

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

JUNE 4, 2021

(The Senate was called to order at 2:25 p.m.,
President in the Chair.)

THE CHAIR:

Will the Senate please come to order. Members and
guests please rise and direct your attention to our
Guest Chaplain, back by popular demand, Ms. Kathy
Zabel of Burlington.

GUEST CHAPLAIN ZABEL:

We expect to pass through this life but once. If,
therefore, there be any kindness we can show, or any
good thing that we can do to any fellow being, let
us do it now, and not defer or neglect it, as we
shall not pass this way again.

THE CHAIR:

And I am very pleased to invite Senator Kissel to
lead us in the Pledge.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

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. And Good Afternoon, Senator
Duff, here we are again.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Good Afternoon, Madam President. It does seem like we just here recently.

THE CHAIR:

Indeed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President is there business on the Clerk's desk?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

The Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda Number 1, Regular Session, Friday, June 4, 2021.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President I move all items on Senate Agenda Number 1 dated Friday, June 4, 2021, be acted upon as indicate and that it be incorporated by reference in the Journal and transcripts.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

**Senate Agenda
No. 1
REGULAR SESSION
Friday, June 04, 2021**

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

Report - Connecticut Municipal Electric Energy Cooperative - Annual Report for Calendar Year Ended December 31, 2020. (Pursuant to Section 7-233c(i) of the Connecticut General Statutes) Date received: June 3, 2021.

Referred to Committee on Energy and Technology.

Report Audit - Auditors of Public Accounts Report - Central Connecticut State University - NCAA agreed-upon review for fiscal year ending June 30, 2020. Date received: June 3, 2021.

Referred to the Committee on Higher Education and Employment Advancement.

BUSINESS FROM THE HOUSE:

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

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 6442 AN ACT CONCERNING EQUITABLE ACCESS TO BROADBAND. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 9750))

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 6517 AN ACT IMPLEMENTING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE TASK FORCE TO ANALYZE THE IMPLEMENTATION OF LAWS GOVERNING DYSLEXIA INSTRUCTION AND TRAINING. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 9914))

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 6624 AN ACT CONCERNING LICENSING REQUIREMENTS FOR REAL ESTATE BROKERS. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 9246))

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 6647 AN ACT CONCERNING GEOGRAPHIC INFORMATION SYSTEMS. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 9852))

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 6667 AN ACT CONCERNING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE JUVENILE JUSTICE POLICY AND OVERSIGHT COMMITTEE. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 9988))

ENERGY AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 6527 AN ACT INCREASING THE TOTAL OUTPUT OF CLASS III SOURCES.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 6541 AN ACT CONCERNING THE VALIDITY OF INLAND WETLANDS PERMITS IN RELATION TO CERTAIN OTHER LAND USE APPROVALS. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 9841))

PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

HB NO. 5597 AN ACT CONCERNING OPIOIDS. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 9972))

PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE

HB NO. 6394 AN ACT CONCERNING INTEREST ON LOTTERY SALES AGENT DELINQUENCY ASSESSMENTS.

DISAGREEING ACTION(S) - to be tabled for the calendar.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 241 AN ACT CONCERNING OVERSIGHT AND TRANSPARENCY AT THE CONNECTICUT PORT AUTHORITY. (As amended by Senate Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 9467) and House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 9982))

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And for our first set of markings for today.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar Page 9, Calendar 266, Senate Bill 363, would like to mark that item Go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 46, Calendar 358, Senate Bill 1058, like that item as Go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 24, Calendar 441, House Bill 6355, like to mark that item Go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 32, Calendar 496, House Bill 6505, like to mark that item, Go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 18, Calendar 395, Senate Bill 1080,
like to mark that item, Go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 18, Calendar 396, Senate Bill 1081,
like to mark that item, Go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 46, Calendar 480, Senate Resolution
Number 9, I would like to mark that item, Go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 9, Calendar Number 266, Substitute for Senate
Bill No, 363, "AN ACT CONCERNING THE DUTIES OF THE
OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL."

THE CHAIR:

And good afternoon, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Good Afternoon, Madam President. I move Acceptance of Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on Passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. This Bill is before the Chamber, I will say as the Attorney General said in his testimony offered on the Bill, this would bring Connecticut in line with other states by formalizing the Attorney Generals ability to investigate and where it's warranted by the evidence that comes from the investigation, civil rights lawsuits to stop large scaled systematic violations of our laws. In the past people had been concerned about whether there was the power on the part of the Attorney General under previous iterations of this Bill to deal with criminal matters that, there is no criminal jurisdiction here dealing with the enforcement of civil rights in the civil context. And it's a good Bill and I think it should pass and I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further? Good Afternoon, Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Good Afternoon, Madam President. Great to see you this afternoon. Not that it matters to us much here in the Circle, but for a lot of folks out that TGIF enjoying the end of the week as we enter this unofficial, I guess, beautiful time of the year here in New England.

I stand in support of the Bill before us this afternoon. As I've stated here in the Circle many times in the past, I had the great good fortune of being one of the Tri-Chairs of the Judiciary Committee for two years when the Senate was tied here 18 to 18 and the House Chair at that time was then Representative William Tong, who is now our Attorney General and my colleague here in the Senate longtime friend, former Senator Paul Doyle and I thought we all worked really, really well together in a very nonpartisan, bipartisan fashion and I'm lucky that I serve as Ranking Senator on the Judiciary Committee again now with Senator Winfield who's a pleasure to work with in many ways and a true gentleman in every sense of the term.

I'm comfortable with the Bill that is before us. Some people had concerns previously regarding the ambit of the powers of the Attorney General's Office. I would state that we've had a history of not necessarily bashful Attorneys General in the past, certainly it appeared that they had plenty of power to bring litigation against the, those folks out there whether they be limited liability corporations, large multinational corporations, individuals but essentially folks that are doing harm and again on the civil side these actions were brought and justice made it out and I think here in Connecticut we have a lot to be very proud of with all the folks that work in our Attorney General's Office, had good interactions with Attorney Lake and others in Attorney General Tong's office.

Appreciate their efforts especially when the State of Connecticut takes a lead role in class action litigation when we join with other states in trying to root out bad public policies, you know, illegal public policies, illegal performance not by illegal public policies but illegal activities by entities. I think at this time we may be engaged in leading a suit or action with other states regarding generic drugs and I look with admiration to Attorney General Tong and the folks on the Attorney General's staff

and throughout the building who work so tirelessly on these matter.

And if anyone ever dug a little deeper from my years on the Appropriations Committee the State of Connecticut by being a lead state in a lot of this litigation does get the lion's share of proceeds at the end of the day when these matters are successfully resolved and that certainly is a boon to every taxpayer here in the State of Connecticut.

So I don't have a problem with this Bill before us expanding the powers regarding civil rights enforcement when there is widespread violations that harm the good people of the State of Connecticut. I think there is plenty of protections both currently in statute and any other area there may be regulations as well, but again I have the utmost respect having served not only as Tri-Chair with then Representative Chairman Tong but now Attorney General Tong but while he served on the Judiciary Committee with myself as well, not that it should come down to an individual but again I think there is enough safeguards in the Bill before us as well as already in our legal system, to make sure that this expanded ability will be used wisely and carefully and preciousy to attain the ends of justice. And for that reason, I support this Bill this afternoon. Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes, Good Afternoon, Madam President. The Clerk is in possession of LCO 9375 and I would like to move Adoption of this Amendment and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk if you could please call LCO 9375.

CLERK:

LCO 9375 Senate Amendment "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes, I'm hoping this will be considered a Friendly Amendment. This moves along with the expansion of the Attorney Generals powers under this Bill and what it does quite frankly is we passed a Bill on pregnancy centers here and all this does is provide the Attorney General with a definition of what deceptive and deceptive advertising means so that it can provide clarity for him as he will now have the new power of deciding whether pregnancy centers are acting deceptively or have deceptive advertising.

And this is a definition that speaks to purposeful misrepresentation of information and purposeful misrepresentation of advertising. And I hope that others in the Senate will help and support this Amendment just to give clarity and reference for his decisions in the future. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Somers. Will you remark on the Amendment before the Chamber? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. First let me say to Senator Kissel Fridays will become very meaningful in the very near future.

I rise in opposition to the Amendment. I recognize the thinking behind the Amendment. I do think though that discussion should we chose to what the Amendment is doing, is one that probably shouldn't be done in an Amendment that hasn't had the discussion I think that it warrants. But I would also represent that while this might not please everyone, I would engage in that conversation to see what we can make of the conversation. But at this time I would oppose the Amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber?
Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good afternoon. I rise in support of the Amendment. It was something that I think we had discussions on back when the Bill on the pregnancy centers was discussed on the Floor. So I want to lend my support to this clarification which I think the Amendment would do and then I'm going to ask if I may, Senator Winfield to just to repeat what he said. I thought he said we would, he would be willing to work with looking at it further but I didn't quite hear it and I know it's probably not appropriate me not asking the proponent of the Amendment but if that is alright.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield would you like to clarify?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President and it's on the Amendment so I think it's perfectly acceptable. What I said is what I say about everything in the Chamber which gives me a whole lot of work, but I am willing to sit down and have conversations to see if there, I don't make any promises, but if there can be a meeting of the minds, as has happened on other things, we sometimes come back and surprise people on the things that we can work on together. That was the point I was making.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President I thank the good Chair of the Committee for that and everybody knows he is a true man of his word. So I just wanted to understand that and thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Formica. Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President for the second time. First of all I would like to thank the good Senator for his words, Senator Winfield I look forward to have a further conversation about the definition of deceptive. I just wanted to point out why I think it's so important because the other Bill that passed in the description of the title there were people thinking that if you were just a pregnancy crisis center that name in and of itself was defective. There is such a wide range of interpretation of what

that means for some individuals. That's why I think it is important to have a definition that is pulled from a source, as a resource for clarification for his powers that have now been expanded over those organizations and I'm hopeful that this will pass. But if it does not pass today, I look forward to trying to work with Senator Winfield to close that gap of interpretation on deceptive and deceptive advertising. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President when the roll is called I'd ask, when the vote is cast I ask that it be done by roll. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

And a roll call vote has been requestion so we will honor the request. Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, I will open the voting machines. Mr. Clerk please call roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 363, Senate Amendment "A" LCO 9375. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered 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 Amendment "A" LCO 9375.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

On Senate Bill 363, Senate Amendment Schedule "A"
LCO 9375:

Total number voting	33
Total voting Yea	11
Total voting Nay	22
Absent not voting	3

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] And the Amendment fails. Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you, Madam President. I would like to pass this temporarily.

THE CHAIR:

And this item will be passed temporarily.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Page 46, Column Number 348, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1059, "AN ACT CONCERNING THE OFFICE OF THE CORRECTION OMBUDS, THE USE OF ISOLATED CONFINEMENT, SECLUSION AND RESTRAINTS, SOCIAL CONTACTS FOR

INCARCERATED PERSONS AND TRAINING AND WORKERS'
COMPENSATION BENEFITS FOR CORRECTION OFFICERS."

THE CHAIR:

And Good Afternoon again, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Good Afternoon, again, Madam President. I think we will see each other a couple of times today.

THE CHAIR:

Indeed.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

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 WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This is a Bill that comes to us through the Judiciary Committee. It has several parts to it dealing with the Office of the Ombudsperson, the manner in which we would continue to use solitary but in a more limited way and it has parts involved in it about corrections officers and mental health and things that are beneficial to corrections officers.

There has been a conversation that has been going on in the General Assembly about the usage of solitary confinement for many years. Many people who are around the Circle have seen in the last few years we even brought a mock solitary cell to the building for people to be able to get what is not the experience of solitary but a small taste of what

that experience might me. That cell is the size of what some people would say the average size of a solitary cell has the sounds of a, one of these places piped in, it is designed to give the experience. And as people around the Circle engaged in the conversation in the past and know that opportunity was extended to legislators to go into the cell to have that experience. To my knowledge, I've seen the logs, very few people spent more than ten minutes in that cell. And this is a cell where the individuals can go into the cell, know that they have complete control of the situation and leave at any point that they chose to and most people choose to leave within ten minutes.

I had the experience of spending hours in the cell to try to figure out what that experience would be like as best as we could approximate it. I have to tell you that not too long a period of time that experiences, even though I knew I could open the door, even though I knew I had complete control became disoriented. I tried to keep track of the time, that was impossible. I just begun to quickly, quicker than I think people understand, lose sense of things that are important to have as a human being.

This issue that has been in front of the General Assembly is about the way in which we treat people who have done somethings that have landed them in our prisons but who remain human beings, about whether or not we treat them as such. So we have the issue of the Ombudsperson. Now many people know that we in 2017, we endeavoring to yet again to, at that point eliminate solitary confinement. What we wound up with us dealing with some of our juveniles in custody and the office that would deal with juveniles. In this Bill we deal with the Ombudsperson dealing with the system and the powers of the Ombudsperson would have.

Then we deal with the issue of solitary confinement itself and how long people are to be in the cell and

under the original Bill there is an Amendment that will come that will change, this but under the original Bill people would be afforded eight hours out of their cell and when people are to be put in their cell, we know that it is important to make sure that we know some things about the people who we have in our custody and who we are choosing to put in the cell, and the impacts that maybe felt on certain populations more than other populations. And so under the Bill, it calls for an assessment of the individual to make sure that mental health or physical health is not implicated. It talks about the point at which a person can be ordered into a cell. How long they can stay there, 72 hours maximum, and how that gets extended.

This is a Bill I think is very, very important to move forward. There is a lot of discussion. I've had a lot of discussion with the Commissioner of Corrections and his predecessor and his predecessors' predecessor about this issue. One of the things I want people in the Circle to understand is there are dates in this Bill that don't go into effect this year for a reason. The Department of Corrections for many years has said to me, I don't have to ask other people what they said, they said to me, we are going to do something about this. And year, after year, after year I'm waiting. And while I'm waiting the people who are in our system are waiting but they are not just waiting, they are experiencing what it is to be a solitary confinement as it is currently setup. I don't think it's good but the Department tells us they are going to be doing something and then not do it.

So, what I said was this. Okay, I get it. You don't like the fact that we are modifying it, were not ending solitary. You don't like the fact that we're modifying solitary confinement. You should come to us like you've said you're going to come to us. So here's what we are going to do. We are going to say that the parts of this Bill that deal with that issue will go into effect in July of next

year giving you a Session to come back and deal directly with us on the issue of solitary confinement. And if we can come to an agreement then that's how we will change the law and if we can't this law will go into effect.

But then very recently it came back to me that well you know, that even though you might make changes that I'm going to talk about in the Amendment, to the number of hours, we still need to have the people in our restricted housing units not be a part of that. So I said, we want to make sure we get this Bill done. We want to make sure that we put a stake in the ground so we're going to take that part, and this in the Amendment as well, and we are going to extend that out. So, Madam, I would like to call the Amendment on this Bill, which is LCO No. 10009, I had to make sure I had the right number of zeros. I'd ask the Amendment be called and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk could you please call LCO 10009?

CLERK:

LCO 10009, Senate Amendment "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So I think if we're going to have a discussion about the Bill, we should have a discussion about the Bill we're actually doing and this Amendment would make this Bill that we're actually doing. So Madam President, when I am done, I'm going to urge that we adopt this Amendment.

This Amendment takes the eight hours that we talked about because the Commissioner, who I think I have a pretty good relationship with, talked to me about the implications of having eight hours out of the cell. It takes that eight hours and it moves it down to six and-a-half hours and it says that that population as I was just talking about, of those in restrictive housing unit they don't go in 2022 like everyone else, they go in 2023 giving the Department two years to figure out how do we do what we're intending to do here which I think is a significant amount of time particularly given the number of years that we've already spent having this conversation.

This Bill also deals with the fact that the Ombudsperson has the power to investigate and issue subpoenas and as we did in another Bill we add language in that allows the person to whom this subpoena is issued to be able to respond in the statute that would become, that would be in place after this passed.

It was also said to me in conversation with the Commissioner and others who work in the field that the fact that we say, immediately upon putting the person in they have to have the in-person assessment doesn't work. And so the language in this Bill gives them 24 hours in which to make that happen and we think that is appropriate. It gets to the principle of what we want to do, it may not be the way that we started off.

The Bill originally said that a captain or above was needed to put someone into the cell. We said that is what we want but the reality is that might always be the case so it's the captain or above or the person with who is the highest ranking officer at the facility. As you're listening to this what you're hearing is an effort to work with the Department even though we're trying to move forward with the Bill in front of us. At the same time we

also took Sections of this Bill that are dealt with in another Bill, that deal with the Corrections Officers, since they are dealt with in another Bill, we stripped it out of this Bill. I urge adoption, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. And the question is on Adoption. Will you remark on the Amendment before us? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Again very nice to see you this afternoon. As Senator Winfield indicated it appears Judiciary Committee has the first three or four Bills. Our cup runneth over!

As this Amendment essentially will help to become the Bill, should it pass, there is some predicate questions I have just to get a better idea as to the direction that we're moving. And there is not a lot probably about four. My first question is, do we have a process in place as this time whereby an inmate or for that matter an inmate's loved one or someone on behalf of the inmate, can initiate an inquiry or file a complaint?

What we're envisioning here, my understanding is, this Ombudsperson or I've heard it all Ombuds, I understand we are moving away from Ombudsman because that may have male overtones but Ombuds seems awkward to me, so I like Ombudsperson, that seems to get the job done and it's my understanding that the most recent iteration is while the Ombudsperson would have subpoena powers that the latest version would allow an individual to, if not challenge that, to address that in some way rather than automatically compliant. But I'm just wondering, all right so that's where my understanding is where we're moving towards. What is out there right now because I

think we do have some kind of system in place right now?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I will, I think I got the whole question, but if I didn't I'd be happy to go back. So let me start with the challenge if you will if you are in the Amendment LCO 10009, in Lines 4-10 is the place where the challenge, if you will, in the court to the subpoena exists. So yes that would be part of the Bill.

We have, as I said, and Ombuds but it's not for all of Corrections. There are other processes in place. The question of whether or not those processes for complaining or issuing notice that there is a problem work as any of us know whether we agree or don't agree have not always been found to work the people inside of the system which is why the notice of an Ombudsperson to give oversight similar to what we intended to do in the 2017 Bill for those in our juvenile system was put in place.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much. So just so I am clearer, what this would do was expand the Ombudsperson system that we have regarding juveniles to all inmates but I am still unclear as to what methodology we use right now for the non-juvenile inmates. If it's not

an Ombudsperson is it some outside counsel, is it someone up through the Department of Corrections, an administrator? I just probably should know this like the back of my hand, but for the record, I would like to know what are we shifting from to go this expanded Ombudsperson policy?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. So the outside counsel is always in play, I think. But the process that is a process internal to the Department of Corrections and like you, I should have remembered off the top of my head, but we're doing multiple Bills this morning and I don't. But it's a process that is set up by the Department of Corrections in order to indicate that there is something wrong. I couldn't lay it out exactly for you but I know that there are people around the Circle, I'm looking at one who probably could tell you exactly how that process works but there is currently a process in place.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Kissel

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Okay, thank you very much and that's fine. I have to check a little because Senator Winfield, my good friend and colleague, the Co-Chair of the Judiciary Committee said this morning and it's already afternoon, but that's why everyday slips into the next.

Before I jump from this one to my next sort of area of inquiry, I just want one last little thing. So the system that we put in, in 2017 I guess was the year, time flies, for juveniles the Ombudsperson system, can I glean from the fact that we're expanding that to all inmates through this Amendment of the entire Proposal we have before us this afternoon, that it has worked relatively well for the juveniles and that's why we want to see it replicated on a broader scale for all inmates?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I might not suggest that. As a matter of fact, the Ombud, as the good Senator would know, like a lot of things we have in law we don't always implement them extremely well. But the concept I think, when in conversation in 2017 and even now, the concept of an Ombudsperson, if it actually works, if it is implemented correctly, I don't think is really disagreed upon. Now the parameters of that Ombudsperson could actually do might be a place where there is some parting of the way but the concept is not problematic. As a matter of fact, Connecticut at one point did have Ombudspersons around. So this is not based on the fact that we have a system that works really well, it's based on the fact that we know that if we have this system working well, it is a good system. So this is an attempt to try to, which is why the language is relative prescriptive, this is an attempt to try to make sure that we don't just suggest that an Ombudsperson but exactly what that Ombudsperson has the power to do and can do, and how the office would be set up.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. On to another area as you are aware, I have several correctional facilities within my district, more than any other State Senator here in the Circle and they go anywhere from McDougal Walker over in Suffield, to facilities such as Carl Robinson in Enfield, such as Northern Correctional Facility which is I think scheduled to close July first in Somers, and others and as I toured those facilities as well as Manson, as well as Garner, and others throughout the State of Connecticut whether by design or through some form of evolution, certain facilities now seem to have more elderly inmates.

For example Garner has more inmates with mental health issues, Manson has the youth, and even within inmates that are not classified in that fashion there is an effort, I believe within the Department of Corrections to classify inmates based upon, as a layperson I would say, threat level but level of dangerousness, you know, an inmate that typically let's say an inmate that acted up and was a real threat would find himself at the Northern Correctional Facility and then moved back down through the system through classification. And then you go for more cell facilities, you know, if you were, used to be on death row and now it's life without possibility of release, individuals are in their own individual cells, then you go to a facility that has two individuals per cell and then eventually you get the facilities that are more dormitory style and these are for social interaction, more economical in many respects but you certainly want to make sure that the individual is in an appropriate housing area such that safety

of both other inmates as well as corrections officers is maintained. So my question is given that systematic classification of inmates within the Department of Corrections as a whole, why would we be moving in a direction where we have an essentially one-size-fits-all change regarding the housing inmates in isolation, segregation?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I don't know that I would characterize what we're doing as a one-size-fits-all approach. I think we do think that given the impact of having people in our prison, specifically in solitary that it is important that time be given to people to be out of that environment.

Part of the reason the Bill, the Amendment actually that we're on, has the time in in that it has, is to give the Department the ability to come back and make suggestions so that the underlying notion that exists here in what would be the law, could be implemented in such a way as is actually works. But the reality of the case is that for many, many years we have been having this conversation and there have been promises made that have not been kept. And if we don't put in place this will become the law at a certain point. I will probably be gone from this Legislature before we make movement on this issue. I don't have any plans to leave right away, you never know what the voters say. But I don't have any plans to leaver right away but I still feel like this would not become the law.

I think it is important that we say we understand and that the Department needs to function but we

also understand that these human beings need to come out. Because remember let's remember they are coming back out of the system, they need to come back out of the system as healthy as possible, they need to come back to communities as healthy as possible because we're concerned about what happens to the people that the conversation is often about the victims. We don't want to put people who've been broken by our system in place.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Senator Winfield. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President

And through you.

Regarding the specific issue although the Bill addresses more than solitary confinement, or segregation, there is also quite a bit that addresses to my understanding visitation and things of that nature. I'm going to touch on that at the end for a little bit. But back to the solitary confinement, when I just sort of conceptualize what the Department of Corrections might utilize solitary confinement or segregation or whatever the appropriate term is, I can see it being used if there is a fight, and there's danger posed to one or more inmates, you are going to want to probably isolate at least one of those inmates so they are no longer a threat to others.

You may want to isolate or put into solitary confinement or segregate an inmate so and in some respect they are no longer a threat to themselves. I could see both of those. There may be an aspect of our Department of Corrections where an individual who is incorrigible who doesn't follow simple rules

to maintain the health, safety and welfare of both the inmate population as a whole and the safety or correctional officers, men and women our boots on the ground, those folks as a whole and my understanding is that there is ever escalating punishment that can be needed out and that maybe one of the elements of punishment, in other words a particular inmate may have had several tickets or violations and at some point they will be looking at the next violation will get them solitary confinement for a period of time and that if it is part of keeping health, safety and security for the inmates and corrections officers, that is part of what is available to the Department of Corrections.

This is the last resort 24/7, 365 days a year if an individual is found to be so dangerous to society they have to be incarcerated in some way, shape or form and has lost their liberty, there is nowhere else. Actually I'll take a step back, we do have agreements with other sister states, that's not unusual, that some of our inmates are essentially swapped for inmates from another state. I won't name their names on the record because I really find them deplorable human beings, but two very notorious murders are now to my understanding being incarcerated in Virginia, no longer part of the Connecticut prison population but Commonwealth of Virginia. I think it's Commonwealth, sent us up at least two of their inmates so it works, not like a net gain but for whatever reason, I don't intimate knowledge of how they do the assessments, but I'm sure security is a very high if not sole priority.

But I can also envision that we might want to have an inmate in isolation and segregation in some form of solitary confinement to either protect them from the general population, i.e. let's say they are an informant, or let's say they're a police officer that was adjudged of a very violent crime or someone else that the general prison population may not take kindly to. I have heard although I don't have specific knowledge that sex offenders that prey upon

children are at the lower end of the pecking order in a correctional facility, that's just what I've heard. I don't know if that's exactly it, I'd have to do some research and study that.

I'm sure folks with PhDs and Doctorates know all that and I'm sure there are very, very smart folks throughout the Department of Corrections that bring that knowledge to their jobs. And also the other category of individual might be someone that is very much of a threat to themselves so much so, as opposed to my first example of someone was in a brawl, and you know, you want to keep them in isolation because they are a threat to themselves, but then the threat might be even more deeper, more psychological that they are indeed a suicidal threat.

We have had inmates, notorious inmates that have declared, I want to kill myself and they have to be treated in a certain way and it is my understanding that there has to be a watch and sometimes the watch is every 15 minutes, sometimes the watch is like constant, sometimes it's by camera, sometimes it's by other methodologies again I would defer to those folks that have followed a profession in the Department of Corrections, that served as corrections officers, may have marched up the ladder within the Department of Corrections, they have rankings like the military so I can see segregation, isolations, solitary confinement being utilized in several different ways within a correctional facility and again it would be somewhat dependent upon the dangerousness or the threat level of the inmate in that facility.

How would the policy before us as embraced and articulated in the Amendment and the tallit of the underlying Bill address issues where all these disparate separate goals have to be obtained? Again I call it one-size-fits-all but it is a uniformed policy for example, up to six and one-half hours outside of the solitary confinement or the

segregation and what if that comes in direct conflict with the safety of the inmate him or herself if they are a suicide threat of some other threat to either other inmates or their own wellbeing?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. I'm trying to make sure I can answer the question before us. I believe the question to the good Senator, the answer to the good Senator's question would be found in Lines 336 - 344 and this is where we talk about the number of hours that individuals would be afforded out of the cell each day. Let me also remind people that upon passage of this Bill nothing would go into effect for people in restricted housing until 2023.

But that they're talking about there, there are a number of hours that we ultimately want to have people out of the cell and it talks about certain individuals, certain types of individuals and those people being exceptions. It talks about individuals or reasons why they are exceptions, right. So there are exceptions if there is a serious incident that results in a facility wide lockdown or if there is a substantiated threat of imminent physical harm to a person or another that is evidenced by recent conduct or the incarcerated person themselves ask for segregation for their own personal protection. So these things that we're talking about are in the Bill as well which is why I suggest that while we are trying to develop a policy that we are allowing for the Department to come back and talk about and flush out even more.

We understand that there are reasons why you might need to use segregations. So I think the Bill thinks about those things as well.

Through you, Madam President.

And that's just to be clear, that's in the underlying Bill not the Amendment but it pertains to the Bill that is being modified by the Amendment, so that's it.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. That ends the questions that I would like to ask at this point in time. I understand and appreciate Senator Winfield's frustration. I can state for the record here in the Circle that I have been in a number of meetings with Senator Winfield and other representatives of Department of Corrections regarding a variety of issues.

Quite often we walk away from those meetings thinking X, Y, Z is going to happen and a year goes by and maybe half and X, half a Y and no Z, actually does transpire and so if you do that long enough it can be somewhat frustrating and, you know, I don't blame any particular individual at the Department of Corrections. I believe that I've had an excellent working relationship with a variety of Commissioners of the Department of Corrections and they have a really, really difficult job from top to bottom, there are no two ways about it.

And I understand that part of this is set to take effect in future years and that the Department of Corrections can come back to a lot of these issues in the next legislative session and say, we have revisited some of these and we are going to move

forward on certain policies. So I guess in a way there is a bit of a safety valve mechanism in some of these things.

At this point in time and I don't know if the good Senator has asked for a roll call on the Amendment, I would. It's my intention that is will still evince for the record, I will probably be voting no on the underlying Bill but I think the Amendment takes what's there and moves it in a direction I feel more comfortable with and I appreciate the efforts made by Senator Winfield in that regard and so I will be voting in favor of the Amendment but probably no on the underlying Bill.

But very keen about listening to this debate as it moves forward. To that end, our Caucus, our Chambers, are very lucky to have an individual who has life experience from a professional point of view as a job, got to make sure I phrase that completely correctly, it could be like a professional armored truck robber, no that's not the case whatsoever but at this time, I would like to yield to Senator Cicarella who, as I indicated did work for the Department of Corrections for a number of year and has several insights that despite all my tours of facilities and all my studying these issues, can't really be matched by someone who has actually worked in many of these facilities. So, if I could, Madam President, I would like to yield to Senator Cicarella at this time.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kissel. And after that introduction, are you sure you want to accept the yield, Senator Cicarella?

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President and thank you Senator Kissel. So as Senator Kissel was trying to explain I did have a position as a corrections officer for

some time in the Department of Corrections quite a few years back. And part of my commented questions today are also going to pertain to my current profession where I have a lot of experience with the criminal justice system specifically the Public Defender's Office. So having a well-rounded view of this topic, I have some very serious concerns for other corrections officers as well as staff that are in these facilities if we implement what is in both I guess you could say this Amendment and the underlying Bill.

While working in the Department of Corrections I really had minimal incidents personally. I got along with everybody and a simple philosophy that I was taught early on from some of my mentors in the Department, "Respect gets respect" is part of our Mission Statement. And I treated everybody the same from the corrections officers to the inmates, to the nursing staff, teachers, volunteers, etc. What I do outside of that facility I do the same thing and I feel that it serves me well. And it served me well there.

So I didn't have a lot of problems but I did see a lot of incidents and maybe some of the incidents I was involved in, yet very, very physical, nerve wracking, and sustained many injuries. In some of these processes it was responding to certain situations that I will touch on as we go through this and I have some questions and try to get a good understanding of how we could do some good, help certain populations that need it, whether it's employees of the Department of Corrections or inmates. And there is always room to get better. I say that to my kids, I say that to my staff now, we could always get better.

I think the Department of Corrections does that and they do that well. They really pride themselves and no pun intended, that's kind of the acronym that describes our philosophy if you will, Professionalism, Respect, Integrity, Dignity and

Excellence. And, you know, they strive to change and adapt quite often and I did hear the good Senator say that it was taking quite a while to resolve this issue of solitary confinement and there was some real issues that he was hearing about. And I guess at that point I may have my first question.

Through you, Madam President.

Is, can you give me some of the specifics of the incidents that you've been hearing about through these years and maybe the facilities that they were in, if you happen to know? Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. First I will start off if Senator Cicarella represents that he operating on respect, he gets respect, I absolutely believe that. And I start off there because as I think he knows, I get a lot of these conversations. I can't match them to a specific facility. But all kinds of things like many of us have heard about, the way that people find themselves into confinement depending on which version you're talking about. I've heard all of the stories, right, about people who don't operate under respect and get respect. People operate under I have the power and you don't. And I have some sense of how you should comport yourself up and you haven't done that, so you find yourself in a place where I don't think any of us want to be.

I can't layout and I'll go back, if he would like and find some of the emails and share them with him but I can't lay them all out. The point is that the guidelines maybe clear to the people who have ability and the power in this situation, but for those who don't operate on respect, gets respect,

because they are not clear for everybody meaning the people who can moved, the people who are housed in our system, they are not always used in a way I believe Senator Cicarella represents himself. So, and what this Bill was seeking to do in the Amendment that even I think makes the Bill better, what it is seeking to do is make sure we have guidelines which is why we're not abolishing solitary although some people might light to do that, we are regulating it.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you. And briefly on that response, I wholeheartedly agree that there are bad actors in every profession, bad attorneys, bad doctors, bad dentists, I had a case recently, teachers. There are bad actors in every profession unfortunately. And there's checks and balances for that and there are processes and again maybe certain professions there need to be more but it's almost like a volume of a radio, if we can't hear it we don't go from one to 100, we go a little bit. And I feel with respect that this Bill does just that radio analogy from one to 100 and I'll get into that shortly.

But speaking to the possible bad actors and I've been, you know, I've seen responses to questions that I just wouldn't respond to somebody that way coming from, you know, officers, nurses, not allowing somebody something and I don't know their relationship or prior incidents that may have triggered that response, but maybe I wouldn't have responded that way and, you know, there may be that. I think there is processes when somebody, an inmate does feel as if their rights were violated or they have a complaint, legitimate or not, there is an

outlet for that and I will get into that process shortly and I don't know that through the Department of Corrections.

But back to the bad actors if you will, that maybe in the Department of Corrections. If there was a hypothetical bad actor that said I don't like inmate number one and I'm going to mess with him, it's just simply not a possibility to put somebody in segregation without incident and I will, with stories and maybe some questions, really try to articulate what the process is for somebody to go to seg all of the examples that may fall under what segregation or isolated confinement may be considered in this Bill, there's a lot of different reasons where someone could be in insolated confinement and it is not fun.

Jail is not supposed to be a fun place. I worked there and I didn't like going there. So, it's definitely not a fun, even to be in your regular cell, your regular cell is the same size in the facilities that I worked at as a cell that you would get put into a restricted unit or segregation, and again there is different other rooms that you may be put in that would be approximately the same size and have certain restrictions that this Bill would take away. And this Bill would, would take away tools to help more than the corrections officers, the inmates, the general public. We're going and I hope people who are really listening to me, I know we're living in some odd times and we can't have everybody so close in this room, but I do hope that I can encourage everybody to really pay attention to things that I am about to say because these things can happen and they may.

You can't just throw someone in seg because you don't like them. There needs to be an incident. And I guess maybe I'll touch on some of the incidents that may arise to get somebody put in, now this is just segregate, this is just seg, this is a situation where, I'll give you an example. Give you

an example of mine. I was in a block. A block is where there's cells and there could be two, four, three tiers and then each tier has a bunch of different cells. And they are somewhat confined. So this day I was in one with, it was four, four tiers, and each tier had a dayroom they called it, that's where the inmates that were in that tier of the block, can go in and eat their breakfast, they get some recreation time after breakfast, they go back to their cell and they maybe shower, who can make some phone calls, but it's a controlled environment.

And I'll get to the reason why it's not a possibility what can happen in the blink of an eye. Come out for lunch, maybe a different group will shower and make some phone calls and they go back in. But they are isolated to that group of people and in that one area but they get to come out of the cell. People may have to leave the block and it could be for many reasons, some have jobs, other opportunity to be out of your cell for a very long period of time. Some chose not to have a job, some don't want to go to work, it's not mandatory. So medical could be another reason. You may have a professional visit, that's when an attorney could come speak to you and you go down there and you talk to your attorney and I could probably sit here and list a bunch more, but that's not relevant.

But at one point in time, mind you, I'm the only person in that block, and I'm in the middle and I control the cells, open 'em up and I also control the door to allow other correctional officers in whether it is to relieve me, whether there in an incident, the next shift is coming, I need a break, etc. So as maybe somebody was coming back from a visit, maybe somebody was coming back from work these two inmates that were in different tiers, they just start going at it, right outside in the common area where I could not shut them down to the point where one blocked the door, so now at this point, you have four tiers and 24 cells and you could have two inmates in each cell, so there could be quite a

few people in one of those tiers and all they need to do is block that door. I believe it was, I still remember the names, I won't say them, it was a very, very interesting thing, disturbing thing to see as a young man and a new corrections officer. They start to fight but they just didn't start fighting with their hands. The one person who was about to leave and the person who was coming in, I believe the person who was about to leave, was the one who had a sharpened, it was a clipper, fingernail clipper, and a little guy, and he went after a big guy. But he started stabbing him numerous times. And now me, I kinda run toward the action or want to help, have a directive from the Department of Corrections saying that you need to have to let people in to respond. So I call a code, they come running. By the time they were able to get there, the smaller individual was able to stab the larger one multiple times. We get them, at that point, mace was utilized there and I'll get to that in a minute.

I'll talk on the mace briefly because I think it's a great time to tell that story. An inmate cannot, so there's two people fighting right in front of me. Now me, I have to try to get everybody back in their cells that were out at that time, just my voice. And we had a lot of de-escalation in verbal training to control an area. I actually in the first six months of my job got an award working in a dorm utilizing the verbal skills that we learned in our training in our academy for controlling a dorm, I remember that.

Actually I even have it in my office from the Department of Corrections. But using those verbal skills when they are watching a fight, maybe their friend is getting stabbed or a fellow member of unfortunately a gang, or whatever case it may be, they're not going to take my verbal commands. They are not going to listen to me. There's too many of them for me to give any type of a repercussion for not following a direct order to get into a cell in an emergency situation. Some of those disciplinary

tools are only things we have to say if you don't get in there because we need to make sure it's safe, there was no time to see who was out and who was in their cell. We closed down as much as we could and a CO cannot engage unless there is a two to one ratio and again, it's everchanging I've been out for seven years, they are always changing their directive to, in my assumptions to make it that much better. I guess I'll stand at ease.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So in my process of trying to explain some of these situations, and actually try to get these points across, in an expedient way I tried to do it in one story, but I do think it doesn't do justice to the Amendment that we're speaking at hand. And I think I'm just going to pick up where I left off if I get another opportunity to speak shortly. So, Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cicarella. So we are on the Amendment. Will you comment further on the Amendment? There has been a request for a roll call vote on the Amendment, so would anyone like to remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? If not, I will open the voting machine, Mr. Clerk would you please call a roll call vote on the Amendment.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill Number 1059, Senate

Amendment "A" LCO 10009. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Senate Bill Number 1059, Senate Amendment "A" LCO 10009.

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.

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 1059, Senate Amendment "A" LCO 1009:

Total number voting	34
Total voting Yea	29
Total voting Nay	5
Absent not voting	2

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] The Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Senator Anwar. Good Afternoon.

SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):

Good Afternoon, Madam President. I rise in support of the Amended Bill, Madam President. I just want to share a few thoughts with my colleagues.

Madam President one of the most determinant individuals you may have heard of or read about in our lifetimes is Nelson Mandela. And I want to share one word he has talked about his experience. He went through significant challenges as is well recognized but he said about the solitary confinement, he said, "I found solitary confinement the most forbidding aspect of prison life. There is

no end and there is no beginning, there is only one mind which can begin to play tricks, was it a dream or did it really happen. One begins to questions everything."

Madam President, I feel if's it's worthy to look at it from another perspective as well, this challenge, I wanted to thank Senator Winfield for his leadership in this issue. He has been a leader not only in our state but nationwide recognizing the moral responsibilities that we have on these issues. And I say this because how we treat our prisoners defines us. It does not define the prisoners.

And what we have done is we can do better than what we have and today we will have an opportunity to be better than what we have been and this Bill starts, this Amended Bill starts to move in the right direction and I feel that individuals who are paying their dues to society, we have to leave them in a place in a position that they can come back to the society once they have paid their dues. And by way of their treatment we make them unable to become part of the society and that is a disservice to our society but also wrong as humans. So, Madam President with that I just wanted to make these comments and ask my colleagues to support this Amended Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Anwar. Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And just picking up after listening to the last good Senator make his comment about solitary confinement and how bad jail is in whole, as well as certain types of segregation. I was just actually speaking of the tools that were used when incidents happen. And I was explaining my time in the Department of

Corrections and experience that I had and everybody heard it so I'm not going to highlight it any further. But the two inmates were fighting and it wasn't a backyard fight. Someone could have died.

And as I was saying, we were waiting for other inmates to respond to that situation and the inmates while they're fighting were able to lock down a few of the other inmates and it was those two, and only those two but they were fighting and fighting for death. Only two inmates came originally to the rovers that are in the hallway that are there to respond along with other personnel depending on the code that's called. And they were still going at it and per the directives at that time, it was two corrections officers to one inmate.

So it took quite a while, in my opinion it felt like forever to get other help there so we could respond and I could not get out to help my fellow officers or help the person that was getting stabbed for that matter. The Brass came and most facilities only Brass or senior personnel can carry mace, not every corrections officer carries mace and it's not like what you see on TV and will talk a little bit about seg and the comment about Nelson Mandela just shortly. But that's not what happened. So not everybody has that power to put someone in seg nor do they carry mace. But thankfully the Brass came and they had the mace and that was just one of many things, verbal command, physical force, multiple officers still coming in, the fight continued to happen. Finally we were able to break them apart and because I was the one that saw someone relieved me and we escorted them down to the segregated, seg unit.

But just to talk about that response team that came to that kind of a code when I called it. COs come running. There's officers that are in the hallway and there is not a lot of those officers to go around for budget reasons clearly and they're the ones that would be like, police officers or

firefighters that would come running to help in a situation, whatever it may be. It could be a fire, it could be a fight, it could be a medical call, they're there to come running. But when there are certain calls there are certain procedures that happen and this Bill actually talks about some of the stuff we do.

So if there was that call for that type of a situation, it does alert Brass, it alerts the rovers that are running around the hallways and any other personnel that's available than cannot abandon their post, so if someone is on lunch, gone to the bathroom they stop what they're doing and they go running and they assign a team, someone that goes and gets a camera, someone that gets certain other restraints or anything else that may need to be used depending on the call.

It could be a fire, they get a extinguisher, a med kit, etc. They come running. They have the camera in hand, Brass comes, we're able to get that fight to a point where we separate them, we bring them down to a segregation unit and we have to shower them off because they are covered in blood and mace as we are or a chemical agent and a doctor sees them. They try to talk about what happened. They document my experience, they talk to them, every single person that even stepped on that block will fill out a form of what they say, what they heard, what they did from restraints, every single thing and this is going back seven years is documented. And this talks about that so it's kind of redundant cause it happened.

So they go in to confinement and there it's just like, and this is in Hartford, right down the street, it's just like a normal cell except you don't have the ability to plug in your TV and you can't get your commissary, you can't get your food delivered to you, but you do eat, you get food but it's not your choice of food. But it's not, I'm sure with Nelson Mandela had to endure in a

different country. It's not what you see on TV, it's not a box in the middle of the sun and you're just thrown in there and you can't have sunlight, food or water for two weeks. Simply not that. It's our sole duty as corrections officers to provide a safe environment for the inmate. And all of the rules and regulations are put in place for just that. We also want to protect the staff and the general public for things that could happen if we lose control of a facility and I'll get to that shortly. But it's not what you see on TV. You get to come out, now these are two people who literally just tried to kill each other to the point of multiple stab wounds into another person with a sharpened nail clipper.

So if those two, sharpened nail clipper someone was asking, yep it was a nail clipper that was sharpened and those things are purchased in segregation, I mean in commissary. You can get a lot of different things in jail from TVs to snacks, lot of different things to keep you occupied. And some of those could be used as a weapon, you'll be surprised at the things we've seen in my short time there that are used as weapons.

Anyway getting back to seg, no one has the authority just to put someone in seg for giving somebody a dirty look. Really the only thing you can do is give a verbal command to get back to your bunk or go into your cells and unless they make an incident out of it, all you can do is give them, it's called a ticket and after a certain amount of tickets you go in front of a disciplinary board and that person will decide if the CO, like I said this process is for everything, bad teachers, bad doctors, there's boards and there's steps in place now, can they be made a little bit better, yes, sure. It can always get better, always. But it's that board that will decide and they talk to the inmates, they don't just take the correction officer, the captain, or whoever brought this incident to this board's attention or after they got five tickets, they don't just throw

them in there. They actually have a mini-hearing. They talk about each of the tickets, what happened, you have a problem with this officer, why did you fight with that guy, why did you take this person's Dorito's, right. That's the kind of stuff we hear in there, sure there's other people around the Circle that heard really silly reasons for fighting.

I'm actually get into a story that put me out of my job of only seven years of service. It didn't even happen at my seventh year, it happened before that. But I was a silly incident. But I'll get to that shortly.

After this process and have this hearing they have, the inmate has the ability to make a plea deal essentially and say, okay I admit that I did what I accused of but, you know, let me get three days in seg instead of the full week, okay, so it's a tool, the only tool that the offices have and the staff has to control these situations. And, you know, I was speaking to somebody just a few moments ago prior to speaking and we were talking about working there and you know, some people land themselves in jail for DUIs, you know, anyone of us could end up in jail unfortunately and not mean to go there and we are good hearted people and unfortunately sometimes good people do go to jail and it is a very bad place. But more often than not, the person that is in that facility did something pretty bad and there is a lot of different ways to find yourself in jail.

And just because they go to jail doesn't mean they stop misbehaving and if we take away the tools that our officers have to keep control of dorms or blocks or stop fighting there will be more fights. You know, if I as a kid took a cookie out of the cookie jar and lied to my mom, and she knew I lied, cause I have cookie crumbs on my mouth, she didn't tell me I was, you know, lying about taking that cookie and didn't send me to my room or give me any discipline I'd probably keep eating the cookie, so if we do not

give our officers an ability to hold people accountable for actions, that take place in that facility we are handcuffing our officers and that as we know is not a good thing. It's not going to make it a safe place.

So the proponent of the Bill I have a few questions.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Please ask your questions, Senator.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you and I do apologize in advance for the long story but I think it is a way for me to have these points without having to ask so many questions to get my good understanding of exactly what is the intentions of some of the language in this Bill.

Through you, Madam President.

The language regarding the six-and-a-half hours out of the cell, does that apply to every inmate, if it does not, if you could tell me who it may not apply to?

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you Madam President. So under the original version of the Bill the eight hours became six hours applied to everyone under the Amended version of the Bill those in the restricted housing unit, it doesn't apply to when the portion, as you may know, different portions of the Bill go into

effect at different points. The portion that we're dealing with is July 1, 2022, portion but those in restrictive housing would not go into effect until July 1, 2023, as I stated before, these dates are in effective to give the Department the opportunity to come back when we're talking about those in the larger population or those in restrictive housing with its own recommendations as they have not done in the past.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Cicarella you have the floor.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you. I think I understood a part of that but maybe just a question.

Through you.

May clarify that just a little bit. Hypothetically if we were to take the dates out of the Bill and it would be implemented tomorrow, hypothetically, what inmate population would it apply to? Better yet.

Through you.

What would it not, what population would it not apply to? I think that would be an easier way.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. With all due respect to the question I have a hard time answering that because the dates matter, the dates change who it applies to. And so at the end of 2023 should the

Department do absolutely nothing here, then everybody would get the six-and-a-half hours out of the cell but that is not how the Bill actually works, right. So the Bill works in stages giving the Department the opportunity to be a part of this and I think that is important to remember because if you take any part of this Bill out of it, it functions differently buy what we have before us functions in a certain way for a reason to take into account the things that the Department has said to us in about the fact that they suggest currently they could not do what was imagined here.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. To you, Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you. Thank you for that response. Maybe I'll try to ask it in a different way that would allow you to explain it because what you did was respond makes sense. The first proposed date of implementing any changes to what is current, what population, inmate population would that apply to?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Sorry, Madam President. I did not mean to speak.

THE CHAIR:

No problem.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President.

That would be the population in a facility that was not inclusive of the restricted housing unit and that was a change that came in the Amendment that we adopted earlier.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. You have the floor, Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So, it's my understanding with my time at the Department of Correction that every unit is different and it's done by design. There are units that are made for women instead of men, some are made for the mentally ill or the ill, some are just made for less violent offenders which they have a lot of freedom and they have a lot of time out of their cell where in certain facilities when their crimes are that violent, they have more time away from other people mostly other inmates that protect them as well as the other inmates in those facilities.

But there is even another variation, so here in Connecticut we have jails and we have prisons. And in jails, most of the time they have either shorter sentences and/or are waiting to go to trial or to get a disposition of whatever the pending case may be. So, there are all types of people that are incarcerated and if we apply this in a blanket way which eventually that will happen, there are going to be a lot of unintended consequences for people that may have not, populations of people that may have not been, they have not been meant to be in this Bill or in this situation. So I think the easiest way to do it is maybe ask a couple of questions and that is what I was trying to keep it short.

If someone was on suicide watch, that's a post that we had where somebody came in that either has a mental illness, said they were going to kill themselves or showed signs of that. They see a doctor on the intake process and if they're a threat to themselves they would go into this suicide watch. Another person, type of person that may go into that same block is somebody that is detoxing from alcohol, a very bad detox, somebody could die.

In there we have different rules, different rules when the officers go down, how often, certain situations there are officers that sit right by the door, another whole officer, overtime position that will sit right by the door and watch the person in real time. Within those cells, they are not able to have anything, not even clothing because they could kill themselves. We've seen that. We've seen that. Not in that unit because the officers are assigned to do that and do their job but there is a code when you do your tours if you see somebody, God forbid, hanging, okay there is a code, they come running and there is a response for that situation. And I kind of emphasize that situation because all of the situations that we're talking about or I just spoke of are different and if we try to apply this Bill the way it is written to all the populations, all the facilities I just think it doesn't do what the good proponent of the Bill is trying to do.

So I guess the first question would be.

Through you, Madam President.

Is if that individual was on suicide watch would they have to come out of the facility, I mean come out of that unit at any time throughout the day?

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I will the Senator's attention again to the Lines 336-334 which talk about a substantiated right of eminent physical harm to another person and to physical harm to, I'm sorry, or the incarcerated persons request and the serious incident and then you go further with the physician who has a 24 hours to evaluate the person, so this Bill is trying to look at the situations that would exist and determine whether or not it is situation, I understand the notion that this is one-size-fits-all but determine if the situation itself and whether or not the situation itself should be one of the exceptions under the Bill.

I will also remind the good Senator that there are ways to continue one's time in segregation or solitary are dependent as he knows there are many different ways we talk about this. So I, while I take the point, I don't think that this Bill is simply one-size-fits-all and I think it is a Bill that looks to manage the different situations we would have inside of our prisons.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. To you Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And thank you for that response. And I do also agree that there are many reasons somebody could be in seg again it may be for the original story I said about somebody stabbing somebody. So in this Bill, how long and I apologize, I'm not on the Committee as you know, I got this quite late and there has been a few amendments so I ask these questions with good intentions.

Through you, Madam President.

How long would that individual be able to stay in seg for stabling somebody?

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President and whatever the intention behind the question is, I will answer it though I do believe there is good intention behind the questions.

So I think that what the Bill has in place is that I just want to make sure I'm giving you the right Section, there is a 72 period, 72 hour period for being held in one of these situations. There is the ability to extend that period as well.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. You have the floor, Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So when I look at it and admitting that it was a quick look at certain Sections as it was long and again there was Amendments, so the person that stabbed another individual from my understanding and I think it was 72 hours and then they would be reevaluated. Is that a fair assumption?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

I would consider that fair.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. You have the floor Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Through you, Madam President.

What would be the proper evaluation process to determine whether or not that person should stay in there with this specific incident of causing such bodily harm to another individual?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

First let me remind the Senator back to Lines 335-344 that if there is the, and in this case that I think was laid out there, is actually harm done, so the eminent physical harm to another person exists and that is an exception under the Bill so, I don't think that we can really even need to get into what he is trying to imagine but I understand why.

But as that is an exemption but just to imagine that he might ask a question that seems to be there, after that initial 72 hours an extension of 48 hours could be done by the Deputy Warden, Warden, Commissioner people of those ranks.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. You have the floor Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you.

And through you, Madam President.

Is there a max that that individual for that certain act in this Bill would be forced to be released from segregation or the unit that they would be restricted to?

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

To you Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

So, Madam President the language of the Bill talks about the imminent threat of physical harm, right, so that is a determination that has to be made. If the determination is that there is still imminent of physical harm then under that exemption in the Bill there is an exemption, in the Bill, so I think that's an answer but I'd be happy to give further clarification if it is not.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Senator Cicarella

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

I think one more question I may have regarding that topic could clarify it. So if an individual was

placed in segregation for threatening to punch somebody in the face or punch a CO in the face and we still feel, you know, the Brass or the person controlling the unit feels that he still may do that, and if they're feeling that the individual may be a threat to a staff member, they would be allowed to keep them in their for as long as they felt necessary.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

All right.

Through you, Madam President.

I would answer that question this way, the exemption in the Bill is for a reason and I'm sure that the good Senator doesn't mean it this way but I want to be clear that this is not just about the feeling of whoever is making the determination which is why the dates in the Bill become extremely important.

What is imagined is going to happen now that we would have this in the statute and the Department would have to function under it as it would be the law. The conversation is that should have happened seven, eight, nine years ago will happen about clarifying that very thing. At what point do we no longer determine if someone is an imminent threat and how is that determined, so that when we come back and I'm hoping this is the case given who the Commissioner is and the relationship we have, I believe that it would happen so that when we come back we can make those clarifications in the law because if we don't then we would be, it would have to be the kind of thing where it is clearly, the notion is clear that what is happening inside the

facility is operating in such a way as to undermine the meaning of the law, and that is a harder question to answer.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. You have the floor Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And thank you for answering that question, I think I get that process. So the reason for the date is to allow us or the DOC to weight in over the next period of time to say, this is how this should be handled?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, there is no thing that we walk out of here today understanding, I mean, what I mean is for the Department to engage seriously in conversation in the next few months to figure out how to maintain the spirit of this and make it work for the department at the same time.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Senator Cicarella, you have the floor.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you. And thank you for that response. This is good to hear. I am going to touch on seg just briefly a little bit more and some of the language about some of the things somebody that would be in a unit like that would be access to food, a bathroom. One of the things, a couple of them that may be hard in a situation like that, certain amount of time out of their cells, in that unit 40 individuals that we talked of just before, you know, certain things may stop something like a window, or the right to have some light just because of logistics where this unit may be located. Would there be exemptions for somebody in a facility that just can't accommodate some of these needs, like access to light, natural light I believe it was? I'll find the section shortly.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And through you.

I am sure that was crystal clear but I didn't quite understand what I'm being asked, so I would ask that it be reframed and apologize for missing something that was probably pretty easy to understand.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella if you could reframe the question, sir.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Absolutely, thank you. That was probably on me trying to ask three questions in one for the point of expedience and I do apologize. One of the parts that I noticed was that somebody had the right to have natural light, I'm looking for the Section. If the unit that they are being held in simply does not have that, would there be an exemption?

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I'm trying to get the Section as well so that I can make sure I'm actually answering the question. I'm not sure where the Senator is in the Bill though.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella you have the floor.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, just one second.

THE CHAIR:

You have the floor.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I do believe you were just given the numbers, line numbers?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Let me quickly look at this Section he's talking about. Okay, so the question was if the person couldn't have natural light, was that the question?

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Cicarella

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

I apologize, can you repeat that?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield can you reframe your question?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

My question was asked what exactly the question was, I don't if that's a great reframing, hope the question was so that I could actually answer the question so now that I'm actually oriented in the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. You have the floor, Senator Cicarella

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'll clarify my question. So in Line 358 and 359, it talks about ensuring that the person that is isolated can have a few amenities toilet water, food, light, air. So when I see light and air, I'm maybe misinterpreting the language of this Bill, maybe looking for clarification does that mean electricity light or is that light from a window?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President.

I read that to mean light, whether it be electricity light or not, I think specifically since we are in the age we are in, we would be talking about light. The good Senator talked earlier about the way in which people sometimes imagine what happens in these facilities, you know, I think the concern here is that people might be in a space where there wasn't light and I don't think either of us would think that would be a good thing to have no light. So I don't think that you have to have a window through which light would come, in fact there has to be access to light itself.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. You have the floor, Senator Cicarella

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President and where I was trying to get at is some of these facilities are old and where certain people may be housed whether it be seg or just general pop, there may not be access to light, windows, certain windows don't open, so when I see light and air, I just assumed, you know, natural light or fresh air cause obviously everybody has a right to air and that is not me being facetious so I just want to clarify because that could be a problem for some of the segregation, seg units, cause they don't have natural light in certain areas of the

prison as well as in general pop. So thank you for that clarification regarding the seg.

Regarding the seg, I do apologize I come back and go right into my next topic. If an individual is in seg and they have to use a shower, or come out of their unit at all, they have to have a 2:1 ration, two COs to one inmate, and my concern is if there is not enough hours in the day and there is multiple cells inside of a seg unit, again getting back to the conformity of certain prisons, there may not be an ability to let certain people housed in seg units to come out safely.

So I guess back to the question of the light trying to get clarification if the facility would restrict natural light, would the simple layout of a seg unit not being able to safely provide the opportunity for the inmate in seg to come out for that length of time if there is nowhere for them to go as you will need not only a lot more officers because it's as 2:1 ratio they cannot mingle with other people in seg because it could be a safety issue, would that be taken into consideration when applying the standards to the seg unit specifically?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

To you, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I thank the Senator for the question. As a matter of fact it has already been taken into consideration through the conversation with the Commissioner about the original eight hours and the number of officers that he believes he would need and I don't mean that to be anything other than that's his belief that he believes he would need, we move back to six-and-one-half hours reducing the number of officers. I would

also say it's taken into account in the fact that those in certain types of houses come later than those in other types of housing giving the Department the time to figure out where it is now and how do we get to the place we hope to be under the Bill. I had that conversation with the Judiciary Committee specifically when it comes to restrictive housing unlike the other set of people we're talking about, when it comes to restrictive housing, we have two years versus one year to have that conversation.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. You have the floor, Senator Cicarella

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So that kind of brings me to my next situation that this is just one population within a facility. I spoke briefly of the suicide watch unit, there's medical units, there's a lot of different units within multiple different facilities.

So when we see that we're allotting certain amount of time to kind of make certain changes to accommodate this Bill, I just see a really big concern of the Financial Note associated with trying to implement this. We'll put seg to the side and just talk about general pop in an average, I'll use my, my time in Hartford CC on a block, it might be a challenge just to get, and these are people that have no restrictions, they have you know, the freedoms to do what they are allotted to do in the facility. Some want to be in cells and not be in dorms so it's not a punishment to be there, sometimes you don't get your choice.

It's not a hotel but some want to be in those rather than in a dorm setting. And even six-and-one-half hours, and I'm trying to do math in my head quickly, but with someone coming out for breakfast, somebody coming out to use the shower which is timed because there is only one shower in one tier, using a phone call, they get "x" amount of time, then they get a rec, then they get lunch, they get another afternoon rec, and then they get their dinner and then they are in their cells.

I don't think six-and-a-half hours would even cover for a general pop situation. And if we were going to allow the time to figure out how do we solve that problem, it's going to be building different facilities, it's going to be hiring a lot more corrections officers and other staff that come at a huge price tag. This has a \$20 million dollar price tag and I think that it would substantially more, and we would see that as time went on, to do this safely again, not only for the officers and the staff within these facilities but the other inmates. That is a big concern of mine.

And I to think that we need to take the financial impact of this into consideration. That was more of a statement to say that I do think this is going to be huge, huge challenge to accommodate such a wide or I could say such a Bill that affects such a wide type of population. If it could put it into an analogy, you know, a doctor doesn't treat every patient the same for different types of cancer, there is not a one-size-fits-all approach. Maybe that was a bad example but I do think this has to be, before we move this forward and that's why I'm taking the time to talk here and hope people are hearing me that I think we really need to take the time to analyze the unattended consequences for the good that the good Senator is trying to accomplish before we implement such a broad stroke or broad approach to such a very serious, serious situation for public safety.

Some of the other concerns that I did have, and I spoke briefly on it, was the of pepper spray.

Through you, Madam President.

In this Bill, would the Department of Corrections staff be able to use pepper spray in any situation? Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

To you Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President.

It's an interesting question. As the good Senator knows I've worked on several Bills including the JJPLC Bill which deals with pepper spray, I'm trying to remember honestly, if the good Senator has a question about a particular line I'd be happy to answer but we have a lot of Bills in the last couple of days. I can't remember exactly what we did with pepper spray in this Bill or not.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. You have the floor, Senator Cicarella

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It may take me just a minute to look through. I'm pretty sure I saw that maybe, if could just stand at a brief recess cause I do think it's an important question.

THE CHAIR:

The Chamber will stand. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I think the good Senator meant stand at ease, no recess.

THE CHAIR:

The Chamber will stand-at-ease.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you. I'm just going to turn it over to Senator Winfield, I think he has a response for the question I asked previously.

THE CHAIR:

All right, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President.

Through you, Madam President.

In the Section we're defining what we're doing, there is the term serious incident and under serious incident you have letters "A" through "R" laying out what a serious incident is and this is why I hadn't recognized what was being asked because we're not talking about the limitation usage of a chemical agent although to be honest we had that conversation in other places. We're talking about the use of a chemical agent in ways that are not approved for the building as a serious incident and that is where the

chemical agent comes into the Bill it is not restricting that usage.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you and through you, Madam President.

I just wanted to clarify that because I know I did see that somewhere chemical agent being used and we were talking about tools that corrections officers and staff have to control the serious situations that may occur as the story I said where the two individuals were attempting each other, I do think that was a lifesaving implementation of that tool to stop that incident so I just wanted to clear, clear that up and I do appreciate your response and thank you very much for explaining it just to document when it is in use. I appreciate that.

You know, getting back to the tool that the officers have, I have couple of questions regarding, I could get the Section and I'm working off my summary notes, so if it doesn't, if it doesn't sound correct, I could find it in the actual Bill itself. But it talks about visitation. A quick question, if an individual is being disciplined from anything as minimal as stealing somebody's toothpaste to a very serious situation as we spoke of prior and they are in a form of punishment for the actions that took place within the facility would this Bill stop us, stop the Department of Corrections from taking away visitations for the individuals that are in seg?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President.

While I'm trying to get to the Section on visitation, I will say that with the Amendment adjoining the Bill, we think about some of the issues with social contact visits that are imagined in the Bill for those who, and this came through a conversation with the Commissioner of Corrections, those who have a history of contraband and prohibiting those social contact visits but also setting up a process by which, at least in Statue, those visits could be brought back to brought back into effect.

If we go to Line 626 through 635, it you actually focus on Line 633 through 635, the fact that the Line and I will read which I don't normally do, the fact that the Line says, "The Department may not deprive an incarcerated person of contact social visits provided for this subsection for a period in excessive 90 days" means that there are ways in which that can actually be limited.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you for your response. So in brief they just cannot take away visitation rights for more than 90 days, that would be a summary of that Section?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President.

That would be accurate under Subsection 2, Line 633 through 635.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Through you.

Just a quick question that would give an example that I've seen where individuals unfortunately continue to misbehave whatever incidents it may be and they find themselves in and out of the segregation unit. If that 90 day mark falls when they go back into seg, is that something would have to I guess we could say, be a pass to have that visitation while in seg?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I have done it again. I missed the question, I apologize but if the question could be reframed, I'd be happy to make an attempt to answer it.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So sometimes individuals that find themselves in seg seem to be repeat offenders, just constant visitors to the seg unit for whatever reason and if an individual loses their right to have visitation for an incident they find themselves back in general population, lines up a visit that's coming in two weeks and, you know, on that 13th day, just the day before their visit they get themselves in an incident. The way this is written would we have to make a special, and it does happen quite often, would we have to allow the individual that is in seg to go to the visit?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, the Bill that allows for the contact visits to be limited suggests that we are protecting someone so those types of eminent threats we talked about earlier of if they are the prevention of the introduction of contraband that those visits can be limiting. It doesn't require that those visits should they already be scheduled would be maintained. Yep.

Through you, Madam President.

That would be the answer to that question.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President and thank you for that response, it does answer my question, I do believe. Hypothetically the individual that we just

referenced had a complaint because he felt that that right was violated. He got the ability to read this Bill and he say's I didn't my visit at 90 days and the language may not be clear enough for the individuals to figure out and he wants to make a complaint. What is the current process now for an individual to do that?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

As I suggested, I think it was with Senator Kissel earlier, I'm aware that there are processes in place and the individual that I suggested would probably be able to tell you exactly that the processes are, is the poser of the question. So I don't remember off the top of my head how the process works I guess is the answer. But I'm sure that the good Senator could probably lay it out.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I have an idea and I'm not saying this is 100 percent accurate but I do think that there is counselors each inmate may have for whatever reason and I don't think that they could make the complaint there and there's stuff that's done within the Department of Corrections within. But I do know and this is more of where I'm going with the first, I guess you could say part of this Bill is the process of putting together a team to hear the complaint of inmates. So I do think the

first part would be internal within the Department of Corrections and maybe that's for lack of or maybe smaller things, let's just say smaller things. And then there are other things that may require an additional set of eyes and there is something current in the Inmate Legal Assistance Program, now this is similar I think this may fall under the Special Public Defender's Office but I'm not positive and again just getting thrown on me, I'm just trying to see what we have in place now and if what we're trying to do here in this Bill is better, maybe less expensive or maybe not the right idea or implementation because we have something that it's running, but it might need a tune-up. So that's why I'm asking these questions, and I truly don't know, I'm not saying this is 100 percent accurate, it is my understanding from my past experience with both of these areas.

So before I ask the question a recap because I sometimes confuse myself when I talk for a long period of time. I don't want to do that to the good Senator. For a smaller issue there may be and there is something in place where an inmate could make a complaint, probably through their counselor or it would get to the desk of maybe a captain and then they would air it out and I'm sure there is a procedure, I'm sure it's on the website. I could find that. Is that something that you're proposing in this Bill to handle issues like that?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So I think I now understand, we're back on the issue of the Ombudsperson and maybe it's just appropriate to talk

about what the Ombudsperson does to maybe frame this part of the conversation.

So first we establish obviously the Office of the Corrections Ombudsperson. This person is supposed to be someone who has the ability to see inside the system in ways that most of us can't and evaluated it over services for incarcerated persons, review procedures that the Department has, receive complaints. So the complaint would go to the Ombudsperson in their office so that is a complaint which is sent to them whether it is large or small.

The person would be able to investigate those complaints and decided whether there is merit to the complaint. They could make recommendations to the Commissioner for resolution. That is part of the power if you will. So even though this person is independent we would hope that over time the relationship developed because there is communication there. They would review operations of facilities, provide assistance wherever they could and that would include advocating on behalf of incarcerated persons for a service or something like that. They would actually be someone who could recommend a procedure based on the information they've had.

They are required to publish a quarterly, actually it is a semi-annual report after the Amendment, a semi-annual report of their services and activities so that this is not a thing that we meant to help open up the system and give us permission, then it doesn't function in that way. This keeps us operating as we'd hoped. So that's what the Ombudsperson can do and direct answer to the question, they will be receiving complaints, the size of the complaints is not suggested in the Bill. The point, I think, is so that as we've talked about in the very beginning of this, there are people in the system doing exactly what they are supposed to do. But we've heard all kinds of things about what happened sometimes when a complaint is made. So

there is another avenue to make sure that that complaint gets heard. And it's important to make sure that the system knows what's going on inside its own system that can happen.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And thank you for the explanation. And back to my understanding of the process at hand and how I think that it works pretty well and then the process once we determine something was done wrong and that should be dealt with and I'm glad there is a process to make sure we clean up bad actors in any profession, but what would the process be to the resolution of a situation? You know, at no additional cost, staff is already there are handling these smaller issues and they are identified to be somewhat of a larger issue then they would go to that service, and that's a contract bided on by any legal team, I believe Walt Bansley or I don't want to, I know they had that contract a while back and I do know that there is quite a lot of mail coming in. And when those would come in, those would supersede, you know, I don't like this person or I don't like that corrections officer, he's mean to me, etc. and there would be no additional cost to the State of Connecticut because it's being held, dealt with inhouse and held inhouse and not going out.

When there is something, and again, it can come from many different ways, it can come from the process of the complaint of the officer continuously maybe aggravating or bothering an inmate, it could come from a use of force where an inmate was in the process of restraining and/or a fight that there was too much or excessive force it would go out to this

outside counsel which is the Inmate Legal Assistance Program and the solution most of the time would be some sort of a lawsuit. And they would advocate on behalf of the inmate to get a resolution to the problem. Would this new board or the group that is going to be put together to handle these situations represent them in civil suits?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President.

This Ombudsperson again would receive the complaints, investigate the merit of the complaint and communicate back to the complainant what their decision was but at the same time also communicate with the Commissioner their recommendations because we have complaints this isn't necessarily an attorney who is going to be a representative of everyone who complains, that would be a different Bill I think that there I think we would be talking about a cost that is not borne in this Bill.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So there is for clarification.

Through you, Madam President.

No cost associated with putting together the team to handle all of these, I would assume written, complaints? There is no cost associated with a person or a team receiving them, reading them and understanding if there is an action needed on behalf of the inmate?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President.

This is not the question I answered. I answered the question of whether or not this individual and/or the team around the individual would be representing the complainant. On the question of cost, obviously people are working, we are paying them so there is a cost. So the Ombudsperson would draw pay and those who are staffed in the office with appropriations as suggested by the Bill would dry cost as well.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you.

And through you.

Referring to the Fiscal Note associated with this, which line item would that unit, I'm going to describe it as, come out of, the Department of Corrections or the Government Accountability Office?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President.

I don't have the Fiscal Note part of the Bill in front of me but as the office is established in the Office of Government Accountability the number there should be the number. I will suggest to the good Senator that in the original Fiscal Note despite the fact that the Bill explicitly says that we are hiring a single Ombudsperson somewhere along the line the Department suggested that we would be hiring 12, that is inaccurate. And so some math would tell you that the number is significantly lower than what is suggested there and that conversation is also happened with the good Chair of Appropriations as well so we have counted for the fact that we will be having one Ombudsperson as the Bill actually says as opposed to 12.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you for answering that question. So it is my understanding that they would handle those letters of complaints from the inmates again, I know this question you stated you may not have the full knowledge of it, but from your best understanding would this take the place of the Inmate Legal Assistance Program which hears those types of complaints?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President.

As the Bill is written, it takes the place of nothing. As the Bill is written it is an additional thing that we are doing. What happens in the future with that program, I can't answer that question. But as the Bill is written should we pass this Bill and it becomes law, it does nothing to anything that currently exists except put an independent person in the place to do the things that I've already delineated.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you. So that one person which I kind of agree with the original proposed amount of people, as the law office that was handling this would receive hundreds of letters a day and then there was further action needed on each of these notes and letter that came in from the inmates. So one, I think would be a stretch. That person would have a harder job than us, Senator to go through those decided what the next steps would be so I do think that we're not realizing the amount of work that may come from this. So I do think that it may be little bit more expensive than we're thinking.

Back to that one person, what, and I know this is a work in progress from our earlier conversation, what

would be the process of the individual sending the letter to this one employee, what would the person then do with this information received from inmate?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So let me first respond to the notion that the original perception that there are 12 or whatever somebody might think persons to be Ombudspersons. The Bill which will become law specifically says there will be one and that person would have staff. Now the Ombudsperson obviously would probably be paid at a higher rate than their staff, adjusting if you say there are 12 Ombudspersons, you're saying 12 people being paid at a similar rate which is incorrect. And the staff is staff that is within available appropriations so this is nothing like that a Fiscal Note would suggest to you. I think it is important to remember that because a lot of the conversation about the monies here are just incorrect. I wish they were correct, it would make my job easier but they are incorrect.

I will also say that in terms of what does the Ombudsperson and/or the staff do at the point where they receive a letter is what I was talking to the good Senator about before. If you go to Lines 20, which is after Line 16-19, where we're talking about the reception of the complaint, the next step is for them to investigate the complaint, to render a decision on the merits of the complaint and communicating that decision to the complainant. The next Section, the next Lines 23-24 is to recommend to the Commissioner a resolution on the complaint if it was found to have merit. So that is the process they would undergo. The specifics of how they do

that, of course, are going to be developed over time but that is what they will be engaged in doing.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And just for clarification I didn't pull the number 12 I think I heard that in our conversation back and forth that's maybe what somebody assumed but I just want to clarify that I did not assume that number. But I do know that one person wouldn't be able to handle that volume as that law firm had to hire multiple attorneys and numerous staff with that, so I just want to clarify. I didn't want to put words in anybody's mouth just to clarify. But I do think it will be very, very costly.

Through you, Madam President.

You said this Department or the Ombudsperson team would be an independent person. Would that be a person that is appointed, hired with an application, private attorney how would we establish who this person would be?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President. In the Bill it says that it is a gubernatorial appointment.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cicarella.

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you for that clarification, Madam President. You know, getting back to the financial topic, the financial impact of this Bill, you know, really, really, really brings some other concerns out front on from having the change around after we see that our facilities and our current staff cannot handle the ability to allow certain groups or any groups, you know, for certain matters outside of their area. They would have to be rebuilt and/or more corrections officers, I think this talks about 28 to 42 additional corrections officers. You know, in a situation where someone would have to come out of a unit and/or bring so many people out to a rec yard, there needs to be a certain amount of inmates to corrections officers and I think that number is going to greatly exceed the proposed amount that was going to be allotted to see this through not to mention any type of structural changes to accommodate.

You know, this, I struggle with this and I'm in closing, I was a correction officer for a short amount of time and the reason why I stopped working as a corrections officer is due to an injury that I, a pretty good injury that kind of occurred while breaking up a fight and it was in a dorm situation where the individuals are free to walk around wherever they want. There's two corrections officers in that unit, one controls the door so that cannot get out, the other is the person that walks around and make sure everybody is okay. And the whole other facility and the dorms are small and they are ranked and rated on their risk levels. So the other individuals that may be in other areas of the prison and/or jails have a risk level associated with the crimes that got them in those areas. I was

in a dorm where it is a very low-risk, if you will, laid-back environment. Things do happen in the dorm because there are 120 individuals in a small area and, you know, you put a lot of people in a room, people tend to get a little frustrated with each other. But when we had to break up a fight between two individuals if all of those other inmates were able to get out of that facility while we were breaking up that fight, that could create real problems, safety concerns for everybody in the facility not only for the inmates but for the general public.

We saw that, you know, in riots 20 years ago and in the 80s and 90s. If we don't keep control of the facilities and utilize the tools we have we can't keep control of the facilities we therefor can't keep it safe for the general public. And that is a strong concern of mine and I reiterate not everybody in jail is a bad person, I don't think that everybody will find themselves in solitary confinement, most don't go to solitary confinement or segregation and seg is not what it is made to be on TV.

So if we're trying to fix a very small problem, a very small percentage of inmates actually end up in seg units we're trying to fix yet not a great, great experience but we're trying to fix a very small occurrence and affect a very large population. And I just think that this could be done in a way that we could accommodate both reducing some of the mental and psychological burdens on the individuals that do find themselves in these units, but being able to allow so many inmates out of an area at one time, could make for a lot more injured corrections officers, injured staff, teachers, nurses, etc.

So that is a big concern of mine that we're not going to be able to handle the six-and-a-half hours for all of the population and it's a financial burden and a safety burden that I know well too much about, well too much. So with that, you know, I

cannot support this Bill in this form. Thank you,
Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cicarella. Will you comment
further on the Bill? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. And I know Senator
Osten want to stand and make a statement and ask
questions but I just want to clarify something
because I think it is important. The number of
corrections officers that is in the Bill is for the
eight hours was not a suggestion on our part. That
actually came from the Department. So, that number
was for the eight hours, it should be reduced for
the six-and-a-half hours. We made no suggestion on
a number and I just want to make sure that is clear
because, and maybe the Senator didn't mean this, but
he suggested that number would have come from the
people putting the proponent of the Bill.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator. Okay thank you so much for that, Senator
Winfield. Senator Osten, Good Afternoon.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. And I am being
called back to do a little bit more work on the
budget so I'm going to try to make this a quick as
possible and I might have a couple of questions but
Senator Winfield could sit down.

So I've listened with interested to what Senator
Cicarella talked about. I think many people around
the circle know that I worked in the Department of
Correction. I was there for 21 years and I worked

at seven different facilities both minimum and maximum facilities and I also worked with both male and female inmates. I have covered the gamut of the kinds of facilities that are out there. I also worked at a private correctional facility called Wise Attention Facility up in Rhode Island which was more of a Supermax Facility relative to federal inmates and I worked there for about five years, so I think that I have a number of years of experience and have seen good and bad things that have happened within the confines of a correctional facility.

I do want to reiterate, I worked there in Connecticut where we were at our highest population numbers and watch the timeframe when I first started as correctional officer, ultimately ending up a correctional lieutenant but as a correctional officer worked day, after day, after day often 16, 18, 20 hours a day. I know that people will tell you that you can't work more than 16 hours but when circumstances arise that you are not allowed to go home, you are still at work.

When I first started working for the Department of Corrections the number of chronically mentally ill inmates were around four to six percent of the inmate population and continued at that level throughout the timeframe that I was correctional officer. We closed our state psychiatric institutions, that was a national movement, and Connecticut followed that national movement. And Connecticut unfortunately also followed the practice that happened across this country of not providing the supportive services necessary for people who have behavioral or psychiatric or mental health issues and as such currently based on the latest Sentencing Commission report the inmate population, male inmate population is considered 28 percent chronically mentally ill and female inmate population is considered 80 percent chronically mentally ill and so I would pause it that we use our correctional facilities to, as a geographical change instead of dealing with the issues of really

understanding that people who have chronic mental health issues actually need help and we've not dealt with that issue.

We continue to not deal with that issue and I have repeatedly asked the Judiciary Committee to formulate a process that would deal with that issue and I continue today to say that if we really want to deal with the number of people that are incarcerated the only way to deal with that is to deal with those people who, our correctional officers are expected to deal with day-in and day-out without the training to deal with someone that has chronic mental illness and we expect them to handle that situation much akin to what we have done with our police officers where they are supposed to deal with every kind of person and understand all their needs without really even know that their needs may happen to be.

So I think that as a societal issue, that is one thing that if we don't deal with it then we only have ourselves to blame and so anytime we deal with policy relative to corrections or police I will bring up this issue until someone starts to listen and someone starts to understand that if we don't deal with trauma, if we don't deal with chronic mental illness we have only ourselves to blame for the situations that people find themselves in. We only have ourselves to blame for what happens within the walls of a correctional facility and out on the streets relative to the respond that people have to make.

So I still remain extremely disappointed in the lack of the State of Connecticut, at large, dealing with this issue of chronic mental illness within our prison system and relative to the fact that we just don't seem to understand that this is not going to go away, that people are going to get better if they pull themselves by their bootstraps. Someone who has chronic mental illness much akin to someone has cardiac condition or diabetes, it doesn't go away

unless we treat that situation and move along. So I wanted to put that on the record that this is something that has to be dealt with.

Now, I have a couple of questions, not relative so, relative to the Bill but more relative to the policy.

So, through you, Madam President.

What is the intent of the different number of Bills as Senator Winfield said just a few seconds ago, that there have been a number of Bills. What is the intent? What is the ultimate goal on the different policies that we have done, clean slate, solitary all of the different Bills that we have done relative to this, to incarcerated persons within the State of Connecticut?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I am going to be by taking the liberty to thank Senator Osten for continuously bringing up the issue of mental health. I've tried several times in, not in the last year, but I've tried several times to deal with that issue and quite frankly would be happy to team up with the Senator, I think maybe together we might get some motion. I'm frustrated too.

But in direct answer to the question posed, I think what underlies what we have been trying to do here is the notion in that when we send our people into the prison for transgression, they don't stay there. They come back out and what we do not want to bring back out into society are people who, whatever issues they have are exacerbated by the mental

health issues what were just spoken about or the ones that come from the way that we treat them inside of the facility. What we do not want to have happen is that people get out, they're making an attempt to do what they are supposed to do and they can't avail themselves of employment, housing all of those things. What we're trying to do is say, yes, there are times when people do things that are terrible and they wind up in our prisons for however long they end up in our prisons but when that is over we want to return to society whole people as much as we can. When that is over we want to return to society people who have a chance to keep moving forward. We shouldn't even talk about a second chance, it's just a chance you should have when you come out of prison. That is what undergirds this, so from my perspective it is the way to keep people safe and I will always operate in a way to do so. Thank you.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President and thank you for that answer, Senator. I also have a question on, would you say that there are people who have committed transgressions in the general public that deserve to be incarcerated? I would say that probably 92 percent of all inmates are released into society again after they have served their time and I for one always believe that once your time is served, that should be what happens and you should be able to move along. But would you believe, Senator Winfield that there are people who have committed crimes that deserve incarceration?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

I think that prisons exist for a reason and I think that there are people who deserve to be in the prisons based on the things that they've done. As I suggested the policies I'm doing are not about whether or not people should be in prison there are about how we should treat them when they are there and when they come out.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Senator Winfield I was wondering if you had read any actuarial studies relative to the lifespan of a correctional officer and in truth be told, I have looked at the actuarial studies related to the lifespan of a correctional officer nationally and a correctional officer who starts at around say between 20 and 24 years old generally lives to around the age of 56 to 60.

Through you, Madam President.

I was wondering if you had looked at ways to deal with that particular situation?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And through you.

I over the years have looked at several of those types of studies. And I actually have a deep concern which is way I thought the point of the Bill here that was dealing with the corrections officers pointing to, we stripped it out obviously because it is in other places. But as much as I am an advocate for the work to regulate solitary confinement and to have the Ombudsperson I'm an advocate for making sure that these people don't die at 52, 53, 54 years old because of the stress and because of what they take home when they leave that environment. Because that's what's killing them. And so, yes is the answer and I hope that this Bill gets passed but also hope that we have final action on the other parts that deal with the corrections officers themselves.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Again I could talk forever about my correctional career, it was a career that I am very thankful to have been a part of. It is a part of my life experience and some days were hard. Senator Cicarella talked about some of those hard days. We've all been in those hard days. I've had officers severely hurt. I've been in some really dicey situations and I have, you know, in many ways learned how to shake some of it off but I would tell you some people look at me and say you appear to be a very hardened individual and from my perspective that's what happened. It is just the way it is. That's how you go to work every day and that's how you keep your staff and the inmate

population safe is to try not to take much of it personal.

Through you, Madam President.

I am wondering if Senator Winfield has had an opportunity to talk with the Commissioner of the Department of Corrections?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The Commissioner and I speak quite regularly. I had a conversation with the Commissioner, forgive me, days are now running together it was yesterday or the day before. I certainly had a text yesterday so we are in communication.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And would you characterize his position on this particular piece of legislation as for it, or against it or he is appreciative of you pushing off the date with an ability for him to bring in some policies that he has outlined and truth be told, I've also had conversations with the Commissioner.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I am careful about characterizing his position but if I had to I would think I would characterize it as understanding of what it is we are trying to do and recognizing that the push off of the date allows the Department to come back and participate in the conversation in a real way. I don't want to get too deep in way he thinks because that is not for me to do, but I think there is an appreciation for what we're doing, if there is not I'm sure I'll get a text very shortly.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President and I would characterize his position as cautious and I don't know if I'll get a text but I would characterize the position as cautious, neither completely in approval nor completely opposed to different sections of this Bill but some concerns.

And so that brings me to my second question, well my second question relative to this particular issue as obviously I've asked more questions than that. In last year or maybe last summer, we addressed some issues relative to police accountability and you and I had a rather boisterous conversation back and forth on the specifics of the Bill and I asked at the end of our conversation back and forth if you would having had time in and by pushing off the dates would you look at issues again, I know this time there were, in this session there were changes made to the police accountability Bill, some corrections per se or looking at and maybe revamping a little bit the tenants of the Bill and would you

be willing to do so should some of this seem to be either an overreach or the Department had an opportunity to deal with some of those issues and corrected it and we no longer needed this statutory language?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Through you, Madam President.

I guess the most direct answer to the question is yes. I would just suggest that this Bill, my pen is heavily present in this Bill, the reason the dates are what they are is to allow for conversation to figure out whether we could come to a meeting of the minds and make adjustments and what those adjustments would be. So absolutely and whether that were the case in terms of dates or not, I've always operated as, you know, I'm willing to have conversations but I don't make promises about where they are going to go, but I will have those conversations and sometimes they yield things we did not believe could happen, so yes.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And based on that, there are very specific sections to this Bill and, you know, I would say having been inside every single correctional facility in the State of Connecticut, having worked in seven of them, some of

them are now closed and having worked at a private correctional facility in Rhode Island I would think that my experience from the staff side of this issue would lead to some insights on this particular piece of legislation and I think that, you know, that I am cautious about supporting this piece of legislation. I voted for the Amendment and I do plan on voting for the Bill overall. I think that it will have an opportunity to start to address some of the issue that are happening in our prison system. In the United States of America we incarcerate more people than many other countries do and I think that is something that we should be looking at.

You know, I found correctional staff to be some of the most professionally working men and women who not only cared about the public that Senator Cicarella talked about but also worked very hard to maintain the safety with inside the walls of a correctional facility. It was not only the safety of the staff that people cared about it was the safety of the people that live inside those walls. So I don't want people to get the opinion that correctional staff are somehow purposely damaging people who are incarcerated there. I have been in very difficult situations and made sure, and I'm certain that you would find somebody here or there that did not like the way a situation they and I were involved in like the outcome of that particular situation but I can tell you that the people that work for the Department of Corrections are professionals. They want to make sure that everybody is safe, those that work there, those that live there and those of the public that live around them.

And so I think that Senator Winfield and I would bring in the Co-Chair of the Appropriations Committee into this conversation and she and I have had a number of conversations relative to young people being incarcerated are trying to make a difference in the criminal justice system and that is why I asked Senator Winfield the question

relative to what is the, where are we going. Because it is clear to me that there is path forward and I think that path forward needs to be out in the public. I encourage people to understand that without making characterizations that people that work in the Department of Corrections are somehow the quintessential person that is described in a movie because we don't live in a movie. It is not a *Shawshank Redemption* or the other movie relative to the *Green Mile* and truth be told, I try to stay away from movies relative to prisons because nobody understands it unless you actually worked there or you happen to have been incarcerated there.

I understand, I believe I understand, I may not, but I believe I understand the path forward and I would encourage people to be more open about that path forward without mischaracterizing some of the people who work there. That was my concern with the police officers in the Bill that we did relative to police accountability. It is my concern with this one that in many ways, people are being told that they are the traditional prison guard which that is not the case here.

The corrections officer is highly trained individuals and I am worried that the policy of moving the criminal justice system forward is being waylaid by our inability to explain where we are going, how we are going to get there and what's the ultimate goal is and that makes people very concerned and it worked against us as a state in police accountability and my fear that it works against us here even though the policy is the right policy, it will work against us here again because we have not taken the time to work with people, listen to their concerns and hear what they have to say on a day-to-day basis and not give them the respect for taking on a job that many people would not want to do. Many people would not want to do.

I worked 21 years in state prison, 21 years. I did not, I would not say that it was the most pleasant

environment but I can tell you this, it was a job that I found to be professional and worthwhile and gave me my life experience on where I stand today.

I really think that if we are going to move forward on these policies we have to learn how to talk to people that hold these particular jobs and bring them to the table. Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended before the Chamber?

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. First of all I'd like to thank both Senators Cicarella and Osten for their service to the Department of Corrections. I think Senator Cicarella illuminated all the hard work that he did while he was in service there and really brought into focus the very complex nature of the duties of a corrections officer day-in and day-out. And to Senator Osten, who I believe and she will correct me if I'm wrong, but I believe rose to at least the rank of lieutenant and I remember before she was a state Senator meeting with then Ms. Osten, still Ms. Osten albeit a Senator and she was advocating on behalf of corrections officers and I believe advocating for the right of men and women who had achieved the rank of lieutenant to unionize and I think at first I said, had some issues with that, I think eventually I said I would support that issue.

We have spent an awful lot of time on this Bill, it is very important. It's important to the health and safety of the individual incarcerated in our correctional system, extremely important to the health and safety of those citizens in our state who are not within the Department of Corrections that live in neighborhoods surrounding those facilities

and walk amongst the streets in freedom and want folks that end up in our corrections system to come out as good honest, law abiding tax paying citizens and productive and able to live, work and raise a family in the great State of Connecticut. So we're mindful of the inmates. We're mindful of the citizenry and we're mindful of the corrections officers as well as all other staff that work in the Department of Corrections, nurses, teachers, administrators but those folks that are acting as corrections officers either at entry levels or throughout their career moving up the ranks eventually becoming wardens and other high ranking individuals throughout the corrections system, we want all of them to be able to go home and feel that they put in a solid day's work and they feel appropriately safeguarded and rewarded financially and able to appreciate all the good things in life and that means both mind, body, and spirit and that's important.

I was indicating recently that a lot of these facilities were architecturally designed to maintain order and to, not necessarily make folks in there feel small, but let them know that it's not a free environment and that's one thing if you're an inmate might help maintain order but if you have to work there day-in and day-out, if you have sometimes very subtle yet pervasive impact on you over the course of years. There's a lot of issues being touched upon in the Bill. At this point in time, I would like to offer from my perspective one last Amendment and if the Clerk could please call, Madam President, LCO 10075. I would move adoption of the Amendment, waive a reading and ask leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO 10075, Senate Amendment "B".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. As I said I move Adoption of the Amendment and I would ask when we vote on this it is voted on by roll. It's a very simple, straightforward Amendment. It basically strikes subdivision 2 of subsection B of Section 2 of the underlying Bill essentially that part that says, "that the 6.5 hours would apply across the board to all inmates." I know in the underlying Bill there is some carveouts that are intended to address those special circumstances where that might not be the appropriate across the board policy but I think that as well intended as those carveouts are that they don't address all the circumstances that involved in the wide ranging circumstances involved with each particular inmate within the corrections system.

You know, like I said, I have five correctional facilities in my district, more correctional facilities and inmates than any other State Senator. I have had a very close relationship with the union in my district and the hardworking men and women in the district that are involved in the Department of Corrections and various commissioners although certainly not as many meetings recently as the good Chairman of the Judiciary Committee Senator Winfield or for that matter Senator Osten or any other individuals in this Circle that have been in constant close contact with the Commissioner of Corrections although we have met on several occasions in the past. But that being the case, I hate to use this phrase one-size-fits-all but I just think that this particular section of the Bill as Amended just doesn't fit. I don't feel comfortable with it and I think if we just remove this portion, it would make this Bill that much better and that's

assuming it has the support in this Circle to send it along to the House which I do believe it probably does.

But I would urge my colleagues to support this Amendment. As I said, it just takes that singular provision and eliminates it from the underlying Bill as Amended. Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR CICARELLA (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of the Amendment. I think it is a step in the right direction. After asking many questions with great answers from the good Senator I do think there will be opportunities to make this better with the input of the Department of Correction staff as well as the Commissioner. I do think that this is a step in that direction and I urge everyone to support the Amendment as well. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise in objection to the Amendment. I understand the underlying thought of the Amendment but to do what is within this Amendment would severely change the policy that we have in the Bill. We have recognized that the eight hours we originally intended may have been too far to go but I do not think six-and-a-half hours is something that we can't figure out how to do. And again I will remind the people in this Chamber that we extended the

dates so that we just don't say that's the policy we say this is going to be the policy and let's have a conversation about how this policy is implemented, how the department can actually do what we're talking about, live with it, do it in a safe way, come back next year and make any changes that are appropriate. I think this policy that is in the Bill as Amended is the policy we should be moving forward with and for that reason I rise in opposition and when the vote is cast, I ask that we cast by role.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. And we will take roll call vote on the Amendment. Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? Will you remark further, if not, a roll call vote has been requested, I will open the machine and the Clerk will call the roll.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill, I'm sorry, 1059, Senate Amendment "B", LCO 10075. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered 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 1058, Senate Amendment "B", LCO 10075. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 1059, Senate Amendment "B"

Total number voting	34
Total voting Yea	12
Total voting Nay	22
Absent not voting	2

THE CHAIR:

And the Amendment fails. Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. As I had indicated earlier during this discussion throughout the afternoon, I will be voting "No" on the underlying Bill despite the best of intentions by the proponent, the good Senator of the Judiciary Committee, Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Senator Winfield, as well as others but I just think that a balance my concerns regarding the corrections officers who work tirelessly in our corrections system as well as everybody else that works in the Department of Corrections, the inmates themselves and the public at large I think are not best served by this policy at this point in time although I really, very much appreciate the efforts made to move in what I perceive to be a generally consolatory manner to try to accommodate some of the concerns raised recently by the Department of Corrections and the timeline adjustments but nonetheless on whole I feel very comfortable voting "No" at this time. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill? It not, I will open the voting machine. Mr. Clerk please announce the roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 1059 as Amended by Senate "A", Amendment "A". Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 1059 as Amended by Senate "A":

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yea	26
Total voting Nay	10
Absent not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] And the legislation passes. Mr. Clerk. Pardon me, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Before we go back to the item that was PTd. I'd like to yield to Senator Moore for a Point of Personal Privilege.

THE CHAIR:

And a Good Evening, Senator Moore. Do you accept the yield?

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

I do accept it, thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President I rise today to acknowledge a team of students from Trumbull called "We the People" and I proudly represent these young people. They debate. In my first year as a Senator they asked me to be a judge.

I felt this small because they sounded like they were really attorneys already and they were high school students and they were so great and they are very dedicated to the work that they do. So today, I want to announce that the "We the People" team is made up of 21 seniors and AP U.S. Government Constitutional Studies Course. It is a full-year course that the high school where the students can earn, UConn credits as well.

They completed the State Championship via Zoom on February 8th and they were crowned the State Champions. This was Trumbull's 25th state championship and the ninth under the direction of their Advisor, Katie Boland. They completed at the National Finals via Zoom on Saturday and Sunday April 24th and 25th and made it to the final round, the top 12 parings and on Monday, April 26th, they finished ninth in the National. This was the eight time in school history they made it to the final round of the competition and Mrs. Boland's third time leading them in that.

The course examines the historical, philosophical foundation of our government and it's applications through history to the 21st Century. It fosters civic competence and responsibility as well as striving to keep our Republic alive as Benjamin Franklin asked us to do. I ask that we give them a virtual applause for this success and I am very proud to represent them here in the Chamber. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Moore that is a very impressive achievement and this circle joins you in applauding them for their great work. Congratulations. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Would the Clerk call the previous item as marked PT, Calendar Page 9, Calendar 266, Senate Bill 363 I would like to mark that "go".

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 9, Column 266, Senate Substitute for Senate Bill Number 363, AN ACT CONCERNING THE DUTIES OF THE OFFICE OF THE ATTORNEY GENERAL, as Amended by Senate "A".

THE CHAIR:

And here we are again, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. I'm just going to move the Bill. 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 WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Madam President. So when we were speaking at the, before the prior Bill, notification of an Amendment that somehow didn't make the, didn't,

wasn't present in mind, so the Clerk should be in possession of LCO 9494. I'd ask the Amendment be called and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Mr. Clerk. And we did have one Amendment that was adopted so let be or that had been considered. It was. We're getting there, Senator. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO 9494, Senate Amendment "B".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. This is a relatively short Amendment. Basically what it does is it assures that the Attorney General with the powers that he or she would be given under the Bill doesn't have the power to assert claim against a state agency, or the state, or state officer or state employee. I urge adoption.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you and to refresh the Chamber's recollection there was one Amendment that was brought forward that was rejected and now we are on Adoption of the Amendment before the Chamber. Will you remark on that Senator Kissel?

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Just a quick question or two, through you, to the proponent of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you, Madam President. You had indicated this would allow the Attorney General and his office or in the future could be her office, to proceed against a state agency and I believe you also said employees or officials within that state agency would this be for malfeasance or could this be for some other cause of action directed towards that individual in their individual capacity thereby putting their personal assets or home at risk?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I think I may have been misheard. What I was suggesting that nothing in the Bill, there's two sections to the Bill and there's two sections underlying in the Amendment so each section is referred to with the same language and nothing in each of the sections would allow the Attorney General to assert a claim again the state agency, the state officer or the state employee, etc., etc. not that it would allow it. It would forbid it then.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much and I'm glad that I misunderstood because the way that it is now understood my me is very reassuring and I thank the good Chairman of the Judiciary Committee for that explanation. I'm happy to support the Amendment. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield. All right. So, we now have an Amendment before the Chamber. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Madam President, I would ask for a voice vote on this Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

And a voice vote has been requested on the Amendment before the Chamber. Will you remark further 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 "Aye."

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Aye's have it, the Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill before the Chamber as Amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as Amended? If not, I will open the voting machine and if you would call the roll call vote, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 363 as Amended by Senate "B". An immediate roll call vote has been ordered 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 363 as Amended by Senate "B". An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 363 as Amended by Senate "B":

Total number voting	35
Total voting Yea	26
Total voting Nay	9
Absent not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] One absent. Thank you, Mr. Clerk and the legislation is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 24, Column No. 441, Substitute for House Bill 6355, "AN ACT CONCERNING RISK PROTECTION ORDERS OR WARRANTS AND DISQUALIFIERS FOR FIREARM PERMITS AND ELIGIBILITY CERTIFICATES as Amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" LCO 8427.

THE CHAIR:

Good Evening, again Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Good Evening again, Madam President. As I said we will see a lot of each other today. I move a I move Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Before us is a Bill that came up from the House, originally came from the Judiciary Committee, it is the Bill referred to as the URPAL Bill or the Risk Warrant Bill or by several other names actually. In 1999 the State of Connecticut passed 99 to 12 which was the nation's first Red Flag Law, subsequent to that other states have passed red flag laws and there are things that have been learned as some people consider the things we learned to be loopholes if you will in our law.

There was a strike-all offered in the House which cleared up some issues that we had discovered in the Judiciary Committee, mostly technical, but left the sense of what the Bill was in place.

The key aspects of this Bill are that it has a new risk protection order in the existing statute that an individual who may not currently be in possession of a weapon but may be authorized to get one and is an imminent danger to themselves or others, may be subject to a risk warrant. Police going into remove the firearm, if they are aware of other deadly weapons, may now remove the other deadly weapons as well and establishes a process for family members or

medical individuals who are aware of the imminent danger to make petition to the court.

And finally it removes the one year expiration date that existed in the risk warrants we currently have and the threat of imminent danger being no longer in effect is when the warrant would no longer continue to exist.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Yes indeed, good evening. I stand in opposition to this Bill, it's not the worse Bill I've ever seen in my life and I believe the proponent has driven mightily to try to accommodate various interests.

There is not a huge undercutting of individual's Second Amendment Rights but there is then perhaps the slightest amount of that in my observation although folks may disagree with that. There is a period of time where an individual without having recourse, I believe it's about 48 hours will be off of national database and will not be able to purchase a firearm at that time. I just think that there is a fundamental problem with the process that does not afford an individual due process if one is the least bit undermining one's Constitutional Rights. Others disagree with that and they point to other areas of the law where Constitutional Rights are abridged, people have raised the idea you can't yell fire in a crowded theatre even though one has the right to free speech.

I get all that but I do know that we don't have an awful lot of gun Bills this year and I do believe

that Connecticut is not, if not the preeminent state when it comes to gun laws, certainly we're maybe second behind California, so anybody in the State of Connecticut that has concerns regarding this we have ample laws throughout the Statute Books regarding gun regulations and rules, in my humble opinion.

The second thing that I have some concern with is other statutory constructs regarding things like this. One has an ability to transfer ones firearms to a individual that holds the appropriate licenses. It could be a relative, it could be a friend, with the notion that upon one's charges being cleared or one no longer has any legal cloud hanging over his or her head, or if the matter is adjudicated or in one way, shape or form the matter is resolved such that there is no impediment legally for the individual to get to his or her guns back, that transfer is not contemplated in this Bill, the only transfers are the seizure of the weapon to my reading as well as selling them to a gun dealer who or transferring them to a gun dealer and there is any guessing as to whether those will be available when the original owner has the ability to legally and the wherewithal to take them back.

And, you know, I'm not emersed in this kind of transaction but I would guess that the dealer might sell these or somehow they wouldn't be made available as it would be with another kind of transfer and there could be firearms that while working or one might perceive as a threat might have sentimental value, historical value, family history value and the like and this sort of puts a cloud over what the end result will be as to who will end up with possessory rights over them.

So, you know, given the fact that I think that we certainly have some of the very toughest gun laws in the United States, by far, by far, the fact that I think that an individual concerned about his or her safety has numerous ways to initiate an inquiry regarding his or her safety and the fact that I

believe the way this proposed Bill is drafted, has some encumbrances on an individual's Constitutional Rights as well as the ability to obtain their firearms when the clouds over their head have dissipated. On balance I just think that lawful gun owners have done more than their fair share over the past several years and I don't really see any need at this point in time for any further gun laws here in the State of Connecticut and for that reason, Madam President I will be voting, "No." Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not we will open the voting machine and if the roll call vote could be announced.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered.

THE CHAIR:

Yep. I already called. I already called it.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered the Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate, House Bill 3655. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

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

THE CLERK:

House Bill 6355.

Total number voting	35
Total voting Yea	23
Total voting Nay	12
Absent not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

[Gavel] And the legislation is adopted. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 32, Column No. 496, Substitute for House Bill No. 6505, AN ACT CONCERNING COURT OPERATIONS as Amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" LCO 9024.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Good Evening, Madam President. I move Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Thank you, Madam President. This is the court operations Bill, we have one of these every year. It is usually a large Bill and again this year it is a large Bill, it's 50 plus sections. I will talk about some of the things the Bill does.

The Bill deals with the term Juvenile Detention Center and changes that term to Juvenile Residential Center. The Bill deals with the Judicial Review Council and the members who, the members and employees who have access to juvenile records. The Bill also allows the Supreme, the Supreme, I've been

up a lot today, sorry. Allows the Superior Court judgement that is based on default or nonsuit or civil judgement to be opened or set-aside within four months after the date the decision was sent instead of when it was rendered. It requires that the court Clerk schedule a hearing instead of setting the matter down for the short calendar and this deals with matters related to personal property execution, child support being without when obligor of that claim makes a mistake of fact.

It allows the Court instead of holding a hearing in certain family relation matters to accept an affidavit made under oath stating the requirement in the matter and no civil restraining order, family violence or protective order between the parties would be in effect or pending before the court.

It allows parties to settle by arbitration issues related to child support, visitation and custody which are under our current law. It makes a member of crime victim's immediate family eligible to receive certain notification and expands compensation eligibility. It also creates a crime of abusive oath, document that as a Class D felony.

It requires the Judicial Branch to file an annual report that would go to the Judiciary Committee. Starting in 2023 on an arresting officers request for a court order to detain and arrest a child. It changes the effective date of Bill 6594 which for those who don't know every Bill by heart is the Criminal Justice Process Bill, that date change, it would be upon passage to October 1, 2021.

The Amendment that was passed by the House eliminated the provision that was in the underlying Bill that would have required a civil protection order applicants to provide a statement made under penalty of false statement rather than the affidavit as required under existing law. It's a big Bill, there's a lot of things. I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I was hoping for three in a row but looks like we really need a roll call vote this time and thank you very much, Ma'am. I move Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President, great to see you up there this evening.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

You are quite welcome. I stand in strong support of the Court Operations Bill. As Senator Winfield indicated it is an annual Bill that comes before us. It always amazes me that there are so many things that need to be revised year in and year out, but there it is. Nothing highly controversial and the Judicial Branch is very appreciative of our efforts here in the legislature moving this matter along. And I would urge all my colleagues to support this and it is up to the good Chair Senator Winfield as to whether this should go on consent but I certainly would have no objection to that. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President and good to see you up there. You look good up there. Madam President if there is no objection, I ask this be placed on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. If there are no objections, the item will be placed on Consent. Will the Clerk take the item. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

I think you may have been getting ready to do what I was about to say. Madam President despite my last call I think we need to pull this out of Marked for Consent.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will the Clerk take the item off the Consent Calendar please and announce a roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate, House Bill 6505. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Members voted? Have all Members voted? Please check the machine to make sure that your vote has been properly cast, if so, the machine will be locked.

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 6505:

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yea	35
Total voting Nay	1
Absent not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Bill passed [Gavel]. The Chamber will stand-at-ease.

The Chamber will come back to order. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 18, Calendar Number 395, Senate Bill Number 1080, "AN ACT CONCERNING VARIOUS REVISIONS TO THE TEACHERS' RETIREMENT SYSTEM.

THE CHAIR:

I recognize Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. It is a pleasure to see you there tonight. Madam President, I move Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President, this piece of, before I get to the Bill I have, the Clerk is in possession of a Amendment LCO

No. 9279. I move the Amendment and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO 9279, Senate Amendment "A".

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. This Amendment is a technical change and there is really not much to it at all. I urge the circle to accept the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor say, Aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

All those opposed. Aye's have it the Amendment is adopted. Will you remark further?

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. This Bill does not have a fiscal impact but makes various changes to the statutes governing the teachers retirement system that served to clarify the

administration of benefits and bring the statutes into conformity with federal law. The changes include updating the age and which minimum distribution requirements must be made to 72 for members who attain that age on or after January 1st, 2020, as required by federal law. Clarifying that any voluntary contributions can only be made by payroll deduction on an after-tax basis. Clarifying that the majority of the membership of the Teachers Retirement Board is a quorum for the transaction of business and specifying that a member must provide a statutory basis for any appeals and I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will anyone remark further? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I concur with the Chair's description of what is in this legislation and I would urge support, thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Nice to see you up there.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, sir.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

I received quite a few emails from constituents in my district regarding some language in another Bill that the Appropriations Committee heard, it was Senate Bill 1082 and it was very similar in the

topics as this particular Bill is as well. I happened to just look online, not serving on the Appropriations Committee was pleasantly surprised to see quite a number of Members of this Circle signing on as co-sponsors to 1082. And I would like to take a Section of 1082 and offer it this evening, Madam President to make a good Bill hopefully even that much better. And with that said, the Clerk has in his possession LCO No. 10074. I ask that it be called and I be given leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO 10074 Senate Amendment "B".

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This Amendment dictates how a position will be filled on a TRB and I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I just wanted to play with us. So, when one of the active teachers retires or the term comes up because it's on a four year term, as you know, Madam President the 14 member board currently there are four active teachers that serve on the board and two retired teachers that sever on the board. And this Amendment what they would do would take one of the

active teacher positions and move that to a retired teachers position. So it would have been somebody that already would have spent 37 years in that profession, somebody that is relying, continues to pay the health premiums but relies on the board for their retirement purposes and they felt that there was a lot of testimony regarding that particular section, from my constituents that reached out to me so that is why the Amendment is here before us and I would ask the Chamber for the adoption of the Amendment. I think it provides still, although a minor position but the retirement board is there for retirees. So I think it would be most appropriate to increase the number of retirees on the board without increasing the total number of members of the board. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Sir. Will you remark? Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President and I would urge my colleagues to reject the Amendment. This piece of legislation has been several years in the making and I would urge the people who came up on 1082 to come back next year, we did check with the Teachers Retirement Board, they are not in favor of this change right now and as such, I would ask for a roll call vote and I would urge my colleagues to vote against the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Roll call vote will be ordered. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I think the way the Amendment is crafted, if I understand it correctly,

it doesn't increase the number of members on the board but if I could.

Through you.

Just to clarify my question to the proponent of the Amendment please.

THE CHAIR:

Please frame your question, Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

To answer the good Senator's question, yes the board membership stays at 14 and it would just require that when one of the positions of an active teacher comes up for a renewal that that position is filled by a retired teacher so the board membership stays at 14.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And just to refresh my memory there are currently two retired teachers on the board and four active teachers on the board.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Through you, Madam President.

That's correct.

THE CHAIR:

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. We did hear quite a bit of testimony to the extent that we heard testimony on the Bill in general. We heard testimony about insurance choices, we heard testimony about the relationship of the interest rate percentages as they serve to try and make a reflection of what will be in that fund for teachers and how much the state needs to continue to contribute. I think the Amendment is well intended, it certainly is on point with what we heard. I think the methodology behind it actually letting teachers position that would come up instead of having them get off when they are not ready to get off, instead would be at a renewal time to replace that person with one that has been retired I think is a good approach.

I do know that we had suggested that people come back next year. I don't know how urgent the message was in terms of people did communicate with Senator Witkos but I do know they were very persuasive that night so I would urge support of the Amendment. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?
If not, Mr. Clerk please announce a roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 1080, Senate Amendment "B" LCO 10074. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered 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.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Members voted. Have all the Members have voted. Remember please check the machine to make sure your vote has been properly recorded. The machine will be locked. Mr. Clerk, will you please take the tally.

THE CLERK:

On Senate Bill 1080, Senate Amendment "B":

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yea	14
Total voting Nay	22
Absent not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Amendment fails. [Gavel] Will you remark further? Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I would urge my colleagues to support the underlying Bill as Amended and I would ask for a roll call vote please.

THE CHAIR:

Roll call vote has been ordered. Will you remark further? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I also rise in support of the Bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?
The machine will be open. Mr. Clerk, please
announce the vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the
Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in
the Senate on Senate Bill 1080 as Amended by Senate
"A". An immediate roll call vote has been ordered
in the Senate.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the
Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in
the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all Members have voted? Have all Members have
voted? Please check the machine to make sure your
vote has been properly recorded. The machine will
be locked. Mr. Clerk, will you please call the
tally.

THE CLERK:

On Senate Bill 1080 as Amended by Senate "A":

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yea	26
Total voting Nay	0
Absent not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Bill passes. [Gavel]. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 18, Calendar No. 396, Senate Bill No. 1081 "AN
ACT CONCERNING THE INTEREST RATE RELATING TO
TEACHERS' RETIREMENT SYSTEM COST-OF LIVING

ALLOWANCES AND RESERVING CERTAIN LOTTERY FUND
REVENUE FOR THE CONNECTICUT TEACHERS' RETIREMENT
FUND BONDS SPECIAL CAPITAL RESERVE FUND.

THE CHAIR:

I recognize Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President, I move Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President, this is another essentially a technical change. This Bill makes conforming and technical changes. It has no anticipated fiscal impact.

Section 1 Amends the Statute governing the teacher's retirement system, cost of living allowances by changing the investment return threshold from 8.5 to 6.9 to align with the current assumed rate of return in the teachers retirement systems actuarial valuation. The TRS actuary determines that the change in the investment return threshold has no anticipated actual impact and therefor no fiscal impact to the state's contribution to the fund. The overarching component to the COLA assumption is the annual rate of increase graded by the Social Security Administration.

Section 2 specifies that the online lottery revenue are first pledged for payment for the teacher's retirement funds bond special capital reserve fund and is technical in nature and has no fiscal impact.

And I urge my colleagues to support and pass this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will there be further remarks? Any remarks?
Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I agree with the description of what is in this legislation and I would urge support.

THE CHAIR:

Will there be remarks. Any further remarks?

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Seeing no further remarks, Madam President while I would normally ask this to go on the Consent Calendar I don't believe we have one tonight so I would urge a roll call vote. Thank you very much

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, a roll call vote will be ordered. Thank you.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Bill 1081. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Bill 1081.

THE CHAIR:

Have all Members voted? Have all Members have voted. Please check the machine to make sure that

your vote has been properly recorded. The machine will be locked.

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 1081

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yea	36
Total voting Nay	0
Absent not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Bill passes [Gavel]. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 46, Calendar Number 480, Senate Resolution No. 9, RESOLUTION PROPOSING APPROVAL OF A TENTATIVE AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT AND THE CONNECTICUT STATE EMPLOYEES ASSOCIATION (P-3B BARGAINING UNIT).

THE CHAIR:

I recognize Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President, I move Acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and Passage of the Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further?

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much. This resolution proposes approval of an agreement between the State of

Connecticut and the Connecticut State Employees Association P3-B Bargaining Unit for state school principals number one. And number two the agreement affects seven employees. The agreement would move the principals in the Department of Correction, Mental Health and Addiction Services and the Department of Children and Families into the Education Professionals P3-B Bargaining Unit. The agreement is effective from passage through June 30, 2021. The estimated impact of the fiscal year 21 and the annualized cost is reflected at \$46,357 in fiscal year 21 annualized it will be \$58,602.

The agreement establishes wage increases where employees will receive a general wage increase of 3.5 percent retroactive to June 19, 2020, as well as an annual increment of 2 percent effective January 1, 2021. All employees shall have a January 1st Annual increment date, longevity will be paid to five employees at \$500 dollars twice a year. Social Security, Medicare, unemployment and retiree health related fringe benefit costs will be incurred based on the wage related provisions currently in the P3-B contract.

The current Social Security rate is 7.65, the current employment rate of 0.5 of salary. The current state contribution towards retiree health is 3 percent and the estimated fringe benefit cost to the general fund is \$4,423 dollars in fiscal 21, annualized at \$5,592 dollars. Employees covered by this contract are members of the State Employee Retirement System. The pension pack of the wage related provisions assumes an average normal SERS rate of 5.7 percent and SERS stands for the State Employee Retirement System. The total estimated retirement cost is \$2,261 in fiscal 21, annualized its at \$2,859 dollars. The increase cost to the State Employees Retirement System will not be recognized in the state's actual actuarially determined employer contribution until fiscal year 23 as the fiscal year 21 contribution is based on the June 30, 2019, actuarial evaluation.

The funding available for this, the Department of Corrections, the Mental Health and DCF Agencies did not include funding for this contract budget requests and therefor the reserve to salary adjustment general fund account for collective bargaining cost associate with unsettled contract currently has adequate funding to transfer to the Department of Corrections and Mental Health Administration and the Department of Children and Families.

Lastly the provisions of this contract remain in effect until subsequent agreement is negotiated by the parties. There are seven employees currently classified as state school principals one and two who would join the in the P3-B Union. The employees who will remain in their existing range plans but will be retitled SSP in lieu of MP throughout at least the end of any successor agreement to the 2016 through 21 P3-B contract. The agreement will expire in just a few days on June 30th, 2021.

The impact of the provisions of this resolution will remain in effect in future years subject to the outcome of the collective bargaining process. This is an accretion, Madam President and by that, it means that there is a current bargaining unit and these seven people are not currently in a collective bargaining agreement and they are moving from a managerial plan to a collective bargaining environment and I would strongly encourage the administration to continue to look at this issue as we have far less managerial employees and more and more members of the managerial plan currently numbered at about 1,300 are accreting into bargaining units associated with their particular job class. I am hopeful that this is something that we'll be able to start addressing in the coming years. Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I just want to kind of go over the numbers a little bit so that I can understand and realize exactly what type of increase we're talking about here.

So, through you.

I just have a couple of questions for the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten, please prepare yourself.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Through you.

So the wage increase per year is going to be 3.5 percent, is that correct?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. In fiscal year 21, it is 3.5 percent. We're not sure what it will be in the upcoming years. That contract is not been settled yet.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And then there is an addition.

Through you, Madam President.

I'm sorry, then there is an additional 2 percent as of January this year as well?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Yes, there is, what is called an annual increment of 2 percent in fiscal year 21.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And through you, again.

And then is the longevity something new, the \$1,000 dollars per year for the five employees?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. No.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne, I'm sorry.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

That's okay, we'll learn together. Thank you, Madam President. Okay so this is the, the longevity has already been in effect and is not an addition of pay contained within this new contract?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Just to be very clear, this is basically what is really new for these particular employees is the general wage increase in the annual increment. They were already allowed to receive longevity based on their time in service in the managerial pay plan. In some cases, the managerial pay plan had rolled in longevity into their pay and another case it is not, but this is not a new benefit.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And are these employees on a step-program and how many, I'll just start with one question?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. The answer to that is no, they're not.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Cause I notice the salary range and I notice that as the employees come in they are going to be at a certain step and obviously if there is a salary range normally there has a step associated with it that as they move up through the salary range, so when they go into this new, into the new contract, is there a step they are going to be on within the new contract?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. No, they are at different salary ranges based on their time and service. It's not based on a salary step program, that is why the 3.5 percent is done in annual increment is done, some collective bargaining agreements do not have steps per se. But many people within that bargaining unit will have a

different pay range just based on how long they have been in that particular bargaining unit.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Okay so the 3.5 percent that they're getting would constitute a step for a Level I person coming into that job?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. No, they would just, it would just be an increase in their pay, not a step per se. I think we're just using different language.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. We probably are because normally, you know, I see raises and then I see a step as well and I'm just making sure that they are both not occurring and they didn't occur in the managerial as well because or if they did under the managerial and then when they came into the contract that started. I guess that's what my question is.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. There are no other pay increases in any way to these workers other than what is currently on this sheet of paper in fiscal 21.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And under the managerial rules were there steps of any sort under the managerial rule or pay increases under the system they're under prior to being allowed into this contract?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. In a managerial plan there are not steps either. There are pay increases but what is happening is they aren't pay increases being given out to managerial employees. As a matter of fact, in some cases it has been a decade or more that managerial employees have not seen a pay increase. It is why many managerial employees are moving over or into a

collective bargaining environment so that they can have someone bargain for their pay increases.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I have no further questions. I do have some comments though. And I guess with what was just said, that kind of bothers me a little bit that we just don't pay our nonunion people raises which kind of forces them that if they do want a raise they have to join a bargaining unit and I kind of see that as a, you know, an either or. Listen, we're never going to give you a raise unless you join that union over there. It doesn't make sense.

And then when you join the union, you know, you start looking at, you know, six percent six-and-a-half percent raises a year. The fringe benefits 16.9 percent, you know, we keep raising taxes year, after year, after year and we're giving out raises that are above average across the state. The raises that are being given out in arbitration right now range in the two to I think 2.6 percent right and here we are giving out the three-and-a-half percent, we're also giving out another two percent and then we're giving out the longevity which is in a lot of places being phased out. And even these raises, like I said, they don't include these fringe benefits which is a cost to the taxpayers as well.

I find it hard to vote for a contract when that contract is above what the average worker across Connecticut gets. Especially when Connecticut has some of the highest taxes. This is taxpayer money we're talking about and these are some really big raises. And when the taxpayers are paying more for

raises then they are personally getting, that is hard to swallow. It truly is and for that reason I am going to have to vote against this tonight, regrettably but, you know, these have to be brought back down to a reasonable rate. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President and I thank Senator Champagne for his comments. When we talked about this Bill in the Committee I think there were similar concerns expressed and I would also concur Senator Osten's comments that this is not a new issue. There has been movement from a non-represented managerial position group in one agency or another. This is going to continue to go on. I would agree that I think this administration should look long and hard at its policy for establishing not only pay increases but also what other kind of protections that he offers, that they offer in these types of positions when people feel like their job could be eliminated by one party or another, by one in position commissioner or another. It's just not a good setting.

And then making that even worse, in my opinion, is when you have those people joining bargaining groups that generally are not separate they are actually in many cases part of the similar groups of those that work under them, that's not good either.

When I was first selected, we had a managerial bargaining group and it was very effective. And it was very easy to work with them as we worked through many issues in the town of Litchfield. Why they were formed, I don't know but maybe looking back 20 years it could have been for the very same reason and I wouldn't be surprised. So I would join

Representative Champagne, in his opposition to this. I don't doubt for one minute that these individuals work very hard. I think in some cases the populations of individuals that they work with need very much to have controls especially educational control in their life, but this is not the way that I would propose to do it. So I do stand in opposition. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I was hoping for three in a row but looks like we really need a roll call vote this time. Thank you very much, ma'am.

THE CHAIR:

A roll call vote has been ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate, Senate Resolution No. 9. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Members voted? Have all Members voted? Please check the machine to make sure that your vote has been properly cast. The machine will be locked.

THE CLERK:

Senate Resolution No. 9:

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yea	28

Total voting Nay	8
Absent not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Bill passes [Gavel]. Resolution is passed.
Senator Moore for what purpose do you rise, madam?

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise for the privilege
of -- point of personal privilege for today. Madam,
please?

CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you, Madam President. Today Friday, June 4
marks the National Gun Violence Awareness Day. And
this day, people wear orange as part of a movement
that was inspired by the Friends of Hadiya
Pendleton, a 15 year old Chicago high school
students killed by gunfire in 2013. And it was just
one week after performing at President Obama's
second inauguration.

Her death to a national spotlight and stands as a
reminder of how easily and how abruptly gun violence
can take from us. That which we hold so dear.

So I would ask for a moment of silence for those
lost to gun violence. Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

Members, please rise while we observe a moment of
silence.

(Gavel)

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you, Madam President. And I just want to use this opportunity also right now to do another point of personal privilege.

I want to note that today on June 4, 2021, for the first time in the history of the state Senate General Assembly, that there are two Black women running the floor.

Senator Pat Miller on the dais, and myself, Senator Marilyn Moore running the floor. This is a historic day. It's taken a long time, but I am so proud that our leadership trusts us, pleased in us, and honors us by giving this opportunity to us.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, madam.

The Senate will stand at ease.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will come back to order and good evening, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Good evening, Madam President.

Madam President I'd like to call the next item please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

I know, I have to mark it go. I'll have further ones to mark. Right after we're just getting the page numbers on those. So on the first one that I'll mark go, is Calendar Page 6 Calendar 218. Senate Bill 3.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 6 Calendar Number 218. Substitute for Senate Bill No. 3 AN ACT CONCERNING DIVERSE ECONOMIC OPPORTUNITIES, WORKER PROTECTIONS AND SMALL BUSINESS REVITALIZATION.

THE CHAIR:

And Good evening, Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Good evening, Madam President. And it's a delight to be in the Chamber here with you this evening.

Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill, please?

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes, yes, indeed. Madam President.

Madam President, Senate Bill 3 is about leveraging the opportunities in building the state's economy.

And I would like to initially recognize many people who were involved in this, the Commerce Committee, especially my Ranking Member, Senator Martin, also, Senator Osten, very instrumental, and Teresa Govert, who were all very helpful in bringing us to where we are this evening, Madam President.

Madam President, there is an Amendment like all -- most Bills go through the iterative process and the Clerk is in possession of LCO 9904. I would ask that the Clerk please call and I be granted leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

And Mr. Clerk, if you could please call LCO 9904.

CLERK:

LCO 9904 Senate Amendment "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption. Will you remark?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes, indeed. Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, every business, be it private or public recognizes that their most fundamental, their most essential asset, in fact, is their human capital.

And as we so vividly witnessed, during this very long and painful year of COVID, that there is absolutely no substitution for human capital.

We recognize that, without our truckers, commerce doesn't move. Without our health care workers, our safety net fails. Our acute care facilities, our long term health institutions. And our ERS do not function. Without childcare, and we all witnessed this up close and personal. And without those childcare professionals, families are pushed out of the workforce.

And that's just to name a few of the categories that are so essential and fall under the definition of human capital.

In recognition of our workers, and with the deepest appreciation. In view of this as we move on through post-COVID. Section 1 seeks to incentivize Connecticut companies, by incentivizing them to invest in their labor force their workforce, by expanding the state's stranded tax credit program to include none other than human capital investments.

Examples of human capital investments might be something like investments in job training, investments in work, education programs, or perhaps investments in a company childcare facility, or investments in, for example, subsidizing workers for childcare.

Section 2, moving on through the Bill, Madam President, requires the Commissioner of DECD to prioritize applicants for economic development assistance, those that demonstrate a willingness to provide jobs to individuals in what is typically known as the harder-to-hire categories, such as individuals with disabilities, veterans, minorities, women, and, and dislocated workers.

Madam President, moving on to Section 3 of the Bill. And here I would like to give a very special thanks

to Senator Osten, who was really helpful in crafting and putting this piece together and what it would do is have our Commissioner of Economic and Community Development monitor the hospitality industry recovery, in particularly looking at it very specifically on a quarterly basis to identify how the hospitality industry is putting the lights back on in standing up.

For example, there may be areas of the state we might just save along the shoreline where they the hotels and motels are doing very well and they're back up to capacity whereas other places in the state in Central Connecticut In the like, the convention centers and the hotels may still be dark in some instances and partially shuttered. So we want to be on top of that right away. And that would be the reason to do these quarterly assessments. So we can determine where it is that we have to respond and respond quickly to continue to support this industry in the state of Connecticut.

Madam President, Section 4, will address the issue of what is known as SBIR or STTR programs. Those are federal programs that will provide assistance and grants to businesses in the areas of technology, and business, innovation, and research. And we feel that the state can be much more present in this field. And therefore, we want to put an emphasis on this and have the state develop a specific plan.

We have very, very robust defense industries in the state of Connecticut, and very strong supply chains supporting those defense industries. And we feel like there is much more opportunity with those two particular federal programs.

And then going on to Section 5, this would have DECD do an assessment of our opportunity zone program to identify or to prioritize, well, the most economically-distressed areas that have been identified as opportunity zones, so that we can try to promote them.

The other piece of this is to really get our arms around what in fact, we are doing in the state of Connecticut regards to this federal program of opportunity zones because right now, it's only coincidental or by chance that we know if an opportunity zone program is going on in a particular community.

So this will give us the inventory, to know where in fact, those programs are taking place. And if our state programs are being connected, and matched with them.

And then the last Section, Madam President is Section 6, and that is a Vocational Village Program, which will establish a vocational village administered by DRC. In conjunction with DECD.

So we know that every year in manufacturing, we have about on average 6,000 openings. And it's very clear that we have not been able to fill those openings. And in fact, we really only get to about 50% capacity filling about 3000 of those.

And incidentally, the CMC, the Connecticut Manufacturing Coalition, just in the last week did a survey of its membership, it's about a 1200 company membership association on and of the initial responses that came back, about half of the companies were indicating that they were hiring and of those that were hiring, close to 40% were identifying the fact that they were looking to hire a person who had technical skills, background, occupational kind of training and trades.

So I mean, knowing the demand recognizing the on net demand. And also recognizing the fact that every year, about a thousand inmates are re-entering into our communities throughout the state. And many of them -- and not enough of them, though, have acquired skills during their time incarcerated. But on average, we know that there are about a thousand

people on the waiting list to get into those training and occupational programs.

So the result of this is that many far too many, I mean, while there are training programs, there just are not enough and that would translate to that about a thousand persons or more in our waiting list, do not have an opportunity to engage in any kind of occupational or workforce training. And what is even worse, Madam President is the fact that when those individuals do reentry -- do reenter, and they do not have the skills to sustain themselves to engage in challenging employment opportunities that we clearly know that recidivism exponentially increases.

So, with the establishment of a vocational village with the use of CRF or CARE or ARPA funds, we will be able to stand up a training and facility program, which will offer nationally-recognized industry certifications and credential -- credential programs. And they might include things such as training in welding, we know that there is a dearth of welders in the state. CNC which is computer -- Computerized Numeric Controlled Manufacturing, which manufacturers cannot fill those positions that they are looking for. It could be HBAC, carpentry, electrical training, and coding. Coding programs have been very, very successfully used in these kinds of settings in other states, or it might include training, for example, in plumbing.

But it would in fact, provide training opportunities so that that population of reentering inmates could be job-ready, meeting the demands of our Connecticut workforce and addressing issues such as recidivism.

Thank you a Madam President. And I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Hartley. Will you remark further on the Amendment that's before the Chamber? Senator Martin. Good evening.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Good evening. Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, may we stand at ease just for a minute, please?

THE CHAIR:

Certainly.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you.

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Committee has done a lot of good work on this on this Bill that's a lot longer than this. And through various conversations with a handful of individuals, this Bill was really worked on and tweaked and there's a lot of good things on to this -- to this Bill. And the good Senator did do a good job of describing what each of the sections included, and what we hope to accomplish out of this.

You know, they talk about using existing tax credits, and opening up to include the use of those tax credits through human capital investments, as well as providing or asking the DECD Commissioner to prioritize the financing assistance to companies that would put the emphasis on those that are most needed work. And they've identified it as dislocated workers, or low income workers, minorities, veterans, and non-traditional employers -- employees. As well as there are a couple of studies in here.

One in particular is the opportunity zone, and I know we have them, we have an opportunity zone in Bristol, and there's a handful of them throughout

the state, there is a question whether or not they're working.

And I think it's important for us as a state if we're going to encourage businesses or municipalities to designate certain areas of their town to be opportunity zones. And put in all that effort and time, I think it's imperative for us to make sure that those programs are working. And if they're not working, then what do we need to make it successful. So this, this Bill is going to address that and charge the DECD to look into the opportunity zones.

Another part of this Bill, which I -- caught my attention, and I didn't know too much about it, but the Department of Corrections, is going to be charged with establishing this Vocational Village Program that would offer training program to those that are incarcerated, and in hopes that when that program is established that these individuals would come out with some skills, not only in a trades, but actually get certified certificates, whether or not they are in the trades, or -- what caught my eye with some of the technological aspect of this, too. So I think that's pretty -- I guess, you know, we could pat ourselves on the back, I guess, as a state, when we start looking at that and encouraging those that know that they commit a crime, but they're not just going to stay incarcerated forever. We all know that they're going to most of them are going to come out. But here we are. We're trying to help them so that when they do get out that they don't return to prison, but they have good jobs.

So some very, very good ideas in his Bill. I do have just a couple of questions that I'd like to ask to the Proponent, the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

And we are on the Amendments. So--

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

On the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

On the Amendment. Please do proceed, sir, and Senator Hartley, prepare yourself.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, a lot of people do not know what accumulated credits are. So through you, perhaps if we could just educate the circle that we could -- if the good Senator could provide information so that the rest of the Senators know exactly what committed -- accumulated credits are.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and through you to the good Senator, who was also so instrumental in working through every Section of this Bill and refining it to its product that we have here today.

So, accumulated credits in the vernacular might be known as stranded tax credits. The statutes do define them as accumulated, those are those tax credits that a business can earn, but cannot to have the benefit of and therefore, they are accumulated or stranded.

They are carried forward but that they cannot be used, for example, in the particular year that they are being indicated.

Thank you. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President.

Yes, that is correct. And the accumulated credits or stranded tax credits, you know, they are -- they can be applied to capital projects that help expand the scale and the scope of that particular business.

Also, they can also be used to increase employment. Also, to generate substantial return. It's meant to, really -- those credits are meant to provide a return on that investment, is probably the best way I can describe it.

And that's critical to the program. But in addition to that, we're adding this new capital, human capital investment, and maybe just so that everybody's clear as to what that exactly means, through you, Madam President, if the good Senator could explain what that exactly is. Human capital investment, in order to use these cumulating credits?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President, and through you, to my colleague on the Commerce Committee.

So the definition that we see in the underlining [sic] Bill of human capital is one that actually exists right now in statute. And we have simply indicated it here and the underlining [sic] Bill to indicate that it now can be included in the stranded tax credit program.

So this was typically exist in the credit program, the tax credit program, but now, it can be used against stranded tax credits. And that would be for investments and just exactly what it says human capital.

Human capital would be any investment in a business's employees. It could be a training a job training program, it could be an investment for a -- to give subsidies to their workers for childcare. It could be actually investing in bricks and mortar to build, for example, a childcare center on the campus, or whatever -- of the particular company. And so it's those kinds of investments in one's employees.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

And Madam President, I don't know if you knew or not, but there's a billion dollars of outstanding accumulated tax credits that we have here in the state of Connecticut.

And I think the Bill, I think speaks to the amount that would be -- I haven't capped to that. But nonetheless, it's still that's a lot of estimated tax credits, and including this human capital right now will help sort of, you know, transfer that --

those credits over to get people back to work, and which is a good thing.

Another section of this report talks about the donor report, the portion -- now the part of this Bill talks about the report on the hospitality sector, and maybe the good Senator, through you, Madam President, it could explain exactly what we can expect in that report when we -- it is submitted to us.

Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes, through you, Madam President.

And so with regard to this monitoring of our hospitality industry, as we collectively felt that the hospitality industry had been slammed, they had, in all instances, had to shutter for virtually tried to keep their employees on the payroll, but not able to operate their business.

Unlike some other businesses, the hotel, and the motel industry, really kind of the lights went out. And so as things get stood up again, and we begin to mobilize and we're seeing that, I think almost every day now, and as it's been described there as much pent up demand.

We want to make sure that we have our finger on the pulse of how this industry is faring in getting back to normal hopefully. And we recognize the fact that in some instances as small as our state might be, there are locations that might have a geographic benefit in terms of hospitality -- the hospitality industry.

Typically, you know, summers coming, people want to go down to the shore, to the waterfront and so forth. And so those hotels and motels may have an opportunity to really get back to full or almost full capacity where as others that are in different regions of the state, maybe more central might not have the number of rooms that would be occupied, and so forth.

And so we want to recognize that on a quarterly basis, so that we can be nimble and respond in a quarterly fashion to keep these industries whole, they are the backbone of the state's economy. And, and we want to make sure that we're way in front of this so that we can all get back to normal.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Yeah, without a doubt, Madam President, the hospitality industry, the food industry, but more so, the hospitality industry, definitely, by far, probably the most affected industry, in this, this time of this pandemic period.

So I think, I think it's smart that we, on a quarterly basis, and the good Senator use the word nimble, I think is important here, because there are parts of the state that are going to come back faster than other parts of the state and through -- I think through -- and I like to believe that through this report, that we're going to be able to identify those areas of the state that are not coming back as quickly.

And maybe there might be an opportunity for us to help don't know what that is. But I think that through this quarterly reporting, that we're going

to be able to stay nimble and come up. And, you know, we got a very, I think, an exceptional Commissioner at the DECD. And he's a very talented man. And I think with his staff, with the Committee, I think those area of the state that are most hurting and having a hard time coming back, or recovering from this pandemic, period, I think we might be able to help them in some way or fashion.

I just have just maybe just two more thoughts, or comments. Or actually, I'll just make it one, I have already talked about the opportunity zone and us trying to get our arms wrapped around those -- that program so that we can better maybe tweak it to make it more effective, and really help businesses to tap into it so that they can not only help their businesses by help municipalities are bad are in distress.

Just the last thing I know I made a comment regarding the program at the prison regarding the Vocational Village Program.

Through you, Madam President, I just would like to hear the good Senator's, thoughts on what will be taking place there.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Senator. Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes, Madam President and through you.

So yes, Section 6 speaks to the establishment or the standing up of a vocational Village. This is a model that actually has been embraced in a number of states, throughout the United States and with great success in terms of providing 21st century skills to inmates who are reentering.

And in fact, in one program in California, it was so successful that the exiting former inmate who had taught himself by virtue of books, not technology coding, started his own coding business.

And it has scaled to such a degree that he now has a program training in the facilities and hires only ex-offenders and has an incredibly robust client list with regard to coding because as we know, coding is kind of the bedrock of really technology. Be it your cell phone, your car, or your smart House, putting your lights on and so forth.

Anyway, it was a very successful program. So looking at these models, and truth be known, we've been talking with the Commissioner of Corrections for a number of years about these incredible success stories. We felt that this might be the opportune time, knowing the incredible demand that we have in the manufacturing center -- sector and in the technology area. And that we know that dollars invested are great investments because we are meeting our workforce needs. But we are also staving off recidivism. Because when people get out and have a job, but also a job with a career, it makes - it's a life changer. And it's a contribution to the state of Connecticut and to the workforce.

So the offerings could be and they would be determined by the Commissioner in any number of areas, but they would have to be nationally-recognized, credentialed programs, so that upon completing the certificate program, the credentialing program, the individual does have a nationally recognized credential.

It could be NIMS in manufacturing, something in CNC welding, or the like. And, and so we know also that presently, there are thousands or maybe a little more than that. Individuals who are on waiting lists in the corrections, institutions waiting to have an opportunity to get into such programs.

So while there are many programs that are going on right now, this would be a different kind of a program, and it clearly would be greatly subscribed to.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hartley. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Mr. President.

I have no idea what coding is, and I -- but it's exciting to hear that some of these individuals are going to be able to learn this.

I would assume very entry -- entry level career are certificates in order to get really get a head start sort of into an industry that is just wide open right now.

So I'm excited for them. And as well as just the need, I think we see this -- the lack of -- regardless of industry, and I know that we worked on the Bill, last year, two years ago, regarding apprenticeship programs, and how important it is for us to develop apprenticeship programs, and introduce students at a very young age as to what type of work needs or works is out there in various sectors.

We talk about the trades today, introducing that to the inmates, allowing them to earn these national search certifications. But this apprenticeship program would introduce the various set business sectors at a very young age, starting at the middle school level, going on to high school, and then afterwards, some are going to go to college.

But yet, there are some that are going to go into a certificate program or certification program that would may lead to going to a two year college or going to a four year college while they're in this apprenticeship program.

The needs are across the board, the business sector, the trades, the medical sector, the STEM sector, is across the board.

It's Important that we continue and we got I know the governor is working on the workforce through the workforce council but in the looking to develop that. I'm a strong advocate of that. And I hope that it is in his Bill in his the final package that we may see.

But I think it's important, and I've been saying this at night, I heard from when I first became a Senator and in my community being on the Briscoe, Central Connecticut Chamber of Commerce, Board of Directors, I just heard the call and the comments from the manufacturing sector the trades is we need some workers. We need to introduce these students to our trade. Trade regarding it could be manufacturing, it could be the medical industry or sector, the business sector. But the trades I heard of right from the start how important it is that we not try to steer our children into our -- you're going to college, because I think we've had that model for a few decades now.

And I think we've missed the boat slightly. And I think we all are realizing that -- that Gee, we really need to look at developing the talents of our children. We got have to help them identify those. And some are going to be going on to college and after, you know, grad, Graduate School, and so forth, but there are some that have other gifts and talents. And we should be encouraging them to develop those skills.

I could go on and that but Madam President, but I just want to thank the good Senator, and our Ranking Members as well, and the DECD the DOC as well, in recognizing what we needed to do in this Bill.

I know we're on the Amendment right now. But I want to encourage everyone in the circle here to support this, I'd like to think that you will support this. It's a very good Bill.

And Madam President, thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin. Will you remark further on the Amendment that's before the Chamber? Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH)

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you to Senator Martin. He answered a lot of my questions.

I'm still-- if I could ask some questions to the Proponents of the Bill?

THE CHAIR:

You may proceed, sir.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH)

Thank you, and through you, Madam President.

I'm still trying to understand the credits. From No. 1 and then I heard there was a billion dollars of these credits out there. How exactly do you use those to purchase the human workforce, I guess?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And thank you for your question.

So to the good Senator. We have in the state of Connecticut, a tax credit program. And there are about seven or eight categories for which you can get tax credits for.

There's historic preservation, R&D -- Research and Development, Research and Experimentation that's called R&E. And so -- and human capital is one of them. It exists right now. So a company that invests in its employees can also, through the Department of Economic and Community development, in conjunction with DRS file appropriately for the tax credits.

But the other program is called, as indicated in statute, accumulated tax credits, which is really stranded tax credits. Those are the tax credits that a company has gotten by virtue of, you know, either historic preservation investment, investment in human capital, investment in R&D, but they can't use them, because the code says that you cannot use or apply these tax credits to more than 50% of what your tax liability is.

And therefore you don't lose them. But you can't accumulate them. And that essentially, is the program.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Hartley. Senator, Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And through you, s o I have these tax credits. And I've trained -- because I've trained my employees to do their job. And I and I have these but how do I -- So I offset my taxes that I paid to the state of Connecticut that year, or in coming years? I just need to understand that part.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And yes, to the good Senator. So you can accumulate whatever the value is of those investments. And that is determined through the Department of Revenue Services in conjunction with the Department of Economic and Community Development.

And then if in fact, as we indicated, they amount to more than 50% of what your liability is in a particular year, then you cannot use any more than that number.

And anything beyond that would be stranded if you would. You don't lose it, you can carry it forward.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH)

Thank you, Madam President.

I think I have a better understanding of that now.

I want to go to basically Section 6. I like the idea of, you know, providing an opportunity for inmates to pick up a skill so when they get out, you know, hopefully, they can get a job instead of trouble.

But did we look at any studies from any of the programs from any state to indicate what the recidivism rate is for those that go through the program?

Through you, Madam President.

CLERK:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And through you to the good Senator. I cannot quote verbatim what the recidivism rate might be for those who exit with a credential or a job training skill. But for the fact that we know that the majority of them are gainfully employed, we recognize what the value is of that to them personally, to their families, but also to the economy of the state of Connecticut.

And, as I said, is a -- there are national models out there, one of them happens to be a program called PI, which is a partnership innovation training program, which is kind of a gold standard, if you will.

And these are individuals who once again, exit with a very coveted skill, it could be, it could be plumbing, I don't know about anybody else. But during this time of COVID, I've had a terrible time with getting my plumber there not that he isn't good. It's just they can't physically accommodate, you know, all these requests as things are going on.

So it's about putting people in jobs, which are very necessary to our economy, but also giving them self-worth and, and, and value and making them contributing members of our community.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And,, through you again, I understand everything that you said, and I'm for that, but I we're using taxpayer money, whether it's federal taxpayer money -- well, that's at the present time, it's just printed money. But we're using this money to pay for the program. So it's still taxpayer money.

And when I invest in something, you know, that it's specifically not my money, it's the taxpayers money, I really want to know that we're getting a good result from it.

And I figured that when we bring a program forward that we would look to see what the recidivism rates are. Because if the recidivism rate is say, 80%, that's not something we want to get into. So that's why I think it would be important to know that.

My question --my next question is, do we have a cost for these -- for this program, and how much we have we pay for this?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And if I might just harken back to our last exchange. And tell you, for example, in the coding program that I referred to earlier, there was zero recidivism.

And that was in California, one of the largest institutions there. And then the second question was, if you might repeat, please?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And through you. The question was, how much is this going to cost the taxpayers?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

Thank you, Madam President.

Through you. And so, this was actually researched and there was a White Paper on this, and that goes back a year. And at that point, the dollar amount that was put on it was \$20 million, which would address the actual location, the place where this would be and also the, the technology, the CNC machines, whatever the particular credential requires.

Because these are nationally credentialed programs and they have established curriculums which have to be adhered to.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

If a high school student is graduating and wants to become a plumber, does he have any access to this money?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley.

Through you, Madam President.

A high school student who is not a Member, or are not part of a correctional institution would not.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

I think that's part of a problem I have. That, you know, that we have this program going in prison, yet a high school student who may not be able to afford to become a plumber because you can't afford the

tuition gets excluded. But if you go to prison, you get it for free.

It's a good program and I like the Bill. But that's hard for me to overcome. And you know, and I know we -- people can provide information as we sit here on statistics and stuff, but I would hope that some of those statistics would have been looked up prior to this as well.

And \$20 million is a lot of money. And \$20 million dollars, could have taken quite a few high school students and put them through the one-year program to allow them to come plumbers or welders or electricians or any of those others and I do hope that there is money available somewhere in Connecticut, that those high school students could access the same amount and get their education for free.

I'm going to -- I'm going to leave it at that. Again, you know, I like this Bill, the fact that it is helping out and I'm sure I can overcome that portion.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. 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 before the Chamber please signify by saying Aye.

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 Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Madam President when the vote was on the -- on the underlining Bill, if we could have a roll call vote, please? Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

And a roll call vote has been requested on the Bill. And will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as amended?

If not, I open the voting. Mr. Clerk would you please announce the roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. On Senate Bill 3. As amended by Senate "A" An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be locked.

Mr. Clerk would you please announce the tally?

CLERK:

On Senate Bill 3:

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yay	36
Total voting Nay	0
Absent, not voting	0

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

Legislation is passed. Mr. Clerk

Oh, pardon me, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I need to mark the rest of our goal list.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Calendar Page 7 Calendar 242. Senate Bill 1032. I'd like to mark that item go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Followed by Calendar Page 11 Calendar 314 Senate Bill 929. I'd like to mark that item go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar Page 19. Calendar 403 Senate Bill 1100 I'd like to mark that item go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

And Calendar Page 2 Calendar 413 House Bill 6102 I'd like to mark that item go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And Calendar page 35 Calendar 511 House Bill 6504 I'd like to mark that item go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar Page 30 Calendar 474 House Bill 6621 I'd like to mark that item go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar Page 35 Calendar 513 House Bill 6622 I'd like to mark that item go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar Page 26 Calendar 454 House Bill 6629 I'd like that mark that item go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar Page 32 Calendar 499 House Bill 6564 like to mark that item go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 23 Calendar 436 House Bill 6588 I'd like to mark that item go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 25 Calendar 448 House Bill 6417 I'd like to that item go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar Page 2 Calendar 82 House Bill -- I'm sorry, Senate Bill 867. I'd like to mark that item go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And on Calendar Page 4 Calendar 166 Senate Bill 931 I'd like to mark that item go.

Thank you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 7 Calendar No. 242 Senate Bill No. 1032, AN ACT
CONCERNING VARIOUS REVISIONS TO THE EDUCATION
STATUTES.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Good evening, Madam President.
Geez, nice to see you this evening normally is in
the early day time that we do our exchange.

THE CHAIR:

Early morning.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Yeah. Madam President. I move in 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 MCCRORY (2ND):

Yes, Madam President,

The Clerk in his possession of LCO 9976 I ask the Clerk to please call and I be given the leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

And Mr. Clerk if you could please call LCO 9976

CLERK:
LCO 9976. Senate Amendment "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, this Bill is -- actually came from the Governor's -- initially Bill AA1 where they had a lot of educational components to it. And what we decided to do is actually take this strike all Amendment and create our own piece of legislation. It has a number of sections attached to it. And I'd like to briefly go over each section.

First, Section 1 refers to new school lunch programs requires all our school districts that has a K-12 school as well for school wide lunch, be part of the new program.

Section 2 speaks to our gifted and talented student identification. Pretty much requires our school districts to use multiple methods of identification with discussing students who are gifted and talented.

Section 3 speaks to our advanced course enrollment policy. It requires our Public School Boards to adopt a revised policy on student eligibility enrolled in advanced courses.

It also speaks to offering multiple ways to determine students being eligible for advanced courses in college courses.

Section 4 speaks to something we typically don't normally do in our schools, but we want to tighten up a little better. It speaks to our students' success plans.

It requires by July 1, 2021, encourage our public schools to create Student Success plans in collaboration with their parents and guardians. Also, by July 1, 2022, to require students to plan for the academic careers outside of high school.

Section 5, it speaks to challenging curriculum policy. It acts that when students enter high school, students may enroll in advanced courses and require that these students have academic placement plans.

Section 6 speaks to our FAFSA program. This is a Section that we had to do a lot of modifications for, because at one point, it was determined that students will have to fill out the FAFSA Form in order to graduate from high school.

We're not doing that this year. We're actually -- what we're going to do is encourage our Boards of Education to make sure they have opportunities for students to get the support that they need, and also has our Boards of Education concept gives in the support of getting our parents -- and our students getting that FAFSA form filled out.

Section 7 is also pretty much in line with Section 6. It allows our Lions Districts to be able to use the Lions funds to improve the provisions of the FAFSA program.

And Section 8, it requires the State Department of Education to publish the results on a website of FAFSA completion rates in the state of Connecticut.

And Section 9 speaks to our working group. Requires the education community to establish a 10-member Working Group to device ways to improve the FAFSA program. Clearly the FAFSA process is very important if you want to have our students go into higher education.

Section 10 speaks to the age where students will be able to drop out of school. We we're increasing that age from 17 to 18, beginning of school years 2023/2024 and also raise the age for our students to attend or take a GED class.

And finally, Madam President, there is also a Section 12 it allows our education to make the same recommendation to OPM and Ed. Committee about the following provisions -- strategy to remove barriers to post-secondary education. Feasibility to establish an early high school graduation scholarship program; and a feasibility of developing a standardized exit survey for high school seniors.

THE CHAIR:

Madam President, I move adoption. Thank you. And the question is on adoption of the Amendment. Will you remark on the adoption of the Amendment? Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Good evening, Madam President, it's still his evening, I guess for another 20 minutes or so then we'll be saying good morning.

Madam President, I rise in support of the adoption of the Amendment. And I would like to make a few remarks as this is a strike all so it becomes the Bill ultimately when we -- when we adopt it.

First of all, I would echo the comments that were made by my good Chair of the Education Committee

with respect to the work that went into getting this Bill to the point that it is at, at this moment this evening.

I believe that this draft that we're looking at -- this Amendment that we're looking at now was in final form to us after probably six or seven versions earlier today, over the course of the last few weeks.

This is, as the good Chair noted, the pieces of the workforce development Bill that were cognizant to the Education Committee, they were matters of cognizance for us. And these are from the Governor's Office.

So it was, it was a great lot of a great amount of work that went into working through this to get this Bill to a point where I think it met with good resolve from both sides. And I think that we, we may have some good discussion going forward here tonight.

But there's a lot of good things in here. And I think they're important things that we should be doing, as an Education Committee and as the legislature to address some issues that have come up not only just over time, but certainly as a result of the COVID pandemic.

So, you know, I probably have questions I could ask on each section, I don't know that I need to necessarily do that. There are a couple of things that I would like to highlight as well, and perhaps direct a question or two to the, to the good Chair.

One of the things that's very interesting about this, this Bill, or the Amendment on the Bill, is actually in Section 2, where we redefine what we used to call the TAG program, the talented and gifted program, which is something that I can remember back -- way back in the 1980's, when I was in high school in Southbury.

I was part of that program. And it was a really cool thing that was -- that was made available. And I'm very happy to see that we have gone through a good exercise here in Section 2, to kind of redefine how that's going to work. And to make sure that we have not -- we've not lost sight of the fact as we have focused appropriately so on lots of special education issues and dealing with accommodations and making sure that we're doing everything that we should be doing for every student.

This is taking a very appropriate and careful look at another part of the population in our schools. And those are so-called gifted and talented students.

So Madam President through you, I do have a question for the good Chair.

Section 2. Subsection B is new language. And it says that this policy, or this policy requires multiple methods of identification of talented and gifted students.

And I'm just wondering if we might be able to identify what some of those methods are, because I personally don't necessarily recall them.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Thank you, Madam President. And that is an excellent question. So when I sat here and I was actually focusing on that Section of the piece of legislation.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Intelligent minds think alike.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Well, you're very intelligent, I just -- I just think like you. But it's just a great example, I'm going to give you an example, right? As an educator myself, and what you might experience coming up -- as the TAG program or the Gifted and Talented program is, usually the students that are provided the opportunity to be a part of the gifted and talented or TAG program, was a student who had high grades. Was a student that got A's on all their tests, it did very well in school.

And those kids got the opportunity to sometimes be removed from school, their classrooms and go to a special program, where they get all the high, high functioning opportunities. Things that the traditional student doesn't get, the average student doesn't get.

And what we're saying here is, and many times, intelligence can be demonstrated in multiple ways. And I'll give an example, if you have a brick wall in front of you, and you had a fish there, you had a bird there, and you had a dog in front of you. All those things, all three of those animals or species are very intelligent their own way.

But if that -- if the exam was to get over that wall, I think only the bird will be able to go over that wall because it flies. But that doesn't make -- that doesn't identify that the fish or the dog wasn't -- is not intelligent, because they're intelligent also.

But if the measure is to get over that wall, then the only person that's going to get over that wall is that bird. And what we're saying here is, there are multiple ways of showing your intelligence.

And it doesn't have to necessarily just be by your highest test score, or a standardized test, or you can exit school, because multiple people can demonstrate intelligence.

So what we're going to do here is, we will identified other ways that you can demonstrate that you are just as talented as that person who gets the A every time on that test, or very good [inaudible] test.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President, thank you to the good Chair that was a great analogy and a way to understand what we're getting at here.

So, essentially, we're looking to, through these multiple methods of identification, to make sure that we're not relying upon one method of identification for finding out who -- which students would be, would be selected for participation in a gifted and talented-type program. So I think the Chair for that answer.

And then in Section 3, we essentially have, have already answered the question that I was going to ask. So I guess I'll just make a statement about this.

In Section 3, we actually are changing the manner in which we determine eligibility for a student to be considered for participation in things like -- like an AP, Advanced Placement course. And there was a lot of a lot of debate in Committee on this, we questioned why we needed to do this? We questioned if we should be doing this?

Because traditionally, the selection process for an AP type course. You know, let's say you're being you're selected to participate in an AP English class. There were some very specific parameters that were always used for that selection.

And they may not have necessarily addressed what was what was actually before the Selection Committee, if you will, or before the teacher, or the administrator in terms of the actual ability and talent of the student.

So by the changes that would be in effect in Section 3, we are allowing for some different parameters to be used for the selection of AP courses.

Now, the question that did come up, though, and this came through some debate in Committee and from the Committee Members, was that traditionally, and historically, past performance is an indicator of future performance.

So -- and I think that was probably what those selection criteria were based upon, from the beginning of when this became an issue or, or a need within our schools to find a way to identify students who would exceed and excel in an AP class.

So traditionally, we looked and said, "Okay, if, if, if Eric does well in Freshman English in high school, and he's an A student, he probably would do well in an AP class, because he did well in a basic or, or, you know, a regular English class." And that past performance would be indicative of future performance.

But I think what we've learned and what we heard from educators and from our Committee itself is that those grades are not the only factor that we should be considering when we're looking at how to select students to participate in -- and I keep saying referencing only AP, but there's also Dual Credit

Early College. And the Bill actually specifically addresses in the language, other advanced or accelerated course or program offered by a local or regional Board of Ed.

So it's not just AP classes, this would also apply to a student who is looking at early college education. Taking college courses as a sophomore, junior senior.

Some students in high school who have the bandwidth and the ability and the drive and the desire to do that double work, sometimes can finish a high school diploma and march across the stage or walk across the stage and be handed a high school diploma along with a -- with an Associate's Degree from a college that they may be taking those early college credit courses with.

So I think Section 3 does a good job at setting some -- identifying some new standards and looking at how we can open up eligibility for enrollment in these AP classes and early college credit classes by using something that is beyond just grades or perhaps a teacher recommendation.

It goes beyond that. It still includes those parameters, but it's not restricted to those parameters.

And I think that the caution flag that I would raise on this, and hopefully we'll have some data as we move forward, maybe it's after a year or two of this is that we want to make sure that, that these, that these, this change in the parameters does not result in a situation where we discover that maybe some students aren't able to succeed.

And I guess we can expect that there may be some of that, and it will give us an opportunity to learn from that experience and say, okay, maybe that one or those one or two parameters were not correct in

looking at the potential success rate of that student in in an AP type class.

So I think this will also be very much -- this part of the Amendment will be a work in progress as well, as we go through time.

Moving on into Section 4, we are in this Section, requiring that each student have a success plan. And there was some question when we were looking at a different version of this Bill in our caucus, regarding success plans. And then as we move into Section 5, we talked about academic plans.

So Madam President through you to the Chair, can we have a -- can we get a an explanation with respect to what the difference is between the student success plan for each student enrolled in a public school and then the criteria for the academic plan. Because they are concurrent in the Bill.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Thank you, Madam President.

So first, I want to start out with the student success plans.

So the student's success plans have actually been in our requirements for about -- at least the last three or four years. But what we were trying to do with the student success plan now is to match them with what the students will like to do once they get into high schools and further their education, on to college.

So what we want to is require students to include in their academic plan, who are eligible to enroll in challenging courses. So what we want to do is as soon as those students are starting to come out of middle school, we want to make sure they're placed in the right courses once they get to high school.

So if their career path is to go on to college, we won't wait to their level for 12th grade, we want to put them in a position in high school when they first start. So they can have a successful path on to college. Or if they don't want to go to college, if they want to go on to the workforce, or go on to a trading system, they are established set in plan.

So that's the student success plan as it relates to the challenging curriculum, as you can see. So if we want to have our kids prepare to go on to higher education or prior going to the workforce, or go on to a trade school or something, we must have a challenging curriculum in front of them. So they can be accurately prepared.

And unfortunately, many instances in our state, there are pockets in our state where those plans are already there. The students, once they get to high school, they are already on a track to go on to higher Ed, in many school districts or at least continuing education.

But unfortunately, a lot of school districts, that doesn't exist right now. So what we want to do is challenge our school districts across the state of Connecticut, to make sure we have a challenging curriculum for all our students once they enter high school, so they could be on a trajectory to go on and continue with their education on secondary level, or going into the workforce. Or in the in this matter with the kids in this generation start their own businesses.

So that's why I support the change inn what we're doing currently and to prepare for a 21st Century

environment. But we might have a whole lot of students right now, who might not opt out to go into high school -- they might not opt out to go to college, but want to start their own businesses. A lot of students are doing that, especially with the technology.

So Madam President through you, I hope that satisfies the question. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President. And thank you to the Chair for the explanation.

I think there -- it's important to understand why we have a both a success plan and an academic plan for our students and that was perfectly articulated. Thank you, Senator for that.

And again, all of this being done with the intent of ensuring that we are providing -- although I think we already do a pretty good job across the state with some really good examples and maybe some -- maybe some not so good examples, but we already do a good job. This, and this is allowing us to do a better job at the end of the day, and, and giving our local and regional Boards of Education, some different -- some additional guidance on how to best prepare the students that they are entrusted to educate for their futures.

And, you know, as the good Chair just spoke to the future is not necessarily always going to college. You know, we're surrounded -- in Connecticut, we're truly very lucky and fortunate in Connecticut that we have -- we have a very large aerospace industry, with many, not only the big names that we all know, but many secondary and tertiary providers that that,

you know, are all on the banks of the rivers that that flow through our great state.

And I think we have an obligation within our public schools to make sure that we are also, through these plans, identifying students who don't necessarily need to go to college, they should be going into manufacturing jobs. And those jobs, as we know, in Connecticut are generally -- they pay well, you can be a very young person and, and begin a career that maybe you go back to college because someone has said, when you're in the workplace that you have the talent, and you've demonstrated the ability to perhaps move into some other role that requires a college degree.

But these plans will ultimately allow us -- and not us, but allow our Boards of Ed and the administrators and teachers in our public schools to identify students more carefully and more accurately for those that should be going into college and those that may be better served by going into trades as they come out of out of high school.

So moving along into one of the other sections of the Amendment. We spoke about the automatic completion of the financial aid form, when we discussed Senate Bill 881, the Workforce Development Bill a couple of days ago.

And I stated in that debate that I agree with wholeheartedly with the intent here for this, and I'll restate what I said the other day, and that is that, by making this a requirement, and having the Boards of Education adopt the policy, for the completion of the FAFSA, we will ensure that no student is left behind with respect to "can I afford to go to college? What am I eligible for what student loans might I be able to get what Pell Grants might I be able to get?"

So I think that it is -- I think that this is a good practice. There was some concern, and we changed the

language in this Bill, just -- I think this is one of the last changes, that there is not a mandate for our Boards of Education in our school systems to provide time or additional resources for filling out those forms. The FAFSA is not the easiest form in the world to complete.

It does require, you know, tax returns from parents and lots of other information. But it does make resources kind of like when we say, for appropriations purposes, you know, within available appropriation. This is going to rely upon resources that exist in the school systems already, there isn't a mandate here for having to hire new people or to have people stay longer than they should or having to pay people to stay longer than they normally would to help with this.

But I again, I think this is a good direction for us. And it allows for potentially for more of our high school students to -- if they are headed in that direction to understand what the affordability is for higher Ed. and what's available to them.

So moving along, and I do have a few more questions. Trying not to go to too long here. As we're about to say. Good morning, Madam President. It's just about midnight.

In section 8, we are -- I'm sorry, Section 9. Section 8 is the publication of the data that will be collected from -- by the State Department of Education regarding the completion of FASFA forms.

And I think it will be good if we're making this a requirement for our Boards of Education and our local schools to do to -- to have students fill out these forms then we should be reporting out the department should be reporting out and showing the success rate there.

And then ultimately, obviously, with that data, if we have school systems that do not have high

completion rates, then we can address why? And go back and figure out because again, that's an important component of what we're trying to do with this Amendment.

So, the language in Section 9 empowers the Commissioner of Education to establish a workgroup regarding strategies and recommendations to improve the rates of student completion of the FAFSA.

And I'll go back to again a comment because there is some commonality and common thinking between Senate Bill 881 and this Amendment.

We list a whole group of individuals and associations that will participate in that workgroup. And I will go back to a comment I made the other day.

We have once again, omitted all other institutions of higher education that are not part of the state university system or the University of Connecticut.

And I think, and I'll go back to the comments that I made the other day as well that I think this is a little short-sighted, I don't think we need to fix it tonight, we can maybe look at this next year and fix this and include some representation from our private institutions of higher Ed.

Because we are again, we're very fortunate in Connecticut, as I said, a few hours ago, a few days ago, we have an Ivy League College -- university right here in Connecticut, and we have many, many fine institutions that are not part of the state university system, they should be part of this dialogue.

Because we were not going to only direct a student to a State University, or college, we're going to ultimately direct students to some of those private institutions, and they all serve a purpose, they all do very well. And they're good options for someone

who may not want to attend UConn or Central or Western.

And that's not to be disparaging or disrespectful in any way to those universities. They're great schools. But I think that we are a little short-sighted in terms of their omission of them in that Work Group that the Commissioner will be putting together.

And then the only other comment that I wanted to make is, I think it's very smart for us to include, in this Bill that we are changing the dropout age from 17 to 18, and the GED age to 18.

There will probably be some opposition to this when it becomes law. Because we know that there are certain circumstances within our -- certain communities, certain school systems in our state where a child, even though a 17-year old is still a child, in my mind, I have one and he's still very much a child even though he's a man, right.

But there are situations where a 17-year-old needs to drop out of school, perhaps to help support the family, or because someone is ill. And there's a need for someone to be a caregiver.

So we probably will see some concern with respect to that. And I realized one year is only a year. But I think it's the responsible thing for us to do as a legislature to, to keep our -- keep our children in school until they legally become adults, and then they can make a decision to, you know, at 18 you can -- you don't need to, to stay anymore. You know, some states are still at a very young age of 15 and 16 year olds for allowing into -- allowing them to exit from school.

And I think that's a terrible, terrible situation to put any child and, and this, this addresses that. And I think this will result ultimately in better

outcomes for our youngest adults as they're finishing high school.

And hopefully our school systems will be properly empowered through some of the other pieces of this Bill to make sure that we are again addressing the best opportunity and the best need for all of those students that are -- that are in their care and in their charge, if you will.

So I think I'll stop there, Madam President at this point. Again, I appreciate the work that went into this. It was a great exercise to collaborate with my ranking and the Chairs in the Committee and I think we have brought to the chamber tonight and to the floor, a very good Amendment that will do some great things for public schools in Connecticut.

So Madam President, 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 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:

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 McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Yes, Madam President, and I just want to echo the comments from my Ranking Member.

This has been a labor of love. We have a number of revisions -- were added in there till we got it right. And that's why we're here together, working in collaboration to make sure we move this piece of legislation forward. It's tied to a Workforce Bill. And I think at this point, we have a great piece of legislation that everyone can applaud to.

And I ask that this be put on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

And Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Madam President, I would request a roll call please. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you a roll call vote has been requested. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended?

Will you remark further on the Bill as amended?

If not, I will open the vote.

Mr. Clerk, 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 1032. As amended by Senate "A".

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered 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.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine is locked Mr. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1032.

Total number of voting	36
Total voting Yay	36
Total voting Nay	0
Total absent, not voting	0

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

The legislation is adopted. Mr. Clerk -- Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Senate stand at ease for a moment?

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease.

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you Madam President.

The Clerk will call the next Bill please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 11. Calendar number 314.

Senate Bill number 929 AN ACT CONCERNING PENALTIES
FOR THE TAKING OF STRIPED BASS.

THE CHAIR:

Good morning, Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Good morning, Madam President. Nice to see you.

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 COHEN (12TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

This is a Bill -- AN ACT CONCERNING THE PENALTIES
FOR THE TAKING OF STRIPED BASS.

Currently, the penalty provisions or violations that
are really becoming unenforceable at this point. And
what we want to do and because what we know is that
striped bass stock has recently been declared over-
fished and we want to make sure that we are issuing
enforceable violation.

So this proposal would facilitate more effective
enforcement of the taking of striped bass by issuing

infractions, instead of the current penalty provisions.

And I urge my colleagues in the chamber to vote yes on this legislation.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Cohen.

Will you remark further? Good morning, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Good morning, Madam President.

Madam President, I rise with a few questions just to make clear the reason why the current statute has been deemed by the agency to be unenforceable.

So through you if I might.

If I understand the law correctly, today, there are fines in place which cannot be remitted. And so what is the distinction between the language that we are proposing here, and that which currently exists?

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen?

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

The idea is, right now they are having to make arrests with misdemeanor charges. And our court systems simply are not enforcing these violations.

And so as a result, many folks are just taking striped bass without regard to the fish population of the species.

And so instead, this proposal would allow them to have special fines placed, instead of having these misdemeanors placed on these violators.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

I thank the gentlelady for her explanation.

So the situation is, that the Connecticut court will not take up a violation for the illegal taking of a striped bass, which was a fish that for many, many years didn't even, almost didn't even exist here.

When I was just out of high school, I can remember fishing in Long Island Sound, and no one caught a striped bass. You never heard of anybody catching a striped bass. And part of the reason why that was the case was that the courts took it very seriously.

If you overfished, if someone caught you in violation of a striped bass statute, you are going to get prosecuted, you're gone in front of a judge and they were not going to nullify that you were going to go in front of a court.

But the court in Connecticut apparently doesn't really care. So this is what we've relegated ourselves to hear in the state of Connecticut.

Probably one of the most prized fish on the eastern seaboard. The world record was caught in Long Island Sound, the most prized fish to catch, catching and keep. Catch and release. People charter boats, they

spend weekends here. And we couldn't get the court to take up one violation.

DEP would have individuals that they would have arrested, that would have taken 50 fish below the Derby Dam. Repeat offenders, and we couldn't get a judge to actually prosecute anybody.

So this is the fix, Madam President, the fix is you're going to get a \$75 fine. That's the fix. The fix is that the most prized game fish in Long Island Sound is going to be subject to the same penalty of a carp of a bass of a catfish. And that I think, is shameful.

Millions of dollars are spent in this state every year pursuing this fish, in most cases to catch it and release it. We have stripers forever in Connecticut, we have charter fishermen in Connecticut. We have all sorts of opportunities in Connecticut.

And the agency charged with the responsibility of making sure that this fish is protected, and it's available for future generations has decided that they want to Champion a Bill to get a ticket.

Now I can only imagine that if they can't get somebody to go to court, they're probably never going to round them up when they don't pay their fine.

But we're going to play this out. This is what the agency wants to do. I'm sad that this is what it's come to. I'm sad that this is the focus of Connecticut's DEP, is saying we don't know what to do. We got people that are overharvesting these by the thousands and the only thing we can do is issue a fine, a ticket.

I hope it has the impact that they hope for. I hope that somehow this will turn the corner on people that have excessively over fished, especially at

times when spawning striped bass are in the Housatonic River, in the Connecticut River in the Thames River.

I'm not sure how it's going to happen. I'm willing to go along with it. We heard it. Certainly, we've had plenty of testimony. We heard from people how much they desperately want this Bill to pass.

So I plan to support the Bill. And I pray it has an impact. But I'll bet you just to assure as I'm standing here, it will not.

Because the very same people that are not able to get someone into court are probably going to look at people and say we're only going to be able to write them a ticket for \$75 anyway.

So I'm willing to take the chance, I do rise in support of the Bill. I hope that other Members of this chamber will support it. But to be quite honest with you, it's an embarrassment that that's where we are in the state of Connecticut. That we got to take a mandatory court appearance and turn it into an infraction.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the Bill?

Good morning, Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Good morning, Madam President. I rise in support of this Bill. Because protecting the fish in our state is got to be one of our most important jobs.

I believe we just passed something to protect animals from another continent. And I believe the fine was a lot higher than this \$75.

As much as I'd like to say, I would believe that this would work. I already know that most infractions are dropped before they even go to court. And when I was sitting here, I had to smirk a little bit when I heard that they wouldn't prosecute a case, a misdemeanor case, for fish.

There's a lot more serious crimes in Connecticut that are not prosecuted. In fact, gun charges are dropped, almost always. In our courts, almost always.

You know if this doesn't work, maybe we come back, we go after the fishing licenses. Or we look at something a little heavier. And we do this in hopes that, you know, the fish aren't fished out totally.

So I am going to support this and I'm going to hope that it works. I know if they don't pay the ticket and they just throw it away. There will be a warrant form for failure to pay or plead. And that could ruin their day for a little while.

But you know, our system, I think has to be evaluated completely so that we can take care of these problems.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill?

If not, I will open the voting machine. Mr. Clerk Would you please call a roll call vote.

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 929.

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered 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 929.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine is locked. Mr. Clerk please do announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 929:

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yay	35
Total voting Nay	1
Absent, not voting	0

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

The legislation is passed. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 1. Calendar number 403. Senate Bill No. 1100.
AN ACT CONCERNING THE FAILURE TO FILE FOR CERTAIN
GRAND LIST EXEMPTIONS.

THE CHAIR:

Good morning, Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

It is morning, isn't it?

THE CHAIR:

Indeed.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Good to see you Madam President.

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

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Madam President, this Bill allows taxpayers in various towns to receive a tax exemption they were otherwise would not be eligible had they not missed the filing deadline for the exemption.

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an Amendment LCO No. 10107

May he please call and I be permitted to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk if you could please call that LCO

CLERK:

LCO 10107. Senate Amendment "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Yes, Madam President. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on adoption.

Will you remark?

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Madam President, this Amendment offered by Senator Lesser on behalf of constituents taxpayers in one of his towns and allows the individuals to receive the exemption they would otherwise be entitled.

I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Senator Fonfara.

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.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Amendment is adopted because the Ayes have it. And will you remark further on the Bill as amended?

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Thank you Madam President.

The Clerk is in possession of an Amendment LCO 10105. May he please call and I be permitted to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

And Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:
LCO 10105. Senate Amendment "B".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

I move adoption, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Madam President this Amendment offered by Senator Witkos on behalf of constituent taxpayers would also allow the individuals taxpayers to receive the exemption they will be otherwise entitled to I ask passage.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the Amendment before the chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber?

If not, let me try your minds. All in favor of this Amendment please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

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?

If not I will open the vote and Mr. Clerk, would you please call the roll call vote.

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 1100 as amended by Senate "A" and "B".

An Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine is locked, Mr. Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 1100:

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yaw	35

Total voting Nay	1
Absent not voting	0

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

The legislation is adopted.

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 20 Calendar Bill 413 Substitute for House Bill number 6102. AN ACT CONCERNING A SPECIAL TAXING DISTRICT WITHIN THE CITY OF WEST HAVEN as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" LCO 8156

THE CHAIR:

And good morning, Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Good morning. It's good to see you in such an early morning.

Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage, will you remark?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes. This is a Bill involving the City of West Haven. Ironically, I, Chair Planning and Development but two Members of the Senate here both have West Haven in their district.

This is an exciting proposal for Connecticut. It's a basically almost a \$200 million project that is moving forward with great speed.

The purpose of the Bill is to permit the establishment of a special taxing district in West Haven and authorize the district to make expenditures of public and private infrastructure improvements and issue bonds to finance improvements.

At this moment, I'd like to defer to Senator Maroney who is from West Haven and is involved with the project?

THE CHAIR:

And Senator Maroney, do you accept the yield, sir?

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Yes, I do. Madam President.

Thank you Madam President. I rise in support of this Bill and I want to thank Senator Cassano for his leadership on this Bill through the Planning and Development Committee as well as Representative Vahey. For her work on this Bill, Senator Hwang and Representative Zullo, the Ranking Members.

As Senator Cassano stated, this is an economic development project which is crucial in West Haven. It is something that we are looking forward to. It will redevelop a large area of waterfront property. It's a \$200 million development, their building being built by Simon's properties, which is one of the premier mall developers in our country.

It will include up to 100 shops and up to six outdoor restaurants. It'll attract people from as far as Massachusetts in New York.

What the language in the Bill does is it creates a tax district. It's standard language for a tax district similar to what have been done with Steel Point when we did the development when the state assisted with the development of Steel Point in Bridgeport.

It allows for tax incremental financing. It allows for the district once it's created to issue bonds. Neither the state nor the city are liable for those bonds. They can issue up to \$40 million in bonds add up to a 20-year term.

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an Amendment LCO No. 9426. I ask that he call the Amendment and I be granted leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO 9426 Senate Amendment "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

This Amendment does a few things. It does clean up some of the language from the Bill as it came up from the House.

One of the things we did notice when it did -- when it came up from the House was that when it required notice, it required the taxing district to give notice to the city prior to issuing the bonds. It said that they could not issue the bonds for not less than six months after it giving notice to the

city and that was incorrect. As we know, the capital markets move quickly and bond prices change quickly. So that date should have been not less than 60 days.

In addition to requiring -- it adds another requirement in here in that the developer -- the taxing district I apologize must also notify the secretary of OPM and the Treasurer as well as the City of West Haven.

And -- yes?

THE CHAIR:

And I do apologize, and I do want to make sure that you are moving adoption of the Amendment?

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

I am moving adoption. Madam President. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

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

Good morning, Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Indeed. Good morning, Madam President. Good to see you.

Through you. We are discussing the Amendment that was just proposed.

Through you, Madam President. Could I ask some questions to the Proponent of the Bill?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. As the good Proponent cited earlier that this came up from the House and the Bill was amended in the House from the Committee Bill in which it had bipartisan and unanimous support.

Through you, Madam President. Could the Proponent explain what were the necessary changes in the House amended Bill that we now have changed from this proposed Amendment in the Senate?

Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Thank you, Senator Hwang, for your question.

And the changes from the House Amendment. One of the things that the House Amendment had done was it required to get a nationally recognized Bond Counsel to provide a statement about the bond issuance that is not changed in this Amendment. Purely in this Amendment, it is cleaning up some of the notwithstanding language, but then also the major changes are for the notice period, instead of saying not less than six months, it will say not less than 60 days.

And then in addition to being required to notify the Mayor of the City of West Haven, they have to notify the secretary of OPM and the State Treasurer.

And then it did come condense some of the requirements the way they were drafted in the original the language, it's a little long. It took

out some of that, and then it removed Section C, because it added it in to Section B.

Just the way they did it grammatically. And then it re numbered or lettered Section D in the underlying Bill to Section C.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you, Madam President.

I'm just trying to get a better understanding. Section B to Section C to Section D.

Could the good Proponent explain? What are the contents of those sections that were moved?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Yes, and actually, so nothing was moved from Section B. So Section B, was merely changed, where they changed the six months to 60 days. And then they inserted the Secretary of OPM and the State Treasurer.

And the original and -- let me get to the line numbers in here.

Okay, so just condensed in the -- what were the responsibilities upon the receipt of notification. It did say so basically said that, they would be able to go to issuance after 60 days of

notification, and it changed a few of those qualifications.

But what they did is here they went to, from Subsection B to subsection C. And in the Amendment, they added them in as Roman numerals one into the items that were in subsection C of the previous Bill, or of the underlying Bill, I apologize and also re-lettered Section D since there was no longer Section C to Section C.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Indeed, thank you, Madam President, the hour must be early ABCs have gotten to me on this.

So I appreciate the good Proponents efforts to explain. But I must say I'm I might be a little more confused even after the explanation.

But let me get to something else if I may, through you, Madam President. The House Amendment in which we're changing in this Amendment added in after the city, quote, in line 353, after city it inserted "and any fire district operating within the limits of the said city."

Through you, Madam President, what would be the intent of that? Is it incorporating fire support and coverage within the mall area? Or there was another reason?

So for a little better understanding of why that was inserted in the House Amendment as it relates to this proposed Amendment.

Through you, Madam President.

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Hwang.

West Haven has three fire districts. So I represent several towns. So in Milford where we do not have separate fire districts, the whole -- the fire department is under the municipality itself. In West Haven, there are separate fire districts that also have their own taxing authority.

And so that's why they were recognized as well because there is a -- West Haven's taxes consist of a property tax as well as a fire. They do have an assessment for the fire district.

So I believe that is why they were recognized.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you, Madam President, it says any fire district, the good Proponent, just raised the question that I just need a better clarification.

You cited three specific fire districts with their own unique taxing districts. This Bill specifically looks at that special taxing district of the mall, but in this amended Bill from the House, it says any fire district operating within the limits of the said city, are there special taxation considerations?

Because if there are three separate fire districts, would taxing districts accounting for it. Are there any special considerations of this special taxing district to account for those three distinct fire needs fire districts through you?

I hope I was able to clarify that. You got three different taxing districts for fire. But in this amended language, you said any fire district.

Are there any specific allocations of taxing from this special district to all three?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Thank you, Senator. That language did not change from the House to the Senate.

That's not part of the current Amendment. But all this does, is it gives the district taxing authority as a special taxing authority.

So the tax day fire districts have existing authority. This is creating an authority for the special taxing district, similar to what was done with Steel Point in Bridgeport, is going to be actually a similar mechanism where here, they're going to be using an added percentage on to a sales tax as a way to pay back the bonds.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you, Madam President.

Again, just the hours early and we will not belabor it. I'm just concerned that as we set up this very special taxing district, specific to the waterfront mall, which I'm so excited about, and I'm eagerly supportive of this, as you have seen in our Senate vote truly bipartisan and unanimous.

But also for legislative intent, I had to ask these questions, because the devils in the details, and if we're allocating a special taxing district, but at the same time, outside of that district, we're looking to utilize services.

Does this special district reimburse for districts and fire services outside of that district?

Just with legislative intent. Because if the good Proponent says it's very similar to Bridgeport's Steel Point, then I'll use that as a basis of how it's done that and we need not be answering it tonight.

But nevertheless, I am concerned that we are utilizing other services within this special district and not proper reimbursement to those services being utilized.

Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Thank you. This is -- it will be done similar to how it is done in Steel Point.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

And the Proponent did say this Amendment in the Senate addresses the clerical or timing from six months to 60 days.

And the good Proponent explained from a standpoint of financing and timing.

Could the good Proponent explain why the rationale move from six months to 60 days?

Through you, Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maroney

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And thank you for the question.

That was something that was noticed by the developer who was asking for the creation of this special district. And it's just the way that the capital markets work, the bond rates will change and fluctuate. And so it is harder to predict exactly what the rates would be in a six months, whereas in 60 days, you have a better idea.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. And I do want to applaud the developers who, along with the town leadership who appeared before the Planning and Development Committee and

offered their passionate support and advocacy. So I wanted to note that.

The last thing if I may, through you, Madam President.

One of the most important things for Members of the Planning and Development Committee when we reviewed the underlying original Bill, without the House Amendment and now being revised by the Senate Amendment, is that there would be no fiscal note.

There would be no fiscal note to the municipalities beyond the special district, and that there would be no fiscal note to the state.

Now, obviously, the retail marketplace impacted by COVID, as well as the changing marketplace of the cyber shopping, utilization. Retail market is a very unpredictable market.

And one of the important things that we try to do as part of the leadership on the Planning and Development committee is to protect the taxpayers of Connecticut.

So through you, Madam President, just for legislative intent, is their confirmation that there is no fiscal impact to the town, as well has to the state of Connecticut, or legal liability through this special taxing district that we are now granting through the statute?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Maroney.

SENATOR MARONEY (14TH):

Thank you, Madam President, in lines 474 through 489, it's eight states that the city and state are

not responsible so does not backed up, it has been reviewed by the Council for the City of West Haven as well as independent Bond Counsel to determine that there's no liability for either the city or the state.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, and that's exactly as I read it as well, Madam President. And I want to thank the Proponent for clarifying this in the circle for legislative intent.

And I also want to complement our Office for Fiscal Analysis for validating that there is no fiscal -- there's no fiscal note as relates to the municipalities, taxpayers, as well as our state taxpayers on this note.

So through you, Madam President, I want to thank the Proponent for this. I appreciate his time for me to better understand the Amendment as it was being drawn up in these late hours.

I want to thank Senator Cassano as the Chair, the Senate Chair of Planning and Development for shepherding this Bill through. As well as my Ranking and in House leadership. In the Planning and Development Committee. I urge support of this Bill.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Amendment? 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.

SENATORS:

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 Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Madam President, I would urge a vote on this and remind the group that the Senate circle that this was passed unanimously in Committee and in the House, and I hope we can do the same thing here.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, I will open the vote. And Mr. Clerk please announce the roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. House Bill 6102. As amended by Senate A.

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted the machine is locked. Mr. Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 6102:

Total number voting	35
Total voting Yay	35
Total voting Nay	0
Absent, not voting	1

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

The measure is passed. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you Madam President I'd like to move for immediate transmittal to the House of Representatives please.

THE CHAIR:

And so ordered sir.

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 35. Calendar No. 511. Substitute for House Bill number 650 for AN ACT CONCERNING ANIMAL WELFARE as amended by House Amendments Schedule A LCO 9152.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

This is a Bill that we so often get from our agencies, proposal that makes various changes to our animal welfare statutes.

It first requires that when an animal control officer finds or happens upon an animal that's too injured for recovery that the ACA -- ACO have that animal humanely, euthanized by a veterinarian.

This allows municipalities to appoint temporary ACOs from other town Animal Control officers, otherwise known as ACOs from other neighboring towns for up to 90 days.

It requires Regional Animal Control facilities to fire to follow the same standards and regulations as municipal pounds, also requires animal shelters to have their animals examined regularly by a licensed Vet.

It requires the Ag. Commissioner to develop a process. Currently, there is a six month containment period for rabies. Quarantine allows for a process to shorten that by a couple of months.

It also updates the feral cat program that we have here in the state of Connecticut and updates the

reimbursement amount paid to veterinarians for that purpose.

The Amendment that came up to us from the House adds provisions about telehealth -- veterinarian telehealth visits and adds a veterinary veterinarian clinic client patient relationship to those telemedicine provisions.

So, I would urge my colleagues to vote in favor of this legislation before us this evening.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further on the legislation before us? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, this Bill was not exactly what the agency asked for.

We had a rather robust conversation about a number of definitional changes.

Companion animals, animals that would come under the jurisdiction of ACOs.

There were a number of things in the original requests and after a Public Hearing and a lot of opportunity amongst leadership to talk about what we thought we could get done this year. This is really a document that represents that work that effort, those issues upon which we could get consensus.

Madam President, as the gentle lady, the Chair of the committee stated, there was a lot of effort put

in Section 4, to try and to make sure that there are circumstances under which ACOs or police end up taking into custody an animal -- that could have been for any number of reasons, but upon the examination of a veterinarian, it's been -- would be determined that the animal is so harmed. So malnourished [sic]. So disease potentially that the most humane and effective thing to do for the animal was to provide that opportunity for euthanization [sic].

Madam President, there is language in this Bill also that talks about the process by which some of our adoption agencies would have to also follow certain regulations with regard to veterinary treatment for animals that they are prepared to adopt out that may be in their custody, we have a very significant issue here in the state of Connecticut, where in people trying to do good will communicate either with an in state adoption agency or an out of state adoption agency.

The stories have become more prevalent in the circumstances are becoming more and more expensive and heart-wrenching. And so we think we believe that the Department of Agriculture recognizes that we know that they are working diligently to try and be sure that those animals are seen by a veterinarian, and then continuously monitored by a veterinarian after they come into the state of Connecticut, and are in the care and custody of -- usually nonprofit adoption agencies.

The latter part of the Bill, as the gentle lady said, has to do with what we pay a veterinarian for certain services and how we pay them.

The Spay-Neuter Program is a program that's been very successful here in the state of Connecticut, many people have been able to take the voucher, and it helps to pay for spaying or neutering cats, dogs, in an effort to try and control the population.

But what we found is that it's not really kept up with the cost of those services. Veterinarians are no different than anyone else, their staff is no different than anyone else. And so this Bill provides for some additional resources being made available to them, and also to the program.

And the last part of the Section of the Bills was discussed, which deals not only with telemedicine, but also with the actual responsibility of the veterinarian in developing a relationship with the owner of the animal.

I can tell you, from my own experience, that I'd be hard pressed other than perhaps in an emergency situation, to just walk into any veterinarian's office and get care for my cat or my dog. I think my wife feels the same way, more often than not, it's the same kind of relationship that you would have with a pediatrician, or an oncologist.

And so there is language on page 18, and page 19 that goes into some level of detail about how that relationship needs to be developed by the veterinarian. It's not just about the animal.

And so I can tell you, Madam President, that in my years of pet ownership, that relationship has been very important, especially at the end of life.

When someone's trying to make a decision whether or not an animal would recover with some additional treatment, would continue to survive with some additional treatment, or whether the time has come for an animal after a certain period of time, a certain amount of effort for that animal to be peacefully put to rest. I guess, is the best way to put it.

And so if not for that relationship, I don't think any of us would be able to come to grips with that situation.

When it comes to telemedicine, which seems to be the direction people are going, especially with the pandemic that we are still trying to get through. People have not even been able to bring their pet to -- in many cases to a veterinarian, or at least if they do, they can't accompany the animal into the animal hospital or the veterinary practice.

And so, again, it is important and there are lines in the 570 to 590 range that very clearly spell out how important it is to establish a relationship first and then do the diagnosis, ongoing diagnosis if necessary, through telemedicine, rather than having telemedicine being the vehicle by which you get to know both the patient, animal and the animal's owner.

So I rise in support of the Bill. It does a lot of good, and it does a lot of good on things that we could get consensus on without putting the Bill to -- my -- from my perspective at risk with trying to put some things in it that just -- we just couldn't get worked out.

So I do rise in support of the Bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

I rise for a question for the Proponents of the Bill, please?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Good morning, Senator. I noticed in the Bill there is a definition for a service animal. Is there a definition for a companion animal?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

I do not see a definition for a companion animal in the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Thank you, Senator. I did not see one either. And I'm wondering if there are regulations that apply to service animals that are different than companion animals, and whether that's any way impacted by this Bill?

Through you, Madam President,

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I do not know the answer to that question. To be honest with you. I don't know the answer to that question. Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator for the answer. I'm trying to clearly define the difference between service animals and companion animals, because service animals seem by definition in this Bill, talk about being trained to help people with disabilities.

Through you, Madam President, would that be correct?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And through you if the good Senator could just repeat his question, and I was trying to get an answer on the prior question.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Of course, Senator. The service animal definition talks about the animal being trained to assist people with disabilities.

The companion animal has a different definition.

So I was -- I want to make sure that they're not both entitled to the same level of access to public buildings, as the -- as the service animal.

Through you, Madam President.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

If we could just stand at ease for one minute so I can get an answer to that question.

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease.

Senator Cohen, welcome back to order.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And thank you for the allowance of time there.

And through you to the good Senator. There is no definition and statute for companion animal and regular companion animals do not get the same access as service animals.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. I appreciate that. I have no further questions.

I just -- the reason that I asked that question, Madam President is, there are public places all over the state of Connecticut that require their employees to attend, serve safe and sanitary requirements to learn how to operate in a clean and safe environment.

And service animals are certainly welcome because they handle people with disabilities.

But companion animals who oftentimes send a small fee to a website and get a name on a vest that they can wear and bring in, Madam President, sometimes are not quite the same level of service to the people.

And they oftentimes scare and intimidate other people in that public building.

So I just wanted to make sure for legislative intent that they did not have the same access opportunities as a service animal.

And I thank the good Senator for bearing with me on that.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill?

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President, through you to the Proponent this Bill.

A couple of questions.

THE CHAIR:

Senator, please proceed. Senator Cohen, prepare yourself.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you very, very much.

Through you, Madam President. I'm trying to understand the animal control -- hold on a second.

The animal population control fund. Bear with me, I apologize.

And through you, Madam President, is it administered by the State Department of Agriculture?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you Madam President. Yes, it is.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you and through you, Madam President. How is it funded?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you, Madam President.

The funding mechanism for the APCP isn't laid out in the Bill, but the program provides our low income Connecticut residents with discounted service and this Bill would increase from 10 to 20%. The maximum amount of the animal population control account funds that can be used for sterilizing and vaccinating our feral cats in the state.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you, Madam President, I appreciate the clarification. I believe it is a surcharge.

And the reason I asked that is because under the fiscal note, there is no fiscal impact. So is it part of -- the surcharge program, is it part of our budget is that part of the allocation, because based upon the office fiscal analysis, there is no fiscal impact so it is not coming out of our budget.

And through this Bill, what I'm understanding to the Proponent, we are increasing from 10% to 20%.

The -- bear with me.

So this Bill would increase from 10 to 20%. The maximum amount of animal population control count funds that may be used for sterilizing and vaccinating the feral cats, as the good Proponent mentioned.

But I just wanted, for point of legislative intent clarification. If it's out of the surcharge, it does not have a fiscal impact. And it is not part of the budgeting process.

Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I apologize that -- through you I apologize to the good Senator, because I do in fact have notes on this.

The account does come from a surcharge on dog licenses, also from various fees, adoption fees from our pounds as well. From those unsterilized cat and dog fees, proceeds from our license plates, the caring for pets license plates as well.

This is a non-lapsing separate fund, created and made up of these fees and also various donations.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, through you, Madam President. This Bill also codifies further the veterinary telemedicine.

As the Ranking Member in Public Health, as well as in Insurance, we did pass a significant landmark Bill in regards to telemedicine and delivery of care.

Through you, Madam President. I understand that tele -- veterinary services is part of that covered telemedicine statute? How is that applicable from a reimbursement side? Just for me to understand a little better the intent? How is that covered on a reimbursement side? Through you, is their statutory regulations to that?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Through you Madam President, I believe the intent of inclusion of veterinary services through the telehealth process is to simply allow that type of practice to be held in the state of Connecticut.

How individual pet insurance companies reimburse that is likely through those individual pet insurance plans.

This Bill -- under these new provisions in this Bill requires that certain relationships be set up between the veterinarian and the patient in this case, which is the animal or pet.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. I want to thank the Proponent of the Bill and her time for answering the questions that I had.

Thank you. No further questions, Ma'am.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill before the Chamber?

If not, I will open the voting machine. Mr. Clerk, would you please announce the roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. House Bill 6504. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 6504.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine is locked. Mr. Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

On Senate Bill 65404:

Total number voting	36
Total voting yay	36
Total voting Nay	0
Absent not voting	0

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

And the legislation is passed.

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 30. Calendar number 474. Substitute for House Bill number 6621, AN ACT CONCERNING ASSORTED REVISIONS AND ADDITIONS TO THE EDUCATION STATUTES, as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" LCO 8974.

THE CHAIR:

Good morning, Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

You're absolutely right, Madam President it's morning time.

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 MCCRORY (2ND):

Absolutely. We have here, House Bill 6621 LCO 8974. A very important Bill here speaks to a number of issues. I'm going to review all the sections and try to summarize them.

Section 1 speaks to the fact that basically, when a Board Education meeting is had it must reflect the questions and concerns of education, and not other priorities, that's what's required.

So we can't have random Board Meetings that have nothing to do with education purposes.

Section 2 speaks to the screening that we're going to be -- allow our school districts to use. The vision screening may be performed by a Snellen chart or an equivalent service screening device.

Section 3 speaks to a task force. This task force will be studying special educational issues, especially in cooling costs, looking at ways that we can reduce the cost of Special Education in the state of Connecticut and also provide better services for our students in the state of Connecticut.

Section 4 of this Bill deals with mental health and screening. I'll be quite honest with you, there's going to be a need for a fix of this Section. So I will hope that those who are concerned about this will be patient because there will be a fix.

It basically requires a local Boards of education, to administer social, emotional learning assessments to our students.

Sections 5 through 10 speaks to the issue of social emotional learning.

This has been paramount in education, especially because of the COVID-19 situation. What we do know as many of our students have returned and will continue to return back into our schools. And they have been affected by this virus in a manner that most people adults have. And there are so many reports that so many students are suffering from mental health issues for the lack of being isolated from their friends, their families for such a long time.

And we know that we have to prepare for different students coming to our schools. This is students who have seen -- many students have seen the loss of loved ones, parents, siblings, neighbors, grandparents, and there's a different type of child that will be in front of our classrooms.

They experienced a summer of watching television was things they have never seen kid, imagine this country have ever been through their life. They visualize that on social media, they visualize that TV, they heard these conversations and their homes, names like George Floyd, Breanna Taylor, you name it, our children have been exposed to it.

So the type of child that's coming back into our schools this year, they're going to ask certain questions. It's just a different type of child that we're educating.

We want to make sure our teachers are prepared to deal with those children, to deal with the concerns that they'd be happy to having with. Deal with anything -- anxieties, all those things that go on

to making sure our children are comfortable in those classrooms when they come back.

So I don't want to bore you and go through each section. But again, all the sections from five to 10. All are related to social, emotional learning, some of them in a manner of making sure that the teachers have the correct professional development.

In Section 7, we're looking to -- look to our school bullying laws and our school climate plans and make them readily available.

We want to make sure that this social, emotional learning is culturally relevant, and have restorative practices to it. Again, for all those reasons I mentioned early, a different child was coming to our classrooms and we must be prepared for them.

We want to require and make sure our relationships with our SRO as they are in our schools that made sure that SRO also go through this training. For again, you're looking at a different child in 20 - in the school districts.

We also want to require, in our teacher professional development requires those school districts to be - to have restorative practices and professional health plans. And also make sure that all individual all those that have any contact with our students, whether they be teachers, social workers, guide housing, counsel, have professional development.

Sections 11 through 12 speaks to our school Para-education Advisory Council. One of the things we're doing with our Para-education Advisory Council is we're going to change this name to Para-professional Advisory Council.

We're going to also have this counsels do a study on how we can do better for their pay and their professional development.

People don't realize the paraprofessionals are sometimes the most important people in our schools, they have their own personal relationships with our children, and sometimes they can reach our children better than the teachers themselves.

We also want to add some members to our Safe School Climate Committee. Some of the members we want to include will be, if it is a high school, a high school teacher. If it's a -- they're in elementary or middle school, someone who was part of mental health evaluation team, and at least one teacher appointed by the teachers organization.

And finally, Madam President, Section 15, which also may need a little work, but this is where we talk about virtual learning.

You think about it. When COVID-19 hit our state, most of our schools this is we're not prepared. There was a lack of preparation. However, there were some school districts who were prepared. And what we demonstrated saw there was a lack of technology that are available across the board.

So what we do know as we move forward, the federal education, Virtual Education will be here for now and in infinity, and we want to make sure that every school district in the state of Connecticut is prepared.

If we ever have to go through this exercise again, that all our school districts will be prepared, all of them be up -- all the technology will be available. And we will see the discrepancy that we saw during COVID-19.

So with that being said, Madam President, I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

The question -- let me ask you if you will remark further on the Bill. And Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Good morning, Madam President, and I will be brief in my remarks the hour is getting late.

I thank my good Chair of the Education Committee for a great summarization of the Bill and the key components.

You know, we we've made some good adjustments through this legislation with respect to how we interact with Boards with vision tests, and whatnot.

But I think the most important element in here is the addressing the social emotional needs of our children in our schools.

And this Bill sets forth some very good standards and parameters for how we will make those assessments. I think that ultimately those assessments will allow us to interact better with the legislation we passed an hour ago here, with regard to the success and academic plans that we're now going to lay out for those students.

If we do not have a good understanding of the emotional and social challenges that a student or child is facing, it's going to be hard for us and for our educators that we trust and rely upon in all of our great public schools across Connecticut.

It's going to be difficult for them to create plans that really match the needs of the students. So this Bill addresses that very carefully.

You know, we received -- many of us, all of us, I suppose, received hundreds, if not thousands, of Postcards from educators across the state. And one of the very important issues that they addressed on those postcards to us, was the need to address the

social and emotional needs of our -- the need to address those concerns about social and emotional aspects.

We learned an awful lot for better or worse during the course of the last 16 months, about the effect of this pandemic on children.

And maybe as adults, we manage things better, because we're adults, we have more experiences to call upon, we bring maturity, we are able to handle things better, perhaps.

But we learned an awful lot about the children that are in our schools. And I think it's important that we have a mechanism for addressing the social emotional piece going forward, and that we're doing valid and important assessments.

I'm also happy -- was happy to ensure that we included a component for our school resource officers to also be trained on how social emotional needs are addressed, and what some of our students are doing.

I'm a big advocate for SROs. I think they serve an important role in our schools. For you know, another adult that a child can interact with. They're providing counsel and guidance and they should be properly trained to deal with those social issues and emotional issues.

The last piece that the good Chair spoke to that I also am happy to see is the provision in here for the development of a virtual learning plan.

Nothing was more disheartening, and this was not unique to a city school or a suburban school or a rural school district. This happened all over Connecticut without regard to, to any unique factor.

But we had schools in Connecticut that were completely incapable and unprepared to, to go into any kind of virtual environment at all.

And I know we've had other legislation that we've looked at this session with respect to access points for internet and I know even in some of my districts within my school districts within my Senate district, we had some very creative and innovative deployment of technology, because we cannot assume that -- again, regardless of where this child lives, whatever town or city that they're in, that they automatically have a Chromebook, or a laptop or a tablet, or what have you to get on the internet, or let alone don't have access to the internet.

So a virtual learning plan will address not only those components, but will also put into place a model and a curriculum that can be followed.

And one of the things that we spoke about so much in the Education Committee was making sure that that we're able to assess where our children are in their learning. And this is something that we still will be working on as we get back to -- God Willing is a normal school year in September, what are schools closing, you know, now, and over the next couple of weeks for the current school year, those assessments will be very important for us if we do find ourselves -- God forbid, and back in a, in a shutdown type situation, or, you know, in a situation where our children can't be in school, we have to address this, we cannot go through another school year, where we have children that aren't able to learn. That they don't have access to education.

That's not acceptable. So this Bill begins to address a part of that with having a virtual learning plan. So I know there are other questions from some of my colleagues around the circle. So I will end my remarks here. But I urge passage of this very important piece of legislation.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further?

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President, I rise in support of this Bill, and the emphasis on the terrific dynamic, and the working relationship of the Ranking and Chairs of the Education Committee.

It's been a tumultuous year. And truly, I look at the leadership of this Committee and leading by example, in the collaboration and the respect that you have for each other as you move through the process. And the end product of this Bill is addressing the social, emotional dynamic of education throughout.

Through you to the -- to the Proponent of the Bill on both levels, to the Chair and Ranking. One of the biggest aspects of social emotional learning is the dynamic of students interaction, particularly in the past 16 months of the COVID pandemic, the effect of virtual and hybrid learning has well has right now, the unique challenge that has a state of Connecticut has done a fantastic job in regards to the safety standards of vaccination, as well as the incidences of COVID infections that we have opened up our state that as of May 19th.

We have opened up our state for businesses, and for those that are vaccinated to have masks removed. But we still have a mask requirement in our schools. We have a mask requirement, impacting our daycares, nursery schools, and elementary and preschool.

Through you, Madam President, I would like to ask you, the Proponents, and the advocates in education

as it relates to social emotional dynamics. Are there considerations within the Committee's deliberation of this Bill, to addressing the mask mandate requirement in our schools as it impacts, possibly the social emotional learning dynamics that is so important in this Bill?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Thank you to you, Madam President.

And that's a very good question. We do know, the fact that because of the situation that we're in that our government required us to wear masks where our students wear masks in school.

And clearly that has affected many of our students, especially students with Special Needs. And we have been working around that. But quite frankly, unfortunately, that isn't really an educational committee issue.

That's really more of a Public Health issue. And we're just following the guidelines for Public Health. So I will say to you, Madam President, that that will be my response that we do have -- we do take that consideration. We do that -- we do that -- we do realize that wearing a mask can modify the social emotional behaviors and attitudes and dispositions in our schools. However, we are following the guidelines as set forth by another part our government and that's what we're going to do.

Thank you, through you, Madam President.

Senator, Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Through you, Madam President, I appreciate the good Chair's perspective. And I agree, at present, it is the purview of the Department of Public Health, as well as the Office of Early Childhood Education.

Perhaps, if I may, understanding the importance of the committee's role. And the importance and understanding the dynamics of social emotional learning, has evident by the great work of the Committee leadership and the Committee in presenting this Bill, and addressing so many elements of it.

Indeed, perhaps that we should consider some of the legislative intent of incorporating the Department of Education on these kind of suggestions.

Because one of the things that I've learned, one of the things that I have appreciated from the work and testimonies that I've heard in the Education Committee public hearings is this, social emotional learning is not an isolated learning dynamic. It is an entire ecosystem, in which multiple facets impact of wellbeing of a child.

The interaction with adults, the interaction with their peers, the interaction after with their Household settings. And the fact that the uniqueness or the isolation that a child may feel, contributes to the sense of bullying contributes to the sense of not belonging.

So through you, Madam President, I want to thank and take this moment to applaud the good work of the Ranking and the Chairs of the Education Committee.

But I also want to point out the fact that as we explored the dynamic of social emotional learning, that one of the issues that is important that we do need to address and keeping a level of consistency that we have applied through all facets of

Connecticut, that we should re-evaluate the application and the requirement at present of masks in our schools.

And if we should have a science-based analysis, science and fact-based presentation for the state, through its public health, through its Office of Early Childhood Education, through the input of the Department of Education, to be able to provide guidelines, and expectations and management process, so that our families and our parents and our children get the optimal opportunity to succeed, because it is all about the opportunity to have an engaged and vibrant and successful social emotional learning dynamic.

So I want to thank the Chair and the Ranking for proposing this Bill and raising the important issue of social emotional learning. But nevertheless, we shouldn't just stop there. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill? If not, I will open the vote. And Mr. Clerk if you would please announce the roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. House Bill 6621. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted the machine is locked. Mr. Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

On Senate Bill 6621:

Total voting	36
Total voting Yay	35
Total voting Nay	1
Absent not voting	0

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

Legislation is adopted -- is passed.

Mr. Clerk

CLERK:

Page 35 Calendar Number 513. House Bill number 6622,
AN ACT CONCERNING PRESCRIPTION DRUG FORMULARY AND
LIST OF COVERED DRUGS as amended by House Amendment
Schedule "A" LCO 9290.

THE CHAIR:

Good morning, Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Good morning, Madam President.

Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint
Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill
in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, this Bill prevents an insurance plan from shifting a drug out of its formulary or to a different tier within a plan year.

It is a Consumer Protection Bill. And I want to explain what it does. By way of analogy.

If a person were to offer to sell you a car, say Mercedes, and instead they deliver my beat up 10-year old Chevy, that would be a bait and switch.

And yet, people in this state who go out and purchase health insurance plans either individually on the exchange or they're offered a number of options by their employer, they go and they look at they see what the formulary is. And for folks with particularly complex conditions, sometimes that's very important, that could be a matter of absolute importance.

And yet, under the current practice, an insurance company is permitted to switch the formulary mid-year.

So a person who in good faith went out and purchased one plan finds that they have a very different plan. Madam President, this Bill would prevent that, it would say that you cannot do that, unless the FDA has issued an announcement guidance or similar statement questioning a drug's clinical safety or if the cost is under \$40. Or if a drug becomes a generic mid-year.

But other than that, what you're offering should be what you get. And that sort of principle of common sense should apply to insurance.

Now, I will say I've spoken to the industry, I understand their rationale, which is they are concerned that a pharmaceutical company could elect to raise prices mid-year, and then they'd be holding the back.

And I understand that concern. But that should be addressed contractually between a pharmaceutical -- pharmacy benefit manager and the pharmaceutical manufacturer, and not be put on the backs of the patient.

Madam President, we've heard a lot from different disease advocacy groups, from members of the public who shared their concerns and once again, petition this legislature to take this action that we're talking about today. I want to highlight one in particular.

Ms. Pamela Greenberg of Glastonbury. She's an MS patient. But she talked about how the lack of consistency in her formulary meant that that her cholesterol medications kept on falling off of her formulary. So her -- the amount that she has to pay per month would vary from \$30 to \$125.

She thought she was getting Plan A and in fact, she got Plan B. This is a common sense Bill, and Madam President, I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator, will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good to see you again.

Through you, Madam President, some questions and just point of clarification from the Proponent this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, ma'am. Through you, Madam President. This Bill was amended in the House.

Could the good Proponent of the Bill explain, for legislative intent, what were the proposed legislative changes on the amended Bill from the House?

Through you, Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

So the Amendment adopted by the House in House Amendment requires Office of Health strategy to conduct a study on whether or not freezing formulary has an overall increase on commercial health plans in the state of Connecticut.

And then provide an annual report to the legislature detailing the impact of that law.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you very much. I want to thank the Proponent for the answer.

Indeed, that is the new addition to be able to capture the data and to better understand the various formularies and the guidelines that was outlined here

Through Madam President, again, what were the criteria of measure -- I believe the Proponent mentioned no more than \$40 and time date to it.

But what were the guidelines to ensure that the formulary changes had parameters of guardrails and guidelines to ensure that the consumers are protected through this Bill?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Well, Madam President, the Bill in general prevents an insurance plan from moving a drug to a higher cost tier or removing it altogether.

There are a few exceptions, and the good Senator did reference a couple.

So there is an exception if the tear is \$40 or less per month.

There's an exception that I mentioned earlier, if the FDA issues guidance, that the drug is not safe, or although there is a safeguard in that event where if a physician determines that the drug is medically necessary, if the drug is approved for over-the-counter use during the plan year, or if a generic is made available.

Those are the exceptions listed within the Bill.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, I want to thank the good Proponent for those examples. Indeed, as I read it as well, FDA safety guidelines, the use of over the counter, as well as generic drugs are examples in which the formularies could be changed and adapted.

I want to thank the good Chair for validating that for legislative intent.

Now, this is a Bill that recognizes the incredibly high cost of prescription drugs and recognizing the fact that this is a component, as we in the legislative body in the Insurance Committee as well as throughout various committees try to address the high cost of health care insurance.

Through you, Madam President. It is a consumer-sensitive and protection of the consumers be able to get the best possible care possible, but through you. What were the feedback of the experts that the good Proponent talked about in two examples that were mentioned? Pharmaceutical companies and benefit managers? What were their testimony in regards to this Bill? And how did they react to that?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. As I as I actually indicated when I was first explaining the Bill, both of them are opposed to arguing that it reduces their leverage in negotiating with a pharmaceutical companies and I take them at their word.

We just suggest that that they include a year-long provision in their contracts to prevent them being held to the bag.

But I it's not my job or our job, I think to give negotiating tips to those market participants, but there they were worried that it would reduce their leverage. They did not seem to express concern for the, the patients who would -- may no longer have access to the drugs that they need.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

Through you, Madam President, I would beg to differ on that. I think anybody who's providing healthcare, particularly insurance and benefit managers, their first and foremost priority should be and needs to be the wellbeing and the health of their respective insured.

So I don't think they're looking to take any shortcuts. And if any, do they should be held accountable.

I'm going to pivot a little bit and go back to the analogy that was raised by the good Proponent.

I believe, paraphrasing, the analogy was the potential of bait and switch, that you have the premise of driving a very high-end car, and then bait to a switch at the end of being able to drive a 10-year-old truck. I think that was the analogy.

As I think of that analogy, and I'm thinking to myself, you know, I've got a 10 year old Honda Accord. And I have a fancy new Toyota. But both do the job that is absolutely necessary. It gets me from point A to point B safely.

It isn't about the style points. It isn't about the high label of generic versus a brand label name. It is about doing the job.

It is about the opportunity to be able to re-evaluate and to be able to do what is best to contain cost while providing the highest best care. So I'm not as never you give me a 10-year-old Honda Accord, I will drive it because it gets me there safe.

So if there is a possibility of changing formularies to an over-the-counter, or a generic drug, I would think that the benefit managers would know best individuals that are dealing with this with multiple, multiple experiences would do so.

Maybe they're not his swayed by the style points, by the visuals. I think all they care about and all we should care about is providing the best possible care at the most economical cost. Isn't that the premise that we're striving for? Isn't that the premise we're striving for and saying health care costs are unsustainable, and that the consumers are getting hurt?

And if we could deliver the care, and the prescription drug to address the issue, through over-the-counter through generics. Shouldn't we try to do that?

The analogy that was raised by the Proponent made that clear to me, it isn't about the style, it isn't about the fanciness. It's about what is the most cost-effective way to addressing the problem at hand.

So I appreciate the Proponent of this Bill in regard to that. And I will be supporting this Bill because there are guidelines put in statute.

But I think the easy way of casting blame and dispersion for the high cost of health insurance cost. And the high cost of delivering, should be approached in a much more profound and a much more thoughtful way than rather just casting blame. But recognizing that we could do things in a collaborative, thoughtful, economic way, and not take style point cheap shots.

So through you, Madam President, I appreciate the Proponent of this Bill, and I am eager to hear other points of conversation.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Well, you are you mark further on the Bill? Senator Anwar. Good morning.

SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):

Good morning. Good morning, Madam President. Hope everyone is well rested.

I just rise to support the amended Bill 6622 and want to share my strong support for this Bill.

Madam President, as I speak, I also feel I'm speaking on behalf of the victims in the state of Connecticut who are victims of the bait and switch tactics that have been employed by the insurance.

And I use the word victims and I will try and talk about the reason. I'm using the word victims based on data based on actual numbers.

And I think it's important because the recent comments about a car and a style, well, there is a car that takes you to a place the other car takes you to no place and takes you actually results in an accident. That is what the analogy should be. And I think that's worthy to look at.

So I also want to highlight the issue that the chronic diseases in our community are a part of the expenses and the care of chronic disease remains a big challenge.

And right now in our state, and in our country, it's across the board situation in the entire country. And I will share some of that data with you in a second.

I think it's important to recognize that in United States, we pay the highest cost of medications in the world. And we are the ones who are making the most medicines in the world.

So we pay the highest cost. And interesting fact is that the only country in the planet, which has entities called PBMs, is United States. And I leave it for people to do homework because not a lot of books have been written because their data and information is not as easily accessible. But in the coming weeks and months, I'm hoping to be able to educate people on how that system works. And their job, according to their testimony was to reduce the burden of the insurance industry, at whatever costs, not at the cost of the patients.

That is their words, and I'm just saying what they did, because I asked them that point blank question. Are you interested in the patients? Are you interested in the people who employ you to save the money? And their answer was we are interested to work for the people who employed us in patients are not their priority, their words. And that is something that the Proponents of PBMs will have to deal with.

The study in 2016, from global health living Foundation, talked about the bait and switch tactics. And 68% of the patients with chronic illnesses had their medicines changed. 68% of the patients had their medicines changed in 2016.

And three out of the four whose medicines were changed could not afford the new medicines. So when they were changed from one tier to the next. And then and this is something that we cannot argue about. The reason we cannot argue about is that the people listening are all victims, this is happening every single day, it is an epidemic of the cost that is happening in our communities.

So the ones who actually could not afford the new the same medicines that they were on, they had to switch to the new medicine that they were required to have. And 60% of them said that the efficacy of those medicines, medicines was less than what they were on before. This is 2016 data.

In 2019, Alliance for Patients accessed the study again. And 60% of the patients who had the medicines changed, they had complications with the new medicines.

So now from the previous data, we know that 68% will require to change the medicines and the ones will change them as medicine 60% of them are going to have complications with it and one out of those 10 or 10% of those individuals will have a complication enough to land them in a hospital.

And that is why I say they're victims in our state in our community. Because of this practice.

40% of the individuals who were studied could not care for their family members, children, or the spouse because of the change in the medications. And it was respiratory issues or cardiac issues and so on, or they were directly impacted. So their functionality was compromised.

And I can also say that 20% of the people said that they were not able to fill their prescriptions. And many of them about 20% -- and this is Connecticut now.

20% of the people in the state of Connecticut who are victims of this strategy, or maybe some people would like to call it fraud, but some of these people would actually go ahead and say that they are not able to afford the medicines so they actually don't fulfill their prescriptions -- fill their prescriptions or they reduce the dose on their own, to have the medicines last for longer.

So I just wanted to thank all the people who have been involved in this effort of this Bill to move forward and also hopefully try to -- start to address the challenge. This is not going to address the entire challenge. But it's a step in the right direction and a very strong step in the right direction.

I wanted to thank Senator Lesser for his leadership and also Senator Looney for his leadership and making this into a priority. So we truly -- I truly appreciate it. And I know, as I speak to the patients, and I talk about this Bill, they are excited and they say it's about time somebody did this.

And then after this Bill passes, hopefully, this passes and becomes a law. I'm hoping that around the circle, we can start to look at strategies that why do we have to fight these mechanisms and then things that the insurance industry is doing to harm the patient's wellbeing at times.

And I'm using strong language because it is a strong language because I have seen patients hurt and be impacted.

And we will have to figure out that we have to have a long term strategy and have serious conversation about the long term plans that the insurance industry has in and they would have to look at their calculations, but not at the cost of lives, and the quality of life of our citizens. Thank you, Madam

President. And I am hoping my colleagues will support this Bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Anwar. Will you remark further on the Bill? Good morning, Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Good morning, Madam President.

I'm following this somewhat. And I just want to make sure that I have it.

So I do have a couple questions for the Proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, through you, Madam President, if I understand this correctly, part of what we want to stop with this Bill is the increasing cost of medication halfway through a contract. Is that is that correct?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Now, they were talking about moving it from one tier to another? I'm not quite familiar with that. But is that what they're referring to is if it goes from one tier to another, is that the way it's increasing that cost?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, through you, there, are two ways you could increase cost one, they could just remove the drug from the formulary or two, they could move it to a higher cost tier which would increase the patient's out-of-pocket responsibility. So there, this would prevent that.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And I'm sorry, I'm not up on all the terms. But you said removed from the formulary? Could you just explain that a little more for me, I'm sorry.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

A formula formulary is a list of covered prescription drugs.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And thank you, I wasn't quite sure what that meant.

So if I need a medication for something wrong with the skin, and the doctor gives me one medication, I and use it. I use it on my hands to wash my hands. And halfway through, he switches that medication and it stops working. This is what we want to stop?

Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Through you, Madam President, the Bill doesn't stop doctors from prescribing. What it does is it prevents an insurance company from deciding midway through a plan year that it no longer wants to cover a drug that the patient had signed up for.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

And I think this happened to my wife with the medication she had, she walked into the pharmacy, and they gave her a different one. And when she left, she couldn't understand why they did and they said something about the insurance company. And that medication did not work. In fact, she ended up back at the doctor within just a couple days.

So if I'm correct, that's what we're preventing here?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

It's hard to know exactly what happened in that particular instance. But if the issue was that the in midway through the plan year the insurance company had decided to discontinue a previously covered pharmaceutical or moved it to a higher cost here, then yes, the Bill would prevent that.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

I now have it. Thank you, Madam President. And thank you to the Proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill? If not, I will open the machine.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President speaking in support of the Bill, I wanted to thank Senator Lesser, his Co-Chair and the Insurance and Real Estate Committee for bringing this Bill forward.

The difference between the Bill and the previous versions of it is that it does contain the mandated study. Now that will keep track of whether or not there is in fact any added cost as a result of this, of this provision.

But it isn't Important to note as the Senator said, and bring out the Bill that what we're concerned about here is a situation in which a patient may have chosen a certain policy or a certain coverage, specifically because it contained coverage of a single specific medicine.

And that might be a specialty medicine to treat a condition. And the patient after shopping around was assured that this would be the best coverage because it does, perhaps cover medication that other plans that the patient examined, did not cover.

And then to have the rug pulled out from under that patient in the course of the year for which a premium has been paid, and find out that it is no longer in the formula, namely, no longer in the list of covered drugs, really is just a painful situation for someone who may depend for health or maybe even for life on that medication.

But as Senator Lesser said, it is -- there is not an absolute bar on removing drugs from the formulary, it is has the reasonable provision, that it does allow a carrier to remove a drug, or rather to move a drug to a higher cost-sharing tier, if it is available in network for \$40 or less per month in any tier.

So this is again, dealing with the situation where patients may be paying a great deal of money for the drug, and then all of a sudden discovered that it is not covered or rather, they would be paying a great deal of money without the coverage and all of a sudden are facing that what might be a huge Bill because that drug is no longer covered.

It also would allow a carrier to move a brand name drug to a higher cost sharing tier, if at the same time, it also adds an FDA-approved generic alternative to the formula at a lower cost tier than the brand name drugs.

So there are protections built into this that are reasonable, that recognize the need for cost savings, wherever possible.

But are is primarily aimed at preventing the stark situation from someone who may have insurance coverage so that the cost of a certain drug is affordable, perhaps with a reasonable copay. And all of a sudden finding out that drug is not covered at all. And in a dire situation because the drug is completely unaffordable without the coverage.

So it's a good Consumer Protection Bill. Madam President, and the study provision that was added in does keep will allow for keeping track of whether or not there is a market impact to doing this.

So under the study requirement, the Office of Health strategies, at least annually, we'll have to conduct a study to determine the financial impact of the

Bills requirements on the cost of commercial health plans.

So it is done in a way I think, Madam President that is aware of the dual goals of cost containment, but also Patient Protection.

So I would urge us support of this Bill, Madam President, in concurrence with the House of Representatives. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, I'll open the voting machine. Mr. Clerk please announce the roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. House Bill 6622. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 6622.

An immediate media roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. House Bill 6622.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? Have all those Senators voted? The machine is locked Mr. Clerk Please announce the tally.

CLERK:

On House Bill 6622:

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yay	33
Total voting Nay	3

Absent not voting 0

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

The legislation passes. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 26. Calendar No. 454 House Bill number 6629. AN
ACT CONCERNING THE COLLECTION AND REMITTANCE OF THE
E 911. FEE BY MARKETPLACE FACILITATORS.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

It is still morning, isn't it?

THE CHAIR:

It is. Good morning, Senator.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Good morning to you, Madam President. I move for
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 FONFARA (1ST):

Madam President, this Bill makes marketplace facilitators such as Amazon and eBay retailers for the purposes of collecting and remitting the prepaid wireless E-911 fee, which supports the state's enhanced emergency 911 program.

I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise to support this Bill.

Back in January, January I learned the direct sellers of these prepaid and cell phones, such as AT&T and Verizon would charge and collect and remit 1% fee to the 911 telecommunications fund.

And also learned at the same time that there were those sellers such as eBay, and Amazon were not charging collecting and remitting.

So this Bill corrects that and makes those direct sellers pay that fees collected and paid.

So I urge passage of this Bill. Thank you, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, I will open the voting machine and Mr. Clerk Please announce the roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered

in the Senate. House Bill 6629. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 6629.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine is locked. Mr. Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

On House Bill 6629.

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yea	35
Total voting Nay	1
Absent, not voting	0

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

The measure is passed. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 32 Calendar Number 499. House Bill number 6564.
AN ACT CONCERNING SECONDHAND DEALERS, PRECIOUS METALS OR STONES DEALERS, AND PAWNBROKERS.

THE CHAIR:

Good morning, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Good morning, 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 WINFIELD (10TH):

Shortly I will, Madam President, this Bill comes to us from Judiciary. It allows for additional second-hand dealers, precious metal and or stolen dealers who are licensed as pawn brokers top-rated pawn brokers do, that would mean that they could cash checks for some of their clients, they could pay the check and cash the check.

It eliminates the sunset date on that action, and in most from five to 10 days after a transaction that the properties would be held.

I urge passage.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Good morning, Madam President. Great to see you this morning.

I stand in support of the Bill as well. Again, as stated by the Chair, it extends the date. And this check-cashing provision is a valuable function used by a lot of folks and if that evaporated, it would indeed in my opinion, cause them hardship, and so happy to support the Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the Bill before us? If not, I will open the voting machine. Mr. Clerk please call the roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. House Bill 6564. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine is locked. Mr. Clerk announce the tally please.

CLERK:

On House Bill 6564:

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yay	34
Total voting Nay	2
Absent, not voting	0

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

The Bill passes. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 23. Calendar No. 436. House Bill number 6588. AN ACT CONCERNING MENTAL HEALTH CARE AND SUBSTANCE ABUSE SERVICES. As amended by House Amendments Schedule A LCO 8402.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Good morning again. Madam President.

Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, Madam President, Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an Amendment LCO 9991. I ask that the Clerk, please call the Amendment and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO 9991. Senate Amendment "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes. Madam Clerk -- Madam Clerk-- Madam President, the Amendment strikes Section 5.

That section was substantially included in Senate Bill 1, which has already passed this Chamber and is therefore not necessary in this Bill. And I want to thank Representative Dathan for her work on that Section.

I urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Lesser. And you have moved adoption. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. Good morning again, Madam President.

Through you, on the Amendment, the striking of the entire section of 5 could the good Proponent, explain what was in section 5 and what was struck and why? And if he had repeated it, I apologize. I might have missed it. But I don't think I heard it.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, thank you. The House had proposed creating a peer support taskforce to look at issues related to compensation for peer support services. That was a good idea. And that's why it was included in Section 18 of Senate Bill 1, which has passed both Chambers and is sitting on the Governor's desk and is no longer necessary.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I appreciate the clarification. IT makes sense to me. So thank you.

Through you, I don't know what the process and the procedure is, we are looking at a new Amendment to the amended Bill from the House. I don't know if it's appropriate, or should we wait till the

adoption of this Amendment to find out what were the changes made in the Amendment in the House that we are undertaking? I don't know what the procedural process is.

Through you, Madam President. Maybe you can provide some guidance.

THE CHAIR:

Why don't we just stick to the Amendment at hand and then we can further discuss the Bill after the Amendment is adopted? If it is.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

That's terrific. Thank you for the guidance. And with that said, I want to thank the Proponent of the Amendment and the explanation of the removal of section 5 and the rationale that it was placed into portions of Senate Bill 1.

I would support ma'am.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Amendment that is before the Chamber? Will you remark further on the Amendment before the Chamber? If not, let me try your minds.

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

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted.

Will you remark further on the Bill as amended?

Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

And I will do that until I will answer I think the question that Senator Hwang was attempting to ask earlier.

The two surviving portions of the Bill relates to the prescription of clinically inappropriate psychotropic drugs, it says that no -- insurance policy should not be issuing more psychotropic drugs than a provider deems necessary.

And it also creates a task force to determine what we can do to improve the number of mental health providers who participate in network on insurance plans.

I urge adoption -- passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Passage. Thank you, Senator Lesser. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I want to thank the Proponent for making that explanation, even before I asked.

So thank you. And with that being said, I think it's a very important Bill as it relates to the mental health and substance abuse services within our state.

The specific explanation in regards to specific appointments in the area of expertise is welcomed.

I want to commend and thank the Ranking House Member as well as the Chair for their contributions on this.

So I urge supported on this Bill.

Thank you, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as amended? Senator Lesser.

SENATOR LESSER (9TH):

Madam President hearing no objection. I urge a roll call vote.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you a roll call vote will be taken. Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

I will open the voting machine and Mr. Clerk, please announce the roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 6588. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate on House Bill 6588.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? The machine is locked. Mr. Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill 6588:

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yay	36
Total voting Nay	0
Absent not voting	0

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

The legislation passes. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 25. Calendar No. 448. Substitute for House Bill number 6417. AN ACT REQUIRING BACKGROUND CHECKS FOR CERTAIN EMPLOYEES OF YOUTH CAMPS AND YOUTH SPORTS COACHES, TRAINERS AND INSTRUCTORS as amended by House Amendment Schedule A LCO 8825.

THE CHAIR:

Good morning, Senator Anwar.

SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):

Good morning, Madam President.

Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill in concurrence with the House of Representatives.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):

Yes, Madam President.

Madam President, I wanted to just give a little bit of a background for everybody's understanding why we are going to be looking at this Bill.

We all teach our children to be careful about strangers. Youth sports are part of our life in a healthy life of children. That's the time when they make friendships, they have team building activity, and they reduce their screen time and develop healthy lifestyles.

That's very critical for every child. And similarly, for youth camps. These are fun activities. These are friendship generating activities, team building efforts as well.

And the parents and the guardians trusted children with the strangers that have been hired by the organizations. And these organizations have the best interest of our children.

According to the CDC, volunteers should be treated the same as an official coach and subjected to the same background checks and expectations.

And one of the things that we have seen in some of the situations is that what we refer to as a warm body syndrome, which means that anybody who has a beating heart or who's saying that they were willing to coach are volunteered into doing the job.

And then many of the times are almost -- most of the times these individuals want to do the best for the children and help out.

But the other ground reality we have to recognize is that one in four girls and one in six boys in United States are sexually abused by the age of 18.

This is as per the US Centers for Disease Control and Prevention, and 90% of the abusers are someone who the child knows. I think that's part of the challenge that we have to be aware of child predators are looking for jobs and opportunities where they can get easy access to children.

And this law is going to start to look at a way to address this challenge and have a prevention strategy in place.

Every parent and is interested to have their children protected. Every adult is interested to have the children protected, and many of the states have already have laws as of January 12, 2021. The states that have enacted background checks requirement for volunteers of non- school associated activities of youth sports and athletics are Alabama, California, Florida, Massachusetts, Mississippi, Nevada, New Hampshire, Oklahoma, Oregon, and Pennsylvania.

And Madam President this Bill 6417. As amended and approved by the House, looks at two broad categories.

Section 1 looks at the youth camps. And Section 2 looks at the youth sports coaches, trainers, and instructors.

So Section 1 is -- when enacted for anybody who is over the age of 18 by October 1 2022 is going to be required to go through two of the options, either a, which would be a criminal history and check through the state police and also having their electronic records with the judicial department checked from the judicial history, but also their names and date of birth would be checked on the state child abuse registry, state sex abuse registry and the National Sex Offender Registry that is maintained by the US Department of Justice.

So that's going to be one way of making sure that we do the background check on these individuals, or so. The other option is to use a third party national criminal history record history check as well.

The second part that I'm talking about with a third party was part of the Amendment that was made in the House. And then that is looking at having another

option for a national organization to be able to assess that.

Section 2 is looking at the youth sports coaches and trainers and instructors were, they're going to look at the criminal history again and with the state police and make sure we have the electronic records from the judicial branch of the government, we will look at the state child abuse registry and state sex offender registry for these individuals also look at a National Sex Offender Registry.

And another option would be to do a third party assessment from a national industry, which you can do a background check. And that would be according to the US Olympics or Paralympics criteria.

And these checks would be done every five years. And then there's going to be one that should be done. And after that, if the person is appropriate and has been working, they would be able to get another one in another five years.

So this is a brief summary of what the Bill does. Madam President, this is a step in the right direction. As I have illustrated the challenge that the CDC has recommended, we want to have a uniform strategy across our state and join other states to protect our children.

And I urge my colleagues to support this. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Anwar. Will you remark further? Senator Martin? Good morning.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

It is early morning. Thank you, Madam President, I rise to support this piece of legislation and my

good colleague can grab a seat. I am not going to ask any questions this evening.

But I do rise to support this piece of legislation. And the good Senator did a great job of being -- describing what this Bill does. So I'm not going to go into that.

But I do want to make -- I want to highlight how this important piece of legislation really seeks to protect our children from really bad actors that could possibly seek to do them some harm.

You know, we're talking about, you know, volunteers that may be a part of a youth or they may be a coach, they may be a volunteer for a team, they may work for municipality who may be putting on a camp, they may work for an approved organization or youth camp organization that is hired by the Office of Child development --excuse me, the Office of Carly Childhood.

And so this Bill addresses the possibility of the bad players and when determining what programs these children attend over the summer. You know, some of these sports programs in a parent's primary focus, is really on enriching their children's social and their education, and the extra-curricular activity that they're participating in.

The last thing that they really want to be concerned about, whether it's a part parent or guardian, is whether these coaches are volunteers. Whoever these camps hire, are qualified, are qualified individuals.

So I think by us vetting by vetting those individuals and asking for a background check is vital. They are -- some of these individuals are going to be supervising our kids without anyone overseeing them. So I think we're better -- we'll be better by preventing any future scarring. You know,

living these changing events that may occur. We'd be preventing some of this stuff.

So you know, we really do -- our parents really deserve to know, with complete confidence that we've done everything to safeguard their children when they come to these camps.

So Madam President, I thank you for the opportunity to speak on this issue. And I urge all my colleagues to support this Bill.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin. Will you remark further on the legislation before us? Will you embark further? If not, I will open the voting machine. Mr. Clerk, please announce the roll call vote.

CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate. House Bill 6417. An immediate roll call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? The machine is locked Mr. Clerk Please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 6417:

Total number voting	35
Total voting Yay	35
Total voting Nay	0
Absent, not voting	1

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

Legislation passes. Mr. Clerk

CLERK:

Page 2 Calendar number 82. Senate Bill number 867.
AN ACT CONCERNING INVESTMENT OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL
FUNDS.

THE CHAIR:

Good morning, Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Good morning, Madam President. It's almost three o'clock. And I'm thrilled to be moving acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

And the question is on passage. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, Madam President. This is a good Bill. It's a simple Bill.

We have 169 municipalities here in the state of Connecticut. For the smaller municipalities, they don't really have a lot of ways to raise funds, but they do have trust funds and so on that they invest, as well as up to the largest, city of Bridgeport, and each has that opportunity.

However, what this Bill does is allows those municipalities to pool their funds by having the

Treasurer invest those funds, by doing that and increases the pool and will increase revenue for the 169 municipalities if they all participate.

So is a voluntary program. It will provide more funding for the -- of more funds for the municipalities. And I urge passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Good morning, again.

Through you just a couple questions to the good Chair of the Planning and Development Committee on this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you very, very much.

The good Chair did articulate and explain the Bill in his indomitable way.

But through you. He cites the ability of municipalities, for legislative intent it is -- is it for municipalities that do not participate in the Connecticut Municipal Employee Retirement System, the CMERS?

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Through you, Madam President, that would be up to the municipality.

They can make their own choices as to how they want to invest their funds.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Okay, through you. I believe it is a one of the requirements that it is for municipalities that do not participate in the CMERS program to be able to utilize the proposal in this Bill.

Moving on, I think the other part is important is the fact that this affords the municipalities to make their own financial municipal decision, again, reiterating the concept of home rule and local control in their finances.

I want to also applaud the Treasurer for his willingness to think out of the box to adapt and use their financial expertise and the economies of scale to allow many of our towns to be able to leverage and utilize these resources.

Through you, one final question to the Proponent. We did a Bill earlier that talked about climate change and coastal resiliency funds that allowed the Treasurer to be able to help invest those funds.

Is this, through you, Madam President, to the Proponent, very similar to the climate change and resiliency -- to be able to invest?

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, yes, that can be invested through the Treasurer's office.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you. This is one where you have empowered local municipalities. We have allowed them to make the decisions.

I urge support of this Bill and I want to thank the good Chair for initiating it and hopefully ensuring its passage into the House.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, Madam President, there is an Amendment on the Bill. AN ACT CONCERNING DIVESTMENT OF CERTAIN MUNICIPAL FUNDS.

What this does, it very simply changes of a "requires" to "allows."

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Mr. Clerk, could - the Amendment 8659.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO 8659. Senate Amendment "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

What this does in line 41 after "this Act" insert that's "Administered held or and rested by the State Treasurer."

THE CHAIR:

And do you move adoption, sir?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes. So moved.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Okay.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Through you, I'm sorry.

THE CHAIR:

I know we're all tired.

And so the question is on adoption. Will you remark on the Amendment, sir?

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, Madam President, on the Amendment, through you to the Proponent of this Amendment. What is the intent of that language? I think he had offered permissive, but I didn't really understand as I'm reading through it, it says in line 41, "after this act," insert that "this is administered, held, or invested by the State Treasurer."

Through you, Madam President, what would be the intent of these language changes?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Through you, Madam President, this is a technical fix. It changes it from "must" to "may."

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, through you, and maybe it is early in the hour.

I do not see that in this Amendment in the change of this language, from "shall" to "may" as mentioned here, and again, I beg for indulgence as it was cited here.

I just wanted to be sure for legislative intent that as I'll read again, this Amendment says in line 41,

"after this act" insert "that is administered, held, or invested by the State Treasurer"

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, Madam President, the way the Bill was written, is that was written so that it forced the municipalities to participate instead of let them participate.

And that was the gist of the Amendment. And that's why I say from "shall" to "may".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hwang.

SENATOR HWANG (28TH):

Thank you, and not to belabor the point, perhaps just for the purpose of legislative intent, as the good Chair has repeated in multiple times. Indeed, the legislative intent.

And I will repeat is that it is permissive. And it allows a municipality to make that decision. It is not a mandate, and I appreciate the good Chair's clarification on that through this Amendment and through the intent of this Bill.

So I urge passage of this Bill, and I think the good Chair for his answers.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Amendment?
Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

I'm trying to understand this as well.

Because to me, it's not making sense. Is it says on line, it's replacing, on line 41.

When I -- when I replace this act because it says, "as amended by this Act, as amended by" and then it goes into the language I keep having to switch back.

I apologize for this. But when I -- it says, "as amended by this act," it says as "amended by" that is administered or held and invested by the State Treasurer. It's not making sense to me.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Through you, I'm sorry.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

It specifies what funds. It addresses the [inaudible] comment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If you can just give me one second.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Could we please put [inaudible] this Bill, please
and go on to the next Bill, please?

THE CHAIR:

So ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 4 Calendar Number 166. Senate Bill No. 913, AN
ACT CONCERNING EMISSION STANDARDS FOR MEDIUM AND
HEAVY DUTY VEHICLES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The Proponent is coming
out in a second. So Senate will stand at ease for a
moment.

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease.

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Sorry, Madam President. Thank you.

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 COHEN (12TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

This is a great Bill. As we talk a lot about our air quality standards.

We have actually, in Connecticut been in non-compliance of our federal air quality standards for quite some time.

We actually in Connecticut have some of the highest ozone layers on the east coast.

And this poor air quality obviously impacts everyone and exacerbates climate change which we all are trying to do everything we can to mitigate at this point.

But our environmental justice communities really are the ones that are disproportionately impacted by this.

We know that respiratory illnesses and our EJ communities are skyrocketing cancer rates very high, all higher than surrounding communities.

A lot of times this is because of, you know, various submissions from buildings, but also because they often are close to traffic corridors.

In fact, a recent national study revealed that New Haven and Hartford were in the top 15 large US cities, where it is hard to live with a lung condition like asthma.

And so these -- what this Bill would do would be to require the DEEP Commissioner right now Commissioner

Dykes to study what the impact would be of adopting California's air quality standards.

These are adopted resolute regulations that California has called the California Air Resources Boards, adopted regulations, 15 states have signed a Memorandum of understanding to try and address and get to a zero emission target for medium and heavy duty vehicles.

And so Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of an Amendment that I like to discuss for this Bill at -- is LCO No. 10132.

I'd ask that the Clerk please call the Amendment and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

CLERK:

LCO 10132 Senate Amendment "A".

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cohen.

SENATOR COHEN (12TH):

Thank you Madam President.

This is a bipartisan Amendment that would ensure that our state is in line with others as we all move forward to adopt regulations, should the Commissioner after review decide that these California regulations should in fact be adopted.

We could go ahead roll with regulations once -- at least five states across the country, one of those being in the Northeast region also adopt regulations.

We do anticipate that other states will be joining. As I mentioned, there is a Memorandum of Understanding with many other states across the

country, and several are moving forward to adopt these regulations.

So I move adoption of this Amendment. Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. And the question is on adoption of the Amendment. Will you remark? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and I to rise in support of the Amendment.

From my perspective, the purpose of the Amendment is to be sure that we don't get too far ahead of the market.

It certainly does seem to me that there are some that believe that by setting these requirements across the country, we will develop the market.

We will in fact, be driving that market, no pun intended. I sat in this Chamber and listen to Senator Hartley. Senator Martin talk about an initiative that was going to provide education to people that were incarcerated, we're going to help them learn to trade.

In fact, I heard Senator Hartley talk about how hard it was to find a plumber. She's not the first person to say this year how hard it is to find a plumber, by the way.

But the concern I had with this Bill, the way it was drafted initially was, these vehicles are the very vehicle that the plumber that shows up to your house drive.

So some people may believe that these are very large over-the-road trucks, something that comes in and out of the state of Connecticut.

This classification at its lowest level, is an F-350. It's a C-3500. You see them all over the place. They haul horses, they pull campers, they provide service vehicles for electricians, plumbers, the person that puts in your oil burner.

These are regular everyday vehicles, the market will get there. But if we are ahead of the market, we're going to force these tradesmen that we're trying to help, to pay more for a vehicle than they would otherwise pay if they live somewhere else.

Somebody testify that you get better gas mileage out of a California mission vehicle. That is bull. I've been in the car business for years, in and out.

I don't currently sell them. But I can tell you in the early 70's -- late 70's, early 80' emissions restrictions caused more back pressure, and it created worse gas mileage.

I'm not saying there was worse greenhouse gases emitted. I'm saying it's worse gas mileage. And when you're talking about a vehicle that gets about seven miles to the gallon at best, you can afford to have 25% less fuel economy.

We heard testimony about EVs. They will come, there's no doubt in my mind that the technology will get to beyond an F-150 an F-250 an F-350. These lighter commercial vehicles.

But if there's anybody in this Chamber that believes you can drive an electric tractor trailer and still meet the requirements of what that truck was designed for in the marketplace in that it's designed to operate on it has to have a range of 1000 miles.

Go to a truck stop by 995. What you will see is two operators, one behind the wheel and one taking a rest. There are federal regulations as to how long you can drive and how long you have to rest.

And when that truck is refueled, it's back on the road. These trucks are going to be required to sit for hours, hours to recharge.

So maybe we'll get to zero emissions. My interest in this Amendment was to make sure we're not ahead of the curve.

We're not putting a nickel into helping people buy these vehicles. We haven't taken any of the Volkswagen money and help the common person buy a vehicle.

We got state employees riding around in them. But the plumber is not going to get held by in his truck.

So I'm happy to stand in support of this Amendment. I'm not opposed to cleaner air. There is no testing system in the state of Connecticut that will show that the air that comes into Connecticut is going to be any more clean by the time it leaves the state of Connecticut.

We are out of compliance Ladies and gentlemen, not because of what we do to it, but because of what it is when it gets here.

So I urge my colleagues to support the Amendment. And after the adoption of the Amendment, I intend to support the Bill itself.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Amendment?
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.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The Ayes have it.

And the Amendment is adopted. Will you remark
further on the amended Bill? Will you remark further
on the amended Bill? If not, I'll open the voting
machines. Mr. Clerk Please announce the roll call
vote.

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 913 as amended by Senate
"A". An immediate roll call vote has been ordered 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 931. An immediate roll
call vote has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators
voted? The machine is locked.

Mr. Clerk Please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill 931:

Total number voting	36
Total voting Yay	35
Total voting Nay	1
Absent, not voting	0

(Gavel)

THE CHAIR:

The legislation is passed. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease.

Good morning, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President before we get to our Consent Calendar, I move to make a transmittal of Calendar page 46, Calendar 348. Senate Bill 1059.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. We have a Consent Calendar I'd like to read please?

THE CHAIR:

Yes, indeed we do. Mr. Clerk. Oh, you're going to -- please proceed sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Calendar page 13, Calendar 360. House Bill 6121 like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 14, Calendar 370. House Bill 6422 I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 15, Calendar 371 House Bill 6480 I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 16, Calendar 381. House Joint Resolution Number 50. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 16, Calendar 383, House Bill 6590. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And Calendar page 17. Calendar 386 House Bill 6356. I'd like to move that into Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And Calendar page 20, Calendar 408. House Bill 6500 I'd like to move that item to Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 21 Calendar 414, House Bill 5592. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 21, Calendar 424. House Bill 6320. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 23, Calendar 436. House Bill 6588. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 24, Calendar 443. House Bill 6483. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 25, Calendar 449, House Bill 5610. I'd like to move that to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And Calendar page 27, Calendar 457, House Bill 6420. I'd like to move that item to Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 27 Calendar 459. House Bill 6038. I'd like to move that item to Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 28 Calendar 461, House Bill 5737. I'd like to move that item to Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 28 Calendar 466, House Bill 6634. I'd like to move that item to Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 28, Calendar 467, House Bill 6494. I'd like to move that item to Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 29 Calendar 469, House Bill 6463. I'd like to move that item to Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 29. Calendar 470, House Bill 6534. I'd like to move that item to Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 29, Calendar 471. House Bill 6492. I'd like to move them to Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 29. Calendar 472, House Bill 6637. I'd like to move that item to Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 30. Calendar 478, House Bill 6640. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 31, Calendar 493, House Bill 5312. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 32. Calendar 497 House Bill 6506. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 33. Calendar 500, House Bill 6319. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 33. Calendar 501, House Bill 6398. I'd like to move that into item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 35. Calendar 512, House Bill 6374. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 35, Calendar 515, House Bill 6643. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 37. Calendar 522, House Bill 5412. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 38. Calendar 529, House Bill 5310. I'd like to add that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 39. Calendar 533, House Bill 6458 I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 40. Calendar 540, House Bill 6656. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

Calendar page 40. Calendar 541, House Bill 6547 I'd like to move that item Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 40. Calendar 542, House Bill 6603. I'd like to move that to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 41. Calendar 547, House Bill 6496. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 26. Calendar 453, House Bill 6113. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 27. Calendar 460, House Bill 5420. I'd like to move them to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 38. Calendar 530. House Bill 6444. I'd like to move that item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President, could the Senate stand at ease, please?

THE CHAIR:

[Mic off 09:46:22]

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

If the Clerk can now read the items followed by a vote of the extended Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Senate will stand at ease, please.

THE CHAIR:

And the Senate will stand at ease.

Senator Duff

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

Just for clarification. I believe I said Calendar page 26. Calendar 453, House Bill 6113 to the Consent Calendar please.

THE CHAIR:

And that is so ordered as well.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

The Clerk and now call the items on the Consent Calendar, please.

THE CHAIR:

And Mr. Clerk, could you kindly call the items on the Consent Calendar, please?

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President, I need to remove one item please, because I think we voted on that earlier.

THE CHAIR:

Which one would that be sir?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 23. Calendar 436. House Bill 6588.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, we'll take that one off the list.

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Consent Calendar No 1, page 13. Calendar 360, House Bill 6121.

Page 14, Calendar No. 370. House Bill 6422.

Page 15, Calendar No. 371. House Bill 6480.

Page 16, Calendar No. 381. House Joint Resolution
50. Page 16. Calendar No. 383. House Bill 6590.

Page 17, Calendar No. 386. House Bill 6356.

Page No. 20, Calendar No. 408. House Bill 6500.

Page 21, Calendar No. 414. House Bill 5592.

Page 2, Calendar 424 House Bill 6320.

Page 24, Calendar 443. House Bill 6483.

Page 25, Calendar No. 449. House Bill 5610.

Page 27, Calendar No. 457. House Bill 6420.

Page 27, Calendar No. 459. House Bill 6038

Page 28, Calendar 461 House Bill 5737.

Page 28 Calendar 466 House Bill 6634.

Page 28, Calendar 467. House Bill 6494.

Page 29, Calendar 469. House Bill 6463.

Page 29, Calendar 470. House Bill 6534.

Page 29, Calendar 471. House Bill 6492.

Page 29, Calendar 472. House Bill 6637.

Page 30, Calendar 478. House Bill 6640.

Page 31, Calendar 493. House Bill 5312.

Page 32, Calendar 497. House Bill 6506.

Page 33, Calendar 500. House Bill 6319.

Page 33, Calendar 501. House Bill 6398.

Page 35, Calendar 512. House Bill 6374.

Page 35, Calendar 515. House Bill 6643.

Page 37, Calendar 522. House Bill 541.

Page 38, Calendar 529. House Bill 5310.

Page 39, Calendar 533 House Bill 6458.

Page 40, Calendar 540. House Bill 6656.

Page 40, Calendar 541. House Bill 6547.

Page 40, Calendar 542. House Bill 6603.

Page 41, Calendar 547. House Bill 6496.

Page 27, Calendar 460. House Bill 5420.

Page 38, Calendar 530. House Bill 644

Page 26, Calendar 453. House Bill 6113.

THE CHAIR:

That was very impressive Mr. Clerk, and would you kindly call the roll and I will open the machine.

CLERK:

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

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

CLERK:

Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be locked.

Mr. Clerk call the tally please.

CLERK:

Consent Calendar No. 1:

Total number voting	36
Total vote voting yay	36
Total voting Nay	0
Absent, not voting	0

(Gavel)

CLERK:

Consent Calendar has been consented to. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I don't think I need to dispense with points of personal privilege or announcements.

But I will say that we will be in session on Monday at 11. So I wish all my colleagues a good rest of the weekend. And I would say before that we adjourn that we go forth and sleep and with that I move that we adjourn subject to call of the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

I am all for going forth and sleeping.

(On motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 3:57 a.m. adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.)