, but then phased in over a period of time to reduce the impact on consumers.

And we've all seen the tears in people's eyes when they get this sticker shock. They paid in some cases, hundreds of thousands of dollars for a policy that they are relying on to make sure that they can keep their family's house and pass it on to another generation to keep their family out of poverty, and then find out that this policy is unaffordable. It's a real problem, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President, I appreciate the good Chair's narrative that is so important to the plight of so many people that have shared their stories as he cited.

But I'm grateful to our State's insurance department for the good work and the talent of the people there that have demonstrated that in Connecticut, every single insurance product that is sold by an insurance company goes through the vetting process, and the transparency and the audit process of our insurance department, and has the good Chair cited, that has they ensure compliance and sustainability of any insurance product that is available to the consumer, that there is that oversight.

And I'm grateful that in the State of Connecticut, that every current insurance product that looks to protect the well-being and purport to be able to provide that resource and critical time of need is always audited, always reviewed and transparently provided every single day to people that depend on that transparency.

So I'm grateful that every insurance product in the State of Connecticut goes through our Department of Insurance, and has that audit and transparency process.

And unfortunately, as a result of that, we also find the health care costs becomes prohibitively high and unsustainably growing at a rate that impacts these rates.

So again, I believe this is a good policy to try to rein in a skyrocketing cost that has created so much challenge and trauma to families that want to maintain their long-term care insurance, but just

one more question, ma'am to you. As a good Chair cited that the three year phase-in is current statute, but does this Bill add a component that now will prohibit those insurers going through the three year phase-in from requesting any additional rate increase during this period?

Is that a new aspect of this Bill's requirement that is added to the Bill in addition to current existing statute? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

And thank you to the good Chair. And what's the rationale for that from a standpoint of if these rate increases occur, and it is a market force condition. And there is justification. And there is a validation through the auditing process that we are now saying, regardless of whatever evidentiary data that is provided to justify these rate increases, we're literally saying to those companies, for those three years, if your rate increased more than 20%, and you're in a three year phase-in period, it doesn't matter how much your insurance or your delivery cost is. You are prohibited by this statute from requesting any

additional premium increase. Is that correct?  
Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President. I think I answered the question. But yes, the answer is yes. The purpose of the Bill is to prohibit an insurance company from requesting a second increase after they had a first increase of over 20% approved for a period of three years.

And the reason for that, Madam President is because of the impact of these giant increases on consumers. I think it conforms to the original intent of the law passed by the legislature. I don't think members of this Chamber envisioned that you would have a layering on one increase on top of another. I think the intent was to give consumers a respite. And that's what that was intended to do.

But I think the gentleman is getting at a second issue, which is making sure that our insurance industry is sound. We don't want any insurance companies going insolvent, because that provides real risks to the policyholder.

One long-term care company, Penn Treaty did go insolvent. And that was a real concern. And we have a risk guarantee funds in Connecticut, as do other states and territories, and ensuring the solvency of those funds is really important.

Unfortunately, many of the companies that originally

issued these policies have sold them off. And so that is an issue, making sure that those standalone companies are able to stand up on their own feet and provide the benefit that the consumers have paid for year after year, after year.

What I would say is that this wasn't put in without thought. Our Insurance Department, it chairs the long-term care working group at the NAIC that's working with Commissioners from around the country looking at this issue, and how can we get consumers out from under the mountain of ever skyrocketing rates.

And what they have told us is that the market is maturing, that things are stabilizing, and that conversations around the country lead them to believe that putting a three year freeze is not irresponsible, can be done with in a way that is actuarially justifiable, will protect both the safety and soundness of our insurance system, but also the pocketbooks of the Connecticut consumers who are really being hurt here. We can do both. And I'm glad that the Insurance Department has agreed with us that this is possible, and I believe the insurance industry is there as well.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate the good Chair's explanation. But to me, and I want to note that the good Chair articulated that the Insurance Department and the insurance industry offers support to this three year freeze and I in reading through

the testimonies and perhaps I might have missed it. But nonetheless, I would believe if the good Chair said so, then he has proven validation of that supporting statement.

But that being said, I think it is one of the flaws, a small flaw but it's not a small flaw, but I believe in the importance of being able to have support mechanism and cost containment in regards to long-term care because it truly has grown at an unsustainable rate.

But I think this is what we get into in this circle and in the legislature is, we think we can do a better job than the insurance industry.

And what they have done, and had the experience in for over 100 years, and for their work and being, and having the great pride in Connecticut being called the insurance capital of the world.

What we're looking to do is the possibility of saying, "We in the legislature know what's best in regards to insurance related products as it relates to health care delivery."

I'm at a loss sometimes to say, and honestly say, "I don't think we do as legislators, just as I don't expect—"

Let me leave it at this ma'am, the hour is late, I will simply say that the prohibition in this Bill of freezing, legitimate rate request for three years of the insurer, again reinforces the idea that the legislator body is enacting laws that gets into the business of our insurers, and saying that we know your business better than you do.

Just as the example of the amended offer, the amended Bill that says we're going to tell the Attorney General to make sure that you're doing your job right. I'm glad the Attorney General spoke up, whether it's for fiscal or for logistical reasons or legal reasons of duplicity. Again, this is an opportunity for us to say, let us collaborate and work with our insurance industries. Let's not try to reinvent the wheel and say for us as a legislative body, that we know better than the experts in that industry, the businesses that had to be accountable, transparent, and review and audited for any and every product that they sell in the state of Connecticut. That's the way we have worked in the insurance capital of the world. And I hope we will continue to do so to ensure that every product that we sell is protected and sustained and ensured that the coverage is there when the families needed the most.

So I urge support with some caution, and at the same time, I think the good Chair's indulgence, and I thank, Madam President for your indulgence as well.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Senator Hwang. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, I will open the vote and Mr. Clerk if you would please call the roll.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Bill 1046 as amended. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Bill 1046 as amended. An immediate

roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1046 as amended.

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

THE CHAIR:

And the legislation is adopted, Mr. Clerk

CLERK:

Page 22, Calendar 334, substitute for Senate Bill No. 1083. An act concerning various revisions to the public health statutes. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

And, good evening, Senator Abrams. I feel you were just talking about this, similar

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Hello, Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Yes, Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of LCO No. 9012. I asked that the Clerk please call the Amendment and I give leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9012, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Abrams.

SENATOR ABRAMS (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This Amendment as it states is about the various revisions to the public health statutes.

It begins with requiring the Chief Medical Examiner to have at least one contact hour of training or education in the sudden unexpected death in Epilepsy as a part of his required continuing medical education. This portion of the Bill comes out of a lot of very good work by the Epilepsy Foundation of Connecticut.

And we need to thank our Chief Medical Examiner for

being open to listening to this. They brought this phenomenon to our attention. There is something that's called 'sudden unexpected death' in Epilepsy. And it's when a person with Epilepsy dies of an unexplained— in an unexplained manner or in an unrelated— anything unrelated to the Epilepsy.

And so they really need, although it's rare, it occurs. And the Epilepsy Foundation, both in Connecticut and nationally are trying to find out more information. We heard some very compelling testimony on this. And again, I thank our Chief Medical Examiner for being open to learning more about this so that we can find a way to figure out why this is happening. I think it's a really important piece of this Bill.

The next piece also important, requires licensed health clubs to provide and maintain at least one AED and ensure that at least one employee is trained in its use, is on the premises during business hours. This too came from one of the Senator's constituents who unfortunately had a family member pass away, and we feel that this is very important to have in place.

The next section asks that hospital personnel when a patient is admitted, ask the patient whether they want the hospital to notify a family member, caregiver or some support person about that admission.

The next section after that allows 16 year olds with a parent or guardian written consent to donate blood. One of the things that I've heard a lot about, especially during COVID is the need for blood donations in our State. And off times these happen in schools. And so allowing 16 year olds with parent

permission, and of course who meet the standards to donate will be very helpful to our State.

The next part extends the time period for art therapists licensure applicants to increase from 365 days to two years after the applicant receives his or hers graduate degree.

The section after that revises the marriage license application and certification to meet our times that we're in now. So it replaces bride and groom with spouse one and spouse two, and it also removes the designation of race from the application.

This Bill also changes the date for DPH to send a report to the public health committee on finding reciprocal licenses for food vendors. Luckily, we're hitting that time of year where we see a lot of food trucks out. And there's a lot of disparity between different localities in terms of what they have to do for licensure. And it's really in our best interest to find a policy across our state that allows these businesses to continue in the best way that they can.

The next part is to set up a working group between DMHAS and the Public Health Committee to study psilocybin in the treatment of mental and behavioral health disorders. And lastly, it asked again that if a patient is admitted to the hospital, that they be given the opportunity to receive their discharge materials electronically. Again, just trying to keep up with the times, so I thank you, Madam President, and I move adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Abrams, and the question is on

adoption of the Amendment before the Chamber. Will you remark further, Senator Somers?

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes, good evening, Madam President and I rise in support of the Amendment. This Amendment includes a compilation actually of many of our Senators and our house members on both sides of the aisle ideas that we are been able to incorporate into this Bill, all for the betterment of healthcare for our residents here in the State of Connecticut, and DPH and the DMHAS and other agencies have all signed off on this language. And I'm hopeful that the people in the circle tonight will support this Amendment. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Will you remark further on the Amendment, Senator Lesser on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, let me try your minds, all in favor of the Amendment before the Chamber, please signify by saying yea.

(MEMBERS):

Yea.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The yeas have it, the Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I want

to rise in support of the Bill as amended, specifically section one of the Bill, which is my hope will be known as a Helen's law.

I want to start out by thanking the leadership of the Public Health Committee, particularly Senator Abrams for her, or for their leadership and her leadership in particular, in terms of including this provision.

Helen Martha was a constituent of mine, a resident of Wethersfield, who died just before her 10<sup>th</sup> birthday, of a condition known as sudden unexpected death in Epilepsy, SUDEP. It is the leading cause of death in this country for people with uncontrolled seizures, and it is what it sounds like. It is a mysterious and tragic condition where people die without any previous warning signs. We still don't know why that is.

This Bill will ensure that we are working with the Chief Medical Examiner to get better data, to help get answers. I want to thank Martha family, Chris and Victoria in particular for being really incredible advocates for working with the Epilepsy association to get answers, to make sure that we have no other girls like Helen on our state who died way, way, way too early.

We will find a cure, we will find answers. And this Bill is an important first step and urge my colleagues to support it.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good evening. I rise in support of the Bill. And I want to start by echoing the comments of my good friend and colleague, Senator Lesser. The SUDEP provision in this Bill is so critically important for those who are living with Epilepsy. I've had the pleasure of getting to know a young woman in my district named Emma Boris, who was diagnosed with Epilepsy at the age of 11. And she has— I see Senator Abrams nodding, she has been so memorably inspiring in her testimony before the legislature partnering with the Epilepsy Foundation and coming before this Chamber in 2020, and then again in 2021, not giving up to pass this legislation that Senator Lesser so eloquently said, allows medical professionals in Connecticut to really combat the tragic occurrence of SUDEP.

And a few moments ago, I was looking over Emma's testimony before the Public Health Committee, she said, she refuses to let her condition stop her from living life to the fullest. And this legislation ensures that all the others who are surviving, who are living everyday life to the fullest with Epilepsy, I see that this government cares about them and that we are partnering with them to find answers and to find a cure.

I also rise, Madam President in support of another provision of this Bill and I cannot thank Senator Abrams, Representative Steinberg, Representative Berger-Girvalo enough for including this provision.

You know, every once in a while in this job, a constituent comes to you with a really good idea. It doesn't matter what political party they are, they share a story. They share a policy platform that

just makes all the sense in the world.

You know, Connecticut has passed legislation that requires AEDs to be available at public golf courses. We've passed legislation requiring AEDs to be available at schools and at higher AED athletic facilities. But interestingly, and tragically, we don't have legislation requiring AEDs to be present at gyms. Yet, we know Madam President that those who are at a gym are likely to see their heart rate increase. In fact, there's an increased likelihood that they're going to suffer from a cardiac incident. Sadly, that was the case for my friend and constituent's husband, Suzanne Brennan lives in Ridgefield, Connecticut, and in 2012 she tragically lost her husband, the father of their three children at a gym when he suffered from a cardiac incident and there was not an AED on hand.

His life, very likely would have been saved if that device had been there. In fact the statistics on this are pretty stunning, Madam President. 120-18 study found that the odds of survival more than double, more than double if an AED is on site. Conversely, the chance of survival from cardiac events decreases by up to 10% for every minute if a defibrillation is not performed.

With this Bill, we know we're going to save lives. And I'm just so grateful that Suzanne brought this idea to me and to Representative Berger-Girvalo, and then Senator Abrams was such a champion on this issue and including it in her comprehensive Bill.

I'm thinking about Suzanne tonight and all of her advocacy. I'm thinking about her three children, and the father that's no longer with them. Hopefully, his memory and his family's advocacy will help

prevent future tragedies and save lives. Thank you,  
Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR ABRAMS:

Thank you, Madam President. I think my good  
colleagues for speaking on behalf of their  
constituents with this Bill, I think it's going to  
make a real difference in many ways for the people  
of our State, and I would ask for a roll call vote.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you and a roll call vote has been requested  
and that request will be granted. Will you remark  
further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the  
Bill? If not, the machine will be opened. And Mr.  
Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the  
Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered  
in the Senate. Senate Bill 1083 as amended. An  
immediate roll call vote in the Senate, of Senate  
Bill 1083 as amended. An immediate roll call vote in  
the Senate. Senate Bill 1083. An immediate roll call  
vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1083 as amended.

Total number voting	35
Total number of voting Yea	33
Total voting Nay	2
Absent not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

And the legislation is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 9, Calendar 161, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1020, an act establishing a regional economic development pilot program. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

And, good evening, Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage, will you remark?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes, yes, indeed. I will. Thank you, Madam

President. Madam President, you know the State of Connecticut is uniquely poised right now in this post COVID era to really scale our economic development opportunities.

And we see this incredible influx in migration into the State over 22,000 individuals moved into the State with their families. We also see it in the housing market, which has to put it in the vernacular bid on fire, bidding wars and the like, and that is also being reflected in our commercial markets and sectors as well.

In addition, we also have recognized the fact that when towns and cities work together, when they work collaboratively, that we have demonstrable, better economic outcomes.

And throughout the course of this, a typical year, during our Zoom Public Hearings, we had testimony in the Commerce Committee, and we repeatedly heard the fact that one of the biggest challenges that our smaller towns and cities face is the fact that they did not have a full-time robust economic development entity within their towns and their cities. And that also, they reference the fact that many times the personnel would change by virtue of, you know, an election cycle, so there was no continuity, and there was a lot of disruption. And ultimately, there were many missed opportunities.

And we also recognize the fact that when they had opportunities to come together and to work together, that there was far more of an outcome in terms of leveraging private dollars, much greater multiplier effects.

So, Madam President, the underlining Bill this

evening recognizes those facts, recognizes the return on investment, when we collaborate, not compete, and that it is so important to have embedded in our towns and our cities, the economic development, expertise and talent.

So the underlining Bill stands up a pilot program based on these principles. Madam President, there is an Amendment, the Clerk is in possession of LCO 9033. And I asked that the Clerk please call and I be granted leave, Madam to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9033, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption. Will you remark?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. So LCO 9033 actually is reflective of a- I say this, casually a meticulous vetting of the proposal. And so the changes simply clarify the fact that there is indeed

no fiscal impact that it is within existing resources.

And then it also makes some changes so as to make the program more accessible and available by changing the number of municipalities that are necessary to form the entity from five to four, and by requiring that only one distressed municipality be part of that entity.

And then additionally, it goes on to designate that the Commissioner of Economic and Community Development will have the discretion to entertain and include any applications which might not meet the threshold of the four municipalities, but does in fact have a distressed municipality as part of its entity. I move adoption, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption. Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the Amendment, please signify by saying Yea.

(MEMBERS):

Yea.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed. And the Yeas have it. The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the legislation as amended? Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. The vetting was, I'd

like to look at it if we made it into a better Bill. But, Madam President, you know, economic development is really a crucial component in most communities. And, you know, we all know that it drives economic growth in towns, and not only in our towns but in our State. And it's important that what comes with economic growth, our jobs, and they start from entry level jobs to quality jobs, high paying jobs.

Unfortunately, here in the State, you know, in a lot of municipalities, for the last 40 or 50 years we've seen, you know, I guess the, I won't say failure, but we've seen boarded up buildings, dilapidated factories, retail and housing, housing that has built in code issues, and it's throughout the whole State. So, I think the focus, and that's one of the reasons why I wanted to get on the Commerce Committee is to try to turn things around here in our State.

So, I think this is a good step forward. You know, we've had various attempts in with our State legislature here, you know, we've created opportunity zones, we've adopted the opportunity zones as well. And some of it has worked, some of it hasn't worked so well. But the intent was to elevate our towns, and our cities, and the engineers or those that created these ideas, you know, they touted that, hey, we would spur new investments in our towns, and address these distressed municipalities and create jobs and create economic growth.

So, like I said, we've had some moderate success, but this Bill adds to that, you know, adds to the box of tools that we have, and like the ideas of enterprise zone and the opportunity zone, this pilot program establishes and would use matching grants to

implement economic development in these distressed municipalities and the surrounding or cooperating community. So, Madam President, I highly recommend that my colleagues support this, so thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And, yes, I want to recognize the input in collaboration with the ranking member on the Commerce Committee, and also recognize the fact that this helps us to once again try to leverage what our opportunities are, and to have those opportunities extend throughout the State, small State that we recognize, that we ought not to be competing against each other, we ought to be collaborating with each other, and therefore we have a greater economic impact.

It's all about building the economy, the tax base, and the grand list of all of our communities, with also the recognition that there are some areas of our State, primarily the distressed municipalities, which need to be to have a particular focus. So having said that, I thank the ranking member and urge passage, Madam President, and if there is no objection, I would ask that it be put on the Consent Calendar, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

And seeing no objection. Senator Hartley, we will put that on the Consent Calendar. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

And the Senate will stand at ease. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Will the Clerk please call the next Bill, please?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 26, Calendar No. 368, substitute for House Bill No. 6321, AN ACT CONCERNING THE ADOPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONNECTICUT PARENTAGE ACT, as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A", LCO No. 7450.

THE CHAIR:

And, good evening, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill as amended by the House.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage, will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President, to build a concise to the Judiciary Committee's Parentage Act. It deals with the adjudication of parentage, challenges to that process. It deals with the parent-child relationship, and establishes criteria for determining if the parent-child relationship exists, then it applies under our laws.

It deals with competing claims of parentage. It deals with section on gametes, which some people don't know what those are, those are mature cells that may be used for donors. And part of what comes along with that is the medical information that one might not have under systems we've had in the past that might be pertinent to an individual without necessarily revealing the identity of the donor of that gamete.

It deals with acknowledgement of parentage. It deals with presumptive parentage. Obviously this is the Parentage Act. It deals with parentage through surrogacy.

And this is a Bill that is important to a lot of people, particularly people who don't have what some people termed traditional relationships and have issues when it comes to parentage. It came to us out of Judiciary Committee on a strong vote and out of the House on a vote of 141 to one, it's a Bill whose time has more than come and I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further on the legislation before our Chamber? Senator Kissel, good evening, sir.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Good evening. Thank you very much, Madam President, I stand in strong support of the Bill that's before us this evening. Indeed, as my good friend and colleague, Senator Winfield, good co-chair of the Judiciary Committee indicated, this Bill had a vote of 141 to one in the House of Representatives. And when it was passed on by the Judiciary Committee, it's my belief that it was unanimously voted out of that committee as well.

Whether one agrees or does not agree as to same-sex marriages and relationships, and things of that nature that has now been many years, the law of the land here in the State of Connecticut, and I know people have had disagreements as to how it ended up that way, whether it should have been through votes of the Senate and the House and then signed into law by the Governor.

In many respects, some of these issues were resolved, and especially the same-sex marriage issue by our State Supreme Court. But that being the case, the law has been as it's been for, as I indicated several years. But in many respects, the laws of parentage and the relationship between these relationships, and children have not been gone through our State statutes, so that everything is in compartment with one another.

I want to personally thank for his outreach, and more than one meeting, the last meeting of which I think was close to an hour, if not an hour, State

Representative Jeff Currey of East Hartford, tireless advocate regarding this particular legislation before us, his friend and colleague, and I really apologize, his name escapes me, but he's a professor at Yale. And he actually worked tirelessly on this Bill, as well.

It's a lengthy, not necessarily straightforward, but somewhat complicated Bill. But there just are areas in our law that need to be updated. Same-sex couples, or couples in other types of relationships shouldn't necessarily have to jump through different hoops and have to go to Probate Court and pass different reviews, as opposed to other historically traditional relationships as defined by a man and a woman.

And so I think it's completely appropriate, and probably a long time coming to bring this portion of the laws on balance and up to speed and parallel with the laws that have transformed rather miraculously and quickly over the last less than 20 years, not that people haven't been striving for those changes over that period of time. People have been striving for those changes, probably to the early 60s in one way or another regarding their personal relationships. But I think this law is a long time coming, and it's appropriate.

The other issue that came up regarding my discussions with some of my colleagues and others, is the how the issue of donation of either eggs or sperm or some combination thereof are dealt with in this underlying Bill. And that's in light of the fact that this Chamber has over the years grappled with the issue of adoptions. And if someone gave up the right to their child, traditionally, the woman who gave birth to the child and either implicitly or

explicitly some sort of representations were made regarding the anonymity of the person who gave up the rights to that child, whether those should be abrogated in whole or in part.

And the reason I think that that's of much interest to individuals, probably more so now than ever before, is because children who were given up into adoption, quite often seek information regarding their birth parents and indeed their birth mother or birth father or both, but birth mother.

If not because of, and I don't necessarily think this is the case, in most of the cases mere curiosity or I just want to know, well that certainly is the case with advocates that I've spoken to. But there's also the fundamental belief that with the advancement of technology, with the advancement of medicine, with the advancement of cures, and any one of us, if you happen to find yourself at home on any given evening, you can't watch television for more than an hour without seeing commercial after commercial after commercial for different advancements regarding pharmaceuticals and drugs, and this treatment and that treatment.

And so people who may not know their genetic predispositions have an interest in their birth mother or parents or genetics, because they want to know if they're somewhat predisposed towards a particular ailment, illness, strengths, weaknesses, so that they can take life, make life decisions, predicated on that. And that's completely natural and a logical way to go about your life.

So we're grappling with some of those issues as well. And so when people looked at this Bill before us, they go, "Well, how does this Bill treat that

issue even though it's not exactly the same?" It's not an adoption, but it's utilization of the sperm or the egg or, you know, those issues.

And I think Senator Winfield, I think, said gametes, I have to go back to my anatomy and physiology course from college, which I actually did better than I thought I would do. I did pretty well, it was very fascinating, but it's been a long time. In any event, my understanding of the statute or the proposed statute, the Bill before us is that at the initial time of fertilization, and then what transpires going forward is at the clinic, where all this takes place or medical facility, that the donors would sign a document, if they want to be revealed as to their identity or not.

But also some health information would be gathered by the clinic hospital, medical facility, and held on to and stored the nature and extent of that information, I don't know. But there certainly is that information.

Now, when the young man or young woman reaches 18, it's my understanding that they can then go back to the clinic, the hospital, the medical facility, or wherever the records are, have been stored. And they can then ask, "Can I have the identity of the donors?" And at that point in time, that institution would then glean through the records, and determine did they determine or did the donors wish to remain anonymous.

Or in the years that have transpired today, which there's provisions for change there will perhaps at that point in time, let's say day one, for lack of any other better reference, they said, "No, I don't want any living human being that grows from these

donations to know who I am." And maybe in year 10, they decide, "Nah, I'm not so uptight about that," or "I don't feel I have the same concerns" or there's been so many advancements in medicine, I want to do this, for whatever reason.

They changed their mind, they can redo that document, file that document again with the medical facility or wherever the records are located. And so that when the young man or woman goes, it will be a new order. And then essentially, at that time, the medical facility has to follow the will of the donors.

Now, there's also a provision that if there's the determination that the individual that made a donation does not wish to be determined who he or she is, that I believe what the Bill before says is that, that that medical facility then can reach out to the donors and say, there's been an inquiry. There's a desire by this young man, young woman to get further information. Do you want to change your mind? Do you want to fill out a new form?

One may agree, disagree, but it's my understanding the way this is set up, there's certainly no pressure being put on that individual. And they can say no, whatever my, you know, if I said I didn't want to be, if I wanted to remain anonymous, I want to remain anonymous. And so that's the way that can go.

And I believe that sort of the final process that can occur is that upon that information being provided to the young man or young woman, I'm assuming the younger, it doesn't have to take place as soon as they turn 18, it could be, the individual might be 25.

To my mind, as a practical matter, the most difficult part may be locating the institution, the medical facility, the clinic, or where the records are deposited. Because now we're talking decades down the road, and who knows what technology and medical advances will bring to us at that time. But here we are in 2021 and this is what we have before us.

At that time, the young or the individual making the inquiry can then be offered, or make a request of the facility. Okay, I understand you've done everything on the law requires to reach out. And the as the law states, that individual's desire to remain anonymous shall be respected, and so would you please provide to me based upon the initial information provided to you, whatever health information you can, that would not have any ability to be utilized to identify the donor.

And so you might get and again, this is 2021, let's say this is the law and 10 years from now, they may have genetic information, whether someone is predisposed to certain kinds of illnesses, whether one could expect susceptibility to alcohol, drugs, something else like that, whatever medical advancements are able to provide with the ultimate goal being that the anonymity, if so desired would be respected throughout the entire process, without any pressure being brought to bear on the donors. So we don't want to discourage anybody from making that decision.

At the same time, recognizing that knowledge of some individual's medical predispositions and their genealogical and genetic composition, may have an influence on medical decisions, and anything else

that medicine and pharmaceuticals and technology can provide 18 years from now and ongoing.

So it's not, again, the easiest story-tell, it's a little, I wouldn't say convoluted, I think that's sort of a negative view. I think there's a lot of safeguards, a lot of checks and balances along that timeframe, I think a balance was consciously drawn to protect the rights of the donors are not to discourage that process, or not to discourage the rights of the individual whose genetic makeup makes a part of that individual that has now grown in that relationship.

But at the same time we want to try to afford or create a mechanism where the individual can at some point at the end of the process glean as much medical information as possible to assist them in making life choices in the ever burgeoning world that we live in as far as growth and technology and, you know, I'm watching this AARP commercial, I still shake my head to this day where it says, "Wow, with people growing so much older, half their lives might be lived 50 years and older."

I don't know a ton of people over 100 years old, I'd like to think that that's what we're going to wake up and start seeing more and more of. I do have a concern as to the quality of life, you know, when someone gets to be post 80 and 90, but, you know, I'm talking to people, there are people now in their 80s that are doing really, really well. And in fact, I heard it that if you can make it through certain aspects of the 70s, then it actually gets a little easier for people as they grow older, so it's not a direct straight line there either, that there's sort of ups and downs as far as mortality and morbidity. And we'll leave those predictions to the actuaries

to get their arms around going forward.

So that's just one small aspect of a very lengthy Bill. But I think it's an indication that all the permutations that this envisions and all the laws that are currently on the books that need to be tweaked and modified and changed to comport with the status of the law as it stands for intimate relationships and couples and same-sex couples and how one identifies oneself, all of those things.

This now reaches in and says let's bring one's relationship as a young person growing up as a child, as a baby, as an infant all the way through and have everything fit together in a rational construct that makes sense. And so I don't view this proposed legislation as anything that necessarily widens the ambit, or changes people's rights in a way that some of those other changes historically, over the last 10 or so years have done.

But I do see it as bringing all these other things that we have in our statutes up to the same level so that it's a coherent, rational hole that we are living in here in the State of Connecticut. And I also fundamentally in my last point is, I just think it's unfair to make certain couples or certain groups of individuals jump through certain hoops, having to go to probate, get certain orders, certain notifications, things that can be very costly. Whereas other individuals in a different situation simply because of being man and wife, and in a more traditional, recognized relationship don't have to do all those things, A, which is sometimes time consuming, and makes people nervous and uptight, and have to get counsel, but also can be very expensive, and can be forbidding for just by means of cost, causing people to put off decisions or not have the

kind of relationships by way that they can say XYZ, because they don't have the 1000s of dollars that it would cost to have all of that recognize, where there really might be little to no doubt whatsoever as to what the outcome will be. It's just that a bunch of hoops have to be jumped through, because we haven't brought all those statutes up to where they should be right now. So a long kind of disposition, but I feel very strongly about this.

I really respect and admire representative Currey and anybody who does so much homework over a number of years on a piece of legislation, incorporates a very, very, very smart professor to help draft these provisions, and taking the time, at least with me to sit down for more than one meeting and spend over an hour going over the nuances, and knowing that it was an open door policy all along the way. And that invitations were proffered at least to pretty much everybody that I know on the Judiciary Committee, if they had any interest whatsoever as to the details of what's being proposed.

To me, that's just really darn good legislating. And this Bill has had a ton of work put into it. It's been well thought out, is a perfect, what things in this world are perfect, but it's pretty darn close to addressing as many things as I had questions regarding. And again, for those reasons, and so many others, I really strongly urge my colleagues in the circle to support the Bill that's before us this evening. Thank you so much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. Will you remark further?  
Good evening, Senator Kasser.

SENATOR KASSER (36TH):

Good evening, Madam President, I rise in strong support of this Bill. Being a parent is an enormous privilege and responsibility. A parent is defined by love, the love they give their child, not by their own gender, marital status or sexual orientation. Whether a person is male or female, married or unmarried, gay or straight, that is completely irrelevant to their ability to parent.

But our laws and policies still discriminate on the basis of these factors. All parents are not treated equally in Connecticut. For instance, when parents use reproductive assistance, like IVF, or donor sperm or eggs to conceive a child, they are not legally recognized as parents of that child.

Under current law, they have to adopt their own child. You don't have to be a legal scholar to see that that's wrong. Both straight and gay couples use reproductive assistance to have children and this Bill ensures that they will now be treated equally and given the respect and dignity and rights that they deserve.

Secure legal rights are critical to parents, so they can make medical decisions, provide financial support and care for their child. We heard testimony from families who do not have this security and they live in fear.

If one parent becomes ill or dies, the child could be taken away from the other parent. This Bill gives all families the security and peace of mind they deserve. It also makes parenting policies and forms in Connecticut gender neutral. No longer will the Department of Public Health Forum which is issued

every time a child is born in Connecticut list only mother and father.

Now these forms will list parent one, parent two. All our parenting policies should be gender neutral. But the best part of this Bill is what it does for children, because every child deserves to be safe and loved and have a secure legal bond with their parent. This ensures that security, and that no child will be discriminated against because of the circumstances of their birth.

If their parents are not married, or are the same sex, or use reproductive assistance to conceive, this law finally declares that all children are equal.

I want to thank the good Chairman, Senator Winfield, as well as Representative Currey and Professor NeJaime at Yale for their incredible leadership on this. And I want to thank all the families and individuals who testified in support. And in particular, one young woman named [inaudible]

Malena is the beloved daughter of two fathers. She was one of the first children born in this country to two gay men by assisted reproduction. I first heard about Malena six years ago when my son William started at a new school.

She was a senior and he was a sophomore. But she took him under her wing, mentored him in debate club, and was so kind. She showed William that families are defined by love, not gender.

Now Malena is a student at Yale Law. She has been advocating for LGBTQ equality her whole life, and shining compassion and kindness everywhere she goes.

I want to thank her and I want to thank Malena's dads, Will and Marcellin for their tremendous courage blazing this parentage trail 25 years ago, and for being wonderful parents, who is a remarkable human being. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kasser. Will you remark further? Senator Anwar.

SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of the Bill, an act concerning adoption and implementation of Connecticut's parentage act. Madam President, I just want to echo some of the sentiments that my colleague, Senator Kassar has just eloquently stated.

If we were to look at what impacts an individual, a child, a vulnerable child, is the love, the care, and that is the most important ingredient. And we have been behind in our abilities to provide that ingredient to a number of our children in our State by passing this law, by passing this Bill tonight and hopefully making it into a law going forward. We are going to make sure that this barrier is removed. Thank you so much. And I rise in support, and I would encourage all of my colleagues to support this. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Anwar. Will you remark further on the legislation before the Chamber? Will you remark further? If not, the machine will be opened, and Mr.

Clerk if you would kindly announce the roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. This is House Bill 6321 as amended. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, House Bill 6321, an immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

An immediate roll call vote in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

House Bill 6321 as amended. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

House Bill 6321 as amended.

Total number of voting	35
Total number of voting Yea	35
Total voting Nay	0
Absent not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

And the legislation is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page five, calendar 112. Substitute for Senate Bill No. 393, an act requiring a study of methods to alleviate high room temperatures in residential buildings.

THE CHAIR:

And good evening, Senator Lopes, nice to see you here.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR LOPES (6TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. This is a task force to study methods to alleviate hot temperatures in congregate settings.

The emphasis on this would be towards dormitory settings and possibly senior housing. But it'll be a taskforce that that'll report back to the Housing Committee next year, essentially looking into the dangers associated with extremely hot temperatures in these settings, and are there any methods to alleviate these bad hot temperatures?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lopes. Will you remark further on the legislation before us? Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, I will open the vote and Mr. Clerk, please announce the roll call.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the

Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Bill 393. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 393. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate. Senate Bill 393, an immediate roll call vote.

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Bill 393. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate. Senate Bill 393. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Senate Bill 393:

Total number voting	35
Total voting Yea	31
Total voting Nay	4
Absent not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

And the measure is adopted. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, for our next item will be counter page seven, Calendar 133, Senate Bill 194. Before we get to that Bill, I'd like to remove Calendar page 24, Calendar 345, Senate Bill 1023 from the Consent Calendar and mark that PT as we wait for an amendment. Thank you,

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

And so ordered, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page seven, Calendar 133, substitute for Senate Bill number 194, an act establishing a right to housing.

THE CHAIR:

And good evening again, Senator Lopes.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move of acceptance to the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR LOPES (6TH):

This Bill is an aspirational study on humans, human beings all of us having a right to housing. In essence, it states that it should be a goal of the State to implement policies. We're all people, have a right to housing. Although it does not put any teeth as we would say into this language. It does ask all State agencies when formulating policy and implementing programs to take into consideration that in a State as wealthy as ours should really have care for our residents and aspire to the fact that all people have a right to safe and affordable

housing.

Madam President, the Clerk has possession of LCO 9029. I asked the Clerk, please call and let me give a leave the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

And Mr. Clerk if you would please call the Amendment, LCO 9029.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9029, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lopes.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The Amendment is a joint Amendment. Myself and the Senator Cicarella simply strikes the word progressively and progressive in two sections.

It strikes section three in its entirety, which is the section that had a fiscal note. So it removes the fiscal note from this Bill. And that's about it.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lopes. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber. Good evening, Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Good evening. I just wanted to comment on the Amendment, and also say I do support the Amendment. And one other thing that this does is it looks into not only low income, but moderate income families. So I think that was important that it takes a look at all families that may be in need in these trying times. So I just wanted to add that that is in the Amendment, and I stand in support of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

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

(MEMBERS):

Yea.

Opposed? The Yeas have it. The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended?  
Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you. And after looking at the language of the amended Bill, I do have some questions. The first question being the title, what exactly is meant by the right to housing in conjunction to this legislation that's proposed? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lopes.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It's a very good question, Senator Cicarella. Originally, this Bill, like many other bills started as a little bit more. And I think even last year, started as a movement to identify the fact that we do have two Connecticut, that we do have a wealthy Connecticut and a poor Connecticut, and there are many people in the State who are suffering.

And that part of that suffering is their inability to obtain safe, affordable housing. So in an aspirational aspect, we wanted to move forward with the ideal that this State should be moving to make sure that we eliminate impediments to people living a good healthy life, housing, homelessness, poverty, all sorts of different issues. So in that vein, it became the right to housing.

Through the legislative process, we thinned it out a little bit, we realized the complexities of trying to do more, a lot right away. And so that's where it was dialed back to a study Bill that also encompassed having the Department of Housing hire a couple housing ombudsman who would take complaints and filter them out, incorporate them into a report that would come back and be part of that study.

But due to fiscal constraints, that section was also removed. And we are now down to an aspirational study of this taskforce that will be staffed by members of the Housing Committee in the legislature, and that we will try to put heads together that will look at the ways that State can achieve this goal eventually a right to housing. And then also State agencies, all State agencies will be asked to incorporate a right to housing for people to low to moderate income in their policymaking and in their

execution of policy.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you. And through you, another question, you said all State agencies will be looking into this. Which one specifically will be looking at the reports from this Committee that's going to be put together?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lopes.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It does say each State agency has to find section 1-79 General statutes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you. And through you another question regarding again, in the first section of the Bill, the goal is to establish and fulfill the right to affordable housing but it also talks about descent. Can you tell me what descent would be defined as in this?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lopes.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Barring my lack of knowledge of a defined term for that in statute. It is a vague term that would somewhat roll into the side of, I assume housing that is in good, good condition, safe without defect.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you for that. As I look further, it talks about a few sets of Connecticut residents that may benefit from this study. And one of which I noticed was veterans, and there is a substantial amount of veterans that need housing and safe housing so they could contribute to society.

And being on Veterans Affairs, I do think this is a great study to look into ways that we could help vulnerable populations.

So I am interested to see what the panel does come back with and see how we could find ways to establish these goals, but do it affordably and not

in a way that would create additional expenses or costs for the taxpayers.

At this point, I have no additional questions. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further? Senator Anwar. Good evening, sir.

SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in support of the amended Bill, an act establishing a right to housing No. 194. Madam President, I wanted to make some comments in support of this very important Bill.

Here's the reality for us. And I think first, I wanted to acknowledge and thank Senator Lopes for his leadership and his effort in making this Bill into an effective way of addressing the needs of our State. And I also wanted to thank Senator Looney and Senator Duff for their leadership and clarity around this issue.

Madam President, we as a State have done a fairly good job in preventing homelessness. But our job is far from over in the last year or so. We have been fortunate to get federal funding and support which has helped us prevent some of the homelessness challenges. So it was a band aid strategy that was used.

I feel that there's a lot that we can do. And as a State, we have done very well in prevention. And we have created mechanisms to be able to address this in early identification and management and rapid rehousing services that the State has provided.

But as a State and the size of our State, we have truly the opportunity to make a difference and make this into a priority. I want to share a couple of thoughts with my colleagues and the people who are

listening.

Homelessness is very real. And there are organizations in our State who have been working on this for many years. I want to mention Connecticut Coalition for ending homelessness, but also many of the [cans 07:46:52] that have been part of this effort.

I have had the opportunity during the midst of winter months to have one of the days we go out in the middle of the night and start to look in Hartford, Bridgeport, New Haven, other towns, and as well to see if there are people who are homeless, and we have an opportunity to talk to the individuals and learn about their stories.

The individuals, if we ever have an opportunity to sit down and talk to them and spend some time and humanize them, one will realize that their stories would be very similar to each and every one of us, many of them have been successful in what they were doing. And it was a tragedy in their lives or a tragedy in their situation, or underlying illness that they were not able to get treatment for that resulted in them falling through the system, through the cracks in the system.

And that resulted in a situation where financial decisions, personal decisions, mental health issues, all of them led them to fall through that situation, and then were homeless. We have an opportunity to bring them back, we have an opportunity to try and get them in the right place.

From a medical perspective, I can tell you, each person should think if they were in the midst of winter month, they were homeless, and they had no

shelter, they had no safety, what would they do at that time? You're left with two things. Either you go to the hospital emergency room with an illness that you may or may not have, or you commit a crime and go to prison. Because you have to survive, you're in a survival instincts at that point. And that's what many of these people have shared with me.

And we all end up paying in that situation. So the healthcare costs and the overall lifespan of these individuals, their abilities to come back into the system is limited because we do not have a safe decent place for them to live. And if we were able to provide it to them, we'd be able to take care of them much more. If somebody is impacted by substance use issues, their ability to be successfully treated and rehabilitated goes up exponentially high once they have a safe place, and a home.

And similarly if somebody is going through mental health issues, their success rate doubles, if they have a safe place to be. And a combination of these actually have resulted in improvement in the outcomes, the cost that we sometimes worry about even though this Bill does not have a cost, this is aspirational goal, I can tell you that the cost that the State pays is going to be a fraction if you address this, because the cost of not doing anything is far more than the miniscule cost of addressing these issues.

And that's why I think what we have to start to look at and these analysis have been done, and so much more information is available about our abilities to fix this and prevent this and take care of this, that it is actually not even a financial question any longer.

The good news is that the federal funding may be looking at this as well, because this is going on across the country. And this is going to become a priority to try and help out all the vulnerable communities who are going through challenges the veterans like, Senator Cicarella has alluded to, as well, we can do better. And we have done well. But we can do better.

And sometimes, Connecticut gets lost into the fact that we say we are better than everybody else, which is a fact for so many things that we do so well than the rest of the country. But we have to compare ourselves with ourselves. And that's what we have to do. And I think this Bill is going to take us to a better place. And I want to again, thank all the people who have been working on this, including Representative McGee who has been working hard as a Co-Chair in housing. And I cannot thank the leadership and the efforts for putting this all together and hoping that this becomes a reality. Thank you again, Madam President for this opportunity. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Anwar. Will you remark further?  
Senator Kelly, good evening.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Good evening, Madam President. I have maybe, well, I have one question maybe two for the proponents of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Madam President, can the proponent identify in the Bill, whether there's any, I'm gonna say reference, appointment or evaluation of the Connecticut economy and its impact on citizens inability to afford housing. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lopes.

SENATOR LOPES (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It is a very good question. I do not believe that is in the Bill. But it is a very relevant issue related to the topic.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. And thank you, Senator Lopes. I have no further questions, just more of commentary with regards to the Bill.

The bill is an act establishing a right to housing. And I could not agree more, that we should have a goal of our State to implement policies that will respect, protect and fulfill a right to affordable, decent, safe and stable housing for every resident.

Senator Anwar talked at length about the negative impact that poor housing has on individuals. I know

that the effects of eviction on foreclosure is far and wide reaching to a family that has gone through that.

When I had the opportunity to work in the Department of Social Services, and did home visits throughout Fairfield County, but predominantly in the cities of Bridgeport, Danbury and Stanford, I got to see firsthand, the impact of exactly this, that if you don't have decent, safe and stable housing, it has a negative impact on the family, which is the most important unit, not only of our government, not only of our community, but of the family and the family unit.

But Madam President, what we have before us is an act establishing a right to housing but it misses the biggest point which is giving the people the opportunity to perform the opportunity to succeed, the opportunity to have a decent wage and a decent job to afford better housing.

We've heard that this is housing homelessness, poverty, homelessness and poverty are economic issues as well as human issues.

But what this Bill talks about is policies and government programs, as if the policies and government programs are going to lift the people of Connecticut up. I'm gonna argue that for the past decade, it has failed.

Our state is dead last, dead last in job growth, dead last in personal income growth. We want to create affordable housing, let's put money back in the Connecticut family's pocket, not take money out of their pocket. Every single opportunity this government can do that.

This is a big distinction between the Republican and Democrat parties. We believe in the individual. The majority believes in government.

Since 2010, the communities my hometown of Stratford, Bristol, East Haven, all saw a median income grow by about 15%. But the cost of rent in the same communities rose by 20%.

And the number of families who are paying rent in excess of 30% of their incomes grew by about 14% in those towns.

The problem with Connecticut is that our economy is not allowing our citizens to keep up with the cost of inflation and the cost of housing.

Our economy is failing the citizens. The bigger cities, New Haven and Bridgeport saw an 8% and 7% growth in income respectively, while the rent grew 17%. Over the past decade no city's citizens fell behind 10%.

However, in communities like Darien and Westport, income rose at a 32% and 37%. That's where the affordable housing is, because their income is growing when in other communities it's not.

So our economy is failing most middle income and low income families who are the ones that need exactly this type of policy and goal that's going to bring decent, safe and stable housing to those individuals. But this Bill isn't going to do it because it's not going to change their economic situation, their economic reality.

We are the second most taxed State in the country.

Second, number two. Wouldn't it be nice to be number two in job growth and number 50<sup>th</sup> in tax burden? But that's not the priority of the majority.

Connecticut has the second highest electric rates. These are the reality of Connecticut's families. They have problems, fiscal problems, money problems. It's difficult to balance the budget of the family in Connecticut. And our government is making it that much more difficult. And when we put together, I'm going to say commissions and studies like this, let's be honest, let's look at how we can create an economy that's going to help these people get out of the situation that they're in.

Government studying itself to come up with solutions hasn't worked. The economy that was created wasn't done by Republican majorities. For the past 10 years I've been here, we've had democrat majorities at all levels of government. This economy is the basis or the result of a decade of dominance.

And where are we? Dead last in job growth, dead last in personal income growth. We have housing that's becoming more and more unaffordable, despite how many programs in government policies and studies we do. Because the fact of the matter is, unless the family has more money to afford better housing, it's always going to be out of reach.

So Madam President, while this is good intended, I believe that the goal should be to create those. I think it misses the mark. It doesn't study the root cause and the root problem.

Fact is Connecticut is unaffordable. And until we turn our economy around Connecticut's middle and low income families will continue to struggle, because

our State is too unaffordable. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Good evening, Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Good evening, Madam President, standing in support of the Bill. I wanted to commend center Lopes and the Housing Committee for all of his efforts to bring it before us tonight. Madam President, we believe it's not an either or, as Senator Kelly said earlier that you either believe in the government or you believe in the individual.

We Democrats believe in both. We believe in individual initiative. And we believe that government can be a positive force in helping the individual achieve his or her potential. And we focus on the needs of the individual and legislation like the Fair Work Week Bill the other night, where we recognized it's not only the needs of the business, but the needs of the individual working for that business, it has to be accommodated, if people are going to have a reasonable life and a predictable schedule.

So it's not either or, that's a false dichotomy. It is both, and success comes both at the individual and for the State, when there's a recognition of the proper role of government. And also, the individual is finding a way to use his or her talents in a way that is supported not impeded by government efforts and also to try to assist individuals in situations where the power relationships might otherwise be

stacked against them. So thank you, Madam President, and urge support for this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, I will open the voting machines and Mr. Clerk, please announce the roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 194 as amended. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 194 as amended. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate, Senate Bill 194 as amended. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

Senate Bill 194 as amended. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, Senate bill 194 as amended. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

Senate Bill 194 as amended.

Total number of voting Yea	25
Total voting Nay	10
Absent not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

And the legislation is adopted. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to mark an item previously marked PT as now ago Calendar page 24, Calendar 345, Senate Bill 1023.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk. Page 24.

CLERK:

Page 24, Calendar No. 345, substitute for Senate Bill No.1023, an act concerning the duties and responsibilities of the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

And good evening, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I move acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and a passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. This is a Bill that deals with the duties of the Commission on Human Rights and Opportunities as an amendment on a system. It's LCO 9042, has to be called, I'd be granted leave at the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

And Mr. Clerk, if you could please call 9042 LCO 9042, please.

CLERK:

LCO No. 9042, Senate Schedule "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I'm going to move adoption and just say that what this Amendment does is it makes sure that our State agencies, boards and commissions, while they're not necessarily required to investigate during a CHRO investigation, they are required to make every effort to mitigate the discriminatory conduct. I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Senator Kissel, good evening.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Good evening. Thank you very much, Madam President. I stand in support of the Amendment, and my urge my colleagues to support it as well. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of the Amendment, please signify by saying Yea.

(MEMBERS):

Yea.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? And the Yeas have it, the Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the legislation that is amended before the Chamber? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Madam President, if there's an objection, I'd ask this item be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I have no objection. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection. We will move that item to the Consent Calendar. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, that is our final Bill on our second goal list and I would ask the Clerk to read the items on the Consent Calendar and followed by a vote on Consent Calendar number one. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk

CLERK:

Consent Calendar No. one, page one count no. 418, Senate joint resolution 48, page two, Calendar 422, house joint resolution 372. Page two, Calendar 429, house joint resolution 373. Page two, Calendar No. 419, Senate joint resolution 49. Page 24, Calendar 351, in a bill 989. Page eight, Calendar 148, Senate Bill 896. Page 11, Calendar 182, Senate Bill 952. Page 25, Calendar 362, House Bill 6503. Page four, Calendar 77, Senate Bill 700. Page nine, Calendar 161, Senate Bill 1020 and page 24, calendar 345, Senate Bill 1023. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate or Consent Calendar No. one. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent Calendar No 1. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate. This is Consent Calendar Number One. An immediate roll call vote in the Senate.

Consent Calendar No. 1

Total number voting	35
Total voting Yea	35
Total voting Nay	0
Absent not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

And the Consent Calendar is consented to. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'm going to yield to Senator Kelly.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. And thank you, Senator Duff. I rise for a journal notation.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. I would like to note that yesterday, Wednesday, May 19<sup>th</sup>, I was out of the Chamber for personal family matters. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The journal will so note. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And, Madam President, today we had Senators miss votes because of business outside the Chamber. And I will yield to any member four points of personal pullovers, privilege or announcements. All at once. Thank you, Madam President. Seeing none. I will just alert members to be will be in session next week, Tuesday, Wednesday and Thursday, planning to convene Tuesday at noon sharp. So hope to see everybody at noon, so we'll get right on the floor. And with that, Madam President, I wish everybody a good weekend and that we adjourn, so just to call the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

And we are adjourned. (Gavel)

(On the motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 11:04 p.m. adjourned Sine Die.)