

S - 704

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2017**

**VOL .60
PART 3
799 – 1211**

aa
Senate

89
May 3, 2017

THE CHAIR:

You're very welcome. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Also, page 44, Calendar 358, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 1003, AN ACT CONCERNING REVISIONS TO VARIOUS STATUTES CONCERNING THE CRIMINAL JUSTICE SYSTEM.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Yes, Madam President. This piece of legislation is a number of assorted changes to our criminal justice statutes, which was recommended to the Judiciary Committee by the state's attorney's office. These requested provisions are not radical but they are more clean-up things. They're not purely technical but then, again, they're not super significant. The Judiciary Committee voted them out 40 to nothing, so

it was a clear strong bipartisan message. A few of the things that clarifies in our nuisance abatement statute that the basis for a state action on the nuisance abatement is a sale of liquor to a minor. It provides other protections and such as we spoke earlier about the conservator situation. It makes clear that second-degree larceny can be if the victim is a conserved person so if the conserved person is victimized by anyone, he can be a victim and the person can be charged with second-degree larceny. There's a number of other things in terms of the eye-witness identification taskforce. It's a good piece of legislation. I urge the Chamber to approve it.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I just wanted to associate my remarks with those of Chairman Doyle and urge my colleagues to support this down-to-earth bill proposal offered to us by the Chief State's Attorney and the Division of Criminal Justice. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Yes, Madam President. Without objection, I move this bill to the Consent Calendar.

aa
Senate

91
May 3, 2017

THE CHAIR:

I'm seeing no objections, so ordered, sir. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Page 44, Calendar 359, Senate Bill No. 1021, AN ACT REVISING THE UNIFORM FRAUDULENT TRANSFER ACT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. This piece of legislation is -- it reforms a debt and revises our -- this Connecticut law, Uniform Fraudulent Transfer Act, but really the true intent of the legislation and it was strongly advocated by our Attorney General, it clarifies basically that when primarily parents are paying for their children's college education that if bankruptcy is later filed by the parents and the bankruptcy court doesn't have the

authority to reach back and take the tuition payments to the college and universities. As such, there is actually a benefit to the state -- state university systems that their monies will not be taken by the bankruptcy court, so it's a technical piece of legislation but it makes sense and it basically preserves tuition paid by parents or others to students in college and I urge our Chamber to approve this piece of legislation. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I also stand in strong support of this legislation. Under the bankruptcy laws, if a state wants a particular carveout, it can put that into statute and that's what this would do, and I want to associate myself with the remarks of Senator Doyle and commend Attorney General, George Jepsen, who used to sit across from me, right across from me, at the circle. Also, Legislative Commissioner, William Hamzy, was instrumental in bringing this here before us and it does happen on an all-too-often a number of times that if a family decides to send their loved one to college and they've actually gone through the entire process and then find themselves in dire financial straits and have to file bankruptcy that bankruptcy trustee can then claw back that money from the universities and then what happens is to add insult to injury the university then goes to that young man or women, assuming that they went to college right after high school, and say you don't have a degree

anymore because we had to give the money back and so now the family who has now lost all that money because the bankruptcy trustee has decided to claw it back now finds their son or daughter lost their degree and they have no resources to go and pay for that college education a second time, so as a public policy, we have decided with this legislation that an individual's desire to send their loved one, their child to college is an important public policy and we should encourage it and not allow the bankruptcy courts to go in and claw that money back. For what it's worth, if there's any transfer within 60 days of a filing of bankruptcy, that automatically comes back, but we are talking about real life scenarios where years have gone by and the bankruptcy trustees in their zealousness have done this and to the credit of Legislative Commissioner Hamzy, Attorney General Jepsen, and others, we've decided that Connecticut will not continue along this path and will reverse this public policy and do it in statute, and I would urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Yes, Madam President. I believe a roll call is in order on this piece of legislation.

THE CHAIR:

aa
Senate

94
May 3, 2017

Thank you very much. At this time, Mr. Clerk, will you call for a roll call vote and the machine is open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

If all members have voted, if all members voted, the machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk, will you please call the tally?

THE CLERK:

On Senate Bill No. 1021.

Total number Voting	34
Those voting Yea	31
Those voting Nay	3
Absent not Voting	2

THE CHAIR:

Bill passes. (Gavel). Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 45, Calendar 365, House Bill No. 7254, AN ACT REQUIRING SPECIAL EDUCATION TEACHERS TO COMPLETE A PROGRAM OF STUDY IN EVIDENCED-BASED STRUCTURED LITERACY INTERVENTIONS FOR STUDENTS WITH DYSLEXIA.

THE CHAIR:

aa
Senate

95
May 3, 2017

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. I move the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on adoption and passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

Yes, I will, Madam President. Thank you. This piece of legislation is -- it's a sequel to a number of pieces of legislation we have passed over the last three years to try to help one-fifth of our student population who present with dyslexia and other reading-related disorders. We have heard so much testimony over the last number of years from students and from teachers who have had dyslexia and teachers who have felt that they had not been adequately prepared to teach students who have dyslexia and other reading-related disorders. We know that there are ways that we can help our students overcome these challenges and so that they can read with more ease and be better -- have better success in school and reduce the great amount of frustration that they experience and that their parents and families experience as well, so it's very exciting for me to bring forward this bill today. This has, again, been a great collaborative effort and it is a series now that this piece of it will require a program of study in evidenced-based structured literacy interventions for students with dyslexia and other reading-related disorders for our

special education teachers who are in fact often the teachers who are dealing with this issue at the most, so I want to thank all the advocates who have worked so hard to make sure that this bill happened and I am honored and delighted to pass this bill today for final action. At this point, if I may, Madam President, if I may yield to Senator Boucher?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Boucher, will you accept the yield, ma'am?

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Yes, I will, Madam President. I thank you and I thank the distinguished chair of the Education Committee, a colleague who has worked very hard and very collaboratively over this session. We entertained probably more bills than I've seen in many, many years so there was a lot of work on our plate and many of the issues were very controversial but at the end of the day, we reached across the aisle and worked well to get all of these important bills out. This is a topic, as was just mentioned, that has been before us for three years in a row and each of those years, we've moved some significant legislation forward. It is an area of education that was little known in the past but, yet, does afflict many, many families and children and could be devastating to the progress of some very talented and bright individuals. There are very famous people, in fact, that have been identified that had dyslexia and yet went on to achieve greatness and were innovators in our society, so it's very important that this focus, and rightfully so on legislation, has happened in each of the last three years and this year there was a concentration on

aa
Senate

97
May 3, 2017

actually helping those preparers, the teachers themselves, to become more knowledgeable in the identification process because without the identification, you can't provide the services that are needed and required. We often have heard of many statistics about our jails are filled with individuals, talented individuals, but that could never read because of dyslexia and if there were able to achieve some success, may not have ended up in our correctional system, so we're very pleased to bring this bill forward. It has very strong advocates, certainly, that have approached us and worked very hard to make sure there was language that was acceptable to everyone we could get out this year, so I commend the Chair of the Education Committee for the hard work on this and all the other individuals that worked hard to make sure that we move this issue forward, particularly in the teacher prep area, so I'm very happy to support this legislation and I hope everyone else will as well. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President, I am so pleased to rise in support of this piece of legislation and I just want to thank the whole Education Committee, in particular our co-chairs who have worked so diligently on the issue revolving around dyslexia and making sure we were giving our children who were suffering from dyslexia the -- all of the attention that they have needed and this has been a multiyear project and we have

all worked so hard together to get this done and I can't thank both the co-chairs so much for doing all the work they've done, and I'd also like to give a special sort of shout out to my constituent, Allison Quirion and her son, Jack, who have come up every year to work on this issue. I've done the research to make sure that they could -- that we would all understand how important it is to have evidenced-based literacy programs for our children with dyslexia and I just cannot thank them any more than what everybody here has done by supporting this piece of legislation and I look forward to seeing this roll out so that we don't end up with children who have not seen the correct care in our correctional environments or not getting the right resources to be as effective as they can be, and I want to thank the whole circle for supporting this piece of legislation. Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President, and I would like to associate my remarks with all of the previous speakers and I'm not in a position to name my constituents that have advocated for this over the last several years because if I did I'd probably leave somebody out and that would be unfortunate, but this is something that parents in particular that either have children suffering with dyslexia or know someone in the family or anywhere in their family throughout the country. They are champions. They have been in the building. They have been on

the phones. They have been at their computers sending emails and they're the ones that really deserve a huge amount of credit for helping getting passage of this legislation through this building. It is not easy to get good legislation through this building. It is way easier to kill bills than to pass bills but to those folks in my district that felt so passionately about this issue regarding dyslexia and the harmful effects it can have on not only ability to learn but one's own self-worth as one is growing up, they deserve a tremendous amount of credit and I want to thank them from the bottom of my heart as well and of course, urge my colleagues to support this legislation. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the bill?
Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I want to just first of all thank Senator Slossberg and Senator Boucher and also align myself with remarks of Senator Osten as well. I think we've all heard from a number of constituents in our district regarding this bill and moving this issue forward in a way that I think is meaningful for the folks that care about this issue and really want to see progress so I just want to, again, take a moment to thank the leadership of the education committee, Senator Osten for her hard work, and the advocates who have really been back here every year over the last few years to ensure that the state moves forward on this. What I've heard from so many

aa
Senate

100
May 3, 2017

different people, not only from my district, but really across the state is how the legislation over the last few years really has moved our state forward and has actually really helped the students as well and as I say many times in this Chamber, that sometimes the legislation we do doesn't seem tangible. It's very intangible when we put words to paper and we vote on bills but when things like this that build upon previous years' legislation and that when we receive emails from folks or communications from folks saying the bills that we've passed have actually helped people, I think that really means a lot and it shows that we're on the right road and that we should continue moving forward on this type of legislation, so again, I urge my colleagues to support the bill and thank the leadership here in the Senate and the House and all others who have worked so diligently on the legislation. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

I'm seeing no objection. Mr. Clerk. Sorry, Mr. Clerk -- Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

aa
Senate

101
May 3, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, that is our last bill for the moment. If the clerk can call the bills for a vote on the Consent Calendar please?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. Clerk, first we're gonna call a list of bills on the Consent Calendar and then a vote please.

THE CLERK:

Page 2, Calendar 80, Senate Bill 804. Page 3, Calendar 88, Senate Bill 548. Page 5, Calendar 100, Senate Bill 616. Page 13, Calendar 166, Senate Bill No. 908. Page 14, Calendar 172, Senate Bill 937. Page 16, Calendar 180, Senate Bill 899. Page 16, Calendar 181, Senate Bill 900. Page 17, Calendar 192, Senate Bill 936. Page 26, Calendar 248, Senate Bill 844. Page 29, Calendar 275, Senate Bill 910. Page 30, Calendar 279, Senate Bill 953. Page 37, Calendar 320, Senate Bill 976. Also, on page 37, Calendar 321, Senate Bill 993. On page 38, Calendar 330, Senate Bill 444. Page 40, Calendar 337, Senate Bill 888. Page 40, Calendar 338, Senate Bill 930. Also, on page 40, Calendar 339, Senate Bill 982. On 41, Calendar 341, Senate Bill 1032. On page 44, Calendar 358, Senate Bill 1003 and on page 45, Calendar 365, House Bill 7254.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, will you please call for a roll call vote on the Consent Calendar?

aa
Senate

102
May 3, 2017

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on today's Consent Calendar. Immediate roll call on today's Consent Calendar has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

If all members have voted, all members have voted, the machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk, will you please call the tally?

THE CLERK:

On today's Consent Calendar.

Total number Voting	34
Those voting Yea	34
Those voting Nay	0
Absent not Voting	2

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar is adopted. (Gavel).

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

aa
Senate

103
May 3, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar page 20, Calendar 209, Substitute for Senate Bill 515, rather than referring it to the Appropriations Committee, we'd like to just mark that PT.

THE CHAIR:

Okay, so ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, we now -- I would like to now move the Senate stand in recess for purposes of caucuses please.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand in recess.

On the motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 4:28 p.m. recessed.

THE CLERK:

There is an immediate Senate Democratic caucus. An immediate Senate Democratic caucus. An immediate Senate Democratic caucus.

UNKNOWN SPEAKER:

There will be an immediate Senate Republican caucus. All Republican Senators please report to the caucus room. There will be an immediate Senate Republican caucus. All Republican Senators please report to the caucus room.

aa
Senate

104
May 3, 2017

The Senate reconvened at 6:08 p.m., the President in the Chair.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

The Senate will meet immediately. The Senate will reconvene immediately. That means you. The Senate will reconvene immediately.

THE CLERK:

The Senate will convene immediately. The Senate will convene immediately. The Senate will convene immediately.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will come back to order. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, is there business on the clerk's desk?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

We got Senate Agenda No. 2. It's dated Wednesday, May 3, 2017, communications from the Speaker of the House.

THE CHAIR:

aa
Senate

105
May 3, 2017

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move that all items on Senate Agenda No. 2, dated Wednesday, May 3, 2017, be acted upon as indicated and that the Agenda be incorporated by reference in the Senate Journal and transcript.

THE CHAIR:

So noted, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. A few more items to mark go please.

THE CHAIR:

Please.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar page 9, Calendar 131, Senate Bill 191, go. Calendar page 17, Calendar 187, Senate Bill 655, go. Calendar page 28, Calendar 264, House Bill 7025, go. Calendar page 29, Calendar 277, Senate Bill 950, go. Calendar page 43, Calendar 352, Senate Bill 726, go and finally, Calendar page 47, Calendar 373, House Bill 6008, go and if the clerk can call in that order and if we can stand at ease until we have our -- actually, if we can go cause I believe Senator Witkos is bringing out the first bill.

aa
Senate

106
May 3, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Okay, Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 9, Calendar 131, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 191, AN ACT CONCERNING CHARITABLE BINGO GAMES, BAZAARS, RAFFLES, THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER PROTECTION AND OCCUPATIONAL LICENSING.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I move the Committee's joint favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I will but prior to that, I believe the clerk has in his possession an amendment and I asked it to be called and I be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

aa
Senate

107
May 3, 2017

Mr. Clerk. Hold on a minute. He's walking in the door, sir. The Senate will stand at ease.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Madam President, if I may, I want to give you the specific LCO number? It would be 6674.

THE CHAIR:

LCO 6674. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO No. 6674, Senate "A", offered by Senators Duff, Leone, and Witkos.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. What the amendment does, it strikes out -- it's a strike all amendment and it adds back in the portion of the underlying bill, which has to do with the repeal of and removal of certain licensures in the state of Connecticut. This has been an effort by Senator Duff and myself working with our staffs to go through our statutes and remove barriers to people that are trying to obtain a license in the state of Connecticut that don't really require any educational component to it or field experience that's required in order to perform in the work that they're doing and we believe, although limited number, it's a first step to making sure that Connecticut removes all barriers

to a workforce to individuals that are not monetary in nature and there are six licensures that are being removed from the language as amended. The first one is an above-ground pool installer, second is a uniform student athlete agent, third is the licensed short-hand reporter. The next one is an internet vendors license, a wholesaler's salesman certificate, a residential flat glass or automotive glazier, and lastly, a real estate intern and who would have thought those folks -- there's many relators in the building -- that you'd have to have a license to be an intern in the field of real estate, so we believe it's a first step towards making access to employment better and easier for the folks that work and live in our state and I move adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on adoption. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Senator Leone. Good evening, sir.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):

Good evening, Madam President. It's a pleasure to see you there tonight. Thank you for giving me the chance to give some remarks. I also would like to concur with the remarks made by my Co-Chairman of the General Law Committee on Senate Bill 191. As stated, this bill would make it easier for people to find employment and it removes barriers to employment as mentioned already and it does eliminate old licensures that no longer are required in today's day and age, and I think this goes a long way towards making our regulatory environment a

little bit more business friendly, so I would support this amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much. Will you remark further?
Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the only license that concerns me is the fact that we're removing a license in this bill. It has to do with the installation of above-ground pools. In the community that I live in and the majority of the communities that I represent, they have septic systems. I'm not sure that we should be allowing someone that isn't trained to install a pool or at least someone that we would know who to go back to should some problem occur, install a pool. I can imagine on some warm July night family goes down to a local pool place, buys above-ground pool, brings it home, and then pays somebody to put it up and then finds they needed a fence, finds that they needed a permit, finds that they needed not to put it on their septic system. I'm all about trying to find ways to put people back to work, Madam President, but I think this is a mistake and I'll be opposing the amendment. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment? If not, I would ask the clerk to please call a roll call vote on the amendment "A". the machine will be open.

aa
Senate

110
May 3, 2017

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Boucher -- Senator Boucher -- Senator
Boucher -- Senator Boucher. If all members have
voted, all members have voted, the machine will be
closed. Mr. Clerk, can you give us the roll call?

THE CLERK:

Senate amendment schedule "A".

Total number Voting	34
Those voting Yea	27
Those voting Nay	7
Absent not Voting	2

THE CHAIR:

The amendment passes. (Gavel). Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President and now that the
amendment has become the bill, I just wanted to
comment on it for a few seconds anyway and to say
that one of all thank Senator Witkos and Senator
Leone for their work on the bill. It was a pleasure
to -- to work with Senator Witkos on the legislation
because it truly is a bipartisan piece of
legislation that really encompasses all political
spectrums. It almost reminds me of the work on

criminal justice reform. You have sometimes some of the most liberal groups and the most conservative groups who come together on certain issues because it makes common sense in order to pass these bills. This is an issue that first came to my attention through folks down in Washington in the Obama administration because they saw occupational -- some occupational licensing as issues that were barriers to entry for folks who wanted to start their own businesses. Ways in which licenses had been set up in the past that really would discourage people from going into business on their own or opening up their own businesses and that had been that way for decades and I think you see other groups who may be on the more conservative side who would say the same thing -- is that why would we necessarily put kind of bureaucratic red tape in the way of those who want to begin a business or start a business. Why kind of snuff out entrepreneurial spirit by a license that may not necessarily be necessary to something that -- to an occupation that may not exactly need it, that may not then be something like a doctor or a nurse that of course you'd want a license but maybe something more minor that would be the more self-policing or not something that necessarily needs to have a license and I think one of the other examples of this would be the barber shop bill we did a few years ago that rather than having folks go to many hours of schooling, we did an apprenticeship so that it actually brought people out of the shadows. It allowed them to get their license and to open up their own businesses and we're actually seeing that right now. Madam President, could we ask for order in the Chamber please?

THE CHAIR:

aa
Senate

112
May 3, 2017

Ladies and gentlemen -- ladies and gentleman, can you take your conversations outside the Chamber please? Thank you very much.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, also we just did it with the cosmetician bill as well, again, working to break down barriers so that we can encourage more folks to organically open their own businesses, to cut bureaucratic red tape, and to look for common sense ways in which we can encourage folks to open up their business and make government a partner in what they're trying to do rather than a hindrance and these are very simple ways in which to do that and in fact, I think this is going to free up some of our folks in state government and it will also be able to let them focus on other things that may be more important and more crucial to the core functions of our state, so anyway, so again, I want to thank Senator Witkos for his work, Senator Leone for his support, and those who brought this issue to my attention because it is not one that generates a lot of headlines but I think one that is very important and folks will be very happy with once this passes the House but I am very happy to see it hopefully, pass the Senate and I certainly urge my colleagues to support the bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, will you call for a roll call vote and the machine will be open.

aa
Senate

113
May 3, 2017

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

If all members have voted, all members voted, the machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk, will you call the tally?

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 191.

Total number Voting	34
Those voting Yea	32
Those voting Nay	2
Absent not Voting	2

THE CHAIR:

The bill passes. (Gavel). Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 17, Calendar 187, Senate Bill No. 655, AN ACT INCREASING FEES REMITTED TO MUNICIPALITIES FOR MOVING VIOLATIONS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

aa
Senate

114
May 3, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. Might we PT this bill and move onto the next one please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 28, Calendar 264, Substitute for House Bill No. 7025, AN ACT AUTHORIZING DOMESTIC INSURERS TO DIVIDE.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Larson.

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Good evening, Madam President. I move acceptance to the Joint Committee's favorable report, passage of the bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President. This bill provides a mechanism for domestic insurance businesses to divide their organization into two or more entities with the approval of the insurance department. In the simplest terms, this would grant the domestic insurance a means to be able to sell segments of their business that best fit their business

aa
Senate

115
May 3, 2017

strategy. Currently, this option does not exist in state law. While policy rates, terms would not be impacted from a division and the bill as it stands does not have a fiscal implication nor does it lose revenue for the state.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you very much, Madam Chairman. I also rise in support of this bill and I'll only take a moment but this is a very important bill for the state of Connecticut. It is final passage but it's something that the domestic insurers of the state of Connecticut have asked for, and I think that this sends a very clear message that the insurance industry is very important to the state of Connecticut and that our domestic insurers provide numerous jobs and something like this helps keep those jobs in the state of Connecticut and I urge its adoption. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?
Senator Larson.

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Thank you very much, Madam President. If there's no objection, I'd ask for a roll call vote.

THE CHAIR:

aa
Senate

116
May 3, 2017

Uh huh, how about consent?

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Oh, I'm sorry -- [laughter]. I didn't realize we were doing it. If there's no objection, I'd ask that the bill be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

I'm seeing no objections. No objection. We got it -- okay. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 29, Calendar 277, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 950, AN ACT CONCERNING THE STREAMLINING OF HIRING PROCESS FOR MANUFACTURING TECHERS IN THE TECHNICAL HIGH SCHOOL SYSTEM.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg. Good evening, ma'am.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I move the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

aa
Senate

117
May 3, 2017

Yes. Thank you, Madam President, so the bill before us does exactly what it says it does in the title. It streamlines the hiring process for hiring manufacturing teachers in the technical high school system. You know, we know as a state that our -- one of the things we want to be doing is supporting our manufacturers and in so doing, we want to support manufacturer -- our workers -- and in order to get that skilled labor force, we need to be supporting our vo-tech schools. In order to get those kids out of vo-tech schools, we need manufacturing teachers and what this bill does is very simply reduces the number of years of experience that is required in order to become a manufacturing teacher from the current eight years to five years and it also requires that the State Department of Education creates some guidelines to clarify what the requirements are for those teachers to be hired and certified in our state. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise to support the bill and the amendment. This is definitely something that is needed in Connecticut in the state of our economy and the change in the business sector in manufacturing in particular really demands that we have those with the latest knowledge in our classrooms so that we can have our graduates be as employable as they possibly can. Thank you, Madam President.

aa
Senate

118
May 3, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

I'm seeing no objections, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 43, Calendar 352, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 726, AN ACT CONCERNING CRIME VICTIM COMPENSATION FOR VICTIMS OF SEXUAL ASSAULT AND RESTITUTION FROM PERSONS COMMITTING CRIMINAL ACTS.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark, sir?

aa
Senate

119
May 3, 2017

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Yes. Madam President, the clerk has an amendment. It's a strike all amendment. It's LCO 6632. May the clerk please call and I be allowed to summarize?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO No. 6632, Senate amendment schedule "A", offered by Senators Doyle, Kissel, et al.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I first move adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on adoption. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Yes. Thank you, Madam President. The amendment before us is a strike all amendment and basically, it deletes section 2 of the amendment, which it would be incorporating court of ops bill and it narrows the earlier -- the file copy -- to say that in our victim compensation fund, which is operated

aa
Senate

120
May 3, 2017

by the Office of Victim Services, the area where the office can provide additional compensation is limited to no more than \$5000 dollars but the potential beneficiaries are minor victims of personal injury incident and the person -- if that such minor victim needs additional medical or mental health counseling needs, so it's focused on minors that are in a personal injury -- victim you know -- that's a broad definition but if these persons -- these young people need additional services to get through the issues of the victimization, they can get additional \$5000 dollars. I think it's a good piece of legislation. It's narrowed by this piece of legislation but under the circumstances to preserve the fund, I think it makes sense and I urge that Chamber to approve this amendment before you. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President and a quick question through you to the proponent of the amendment?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. It's my understanding the current high range is \$10,000 dollars and this anticipates a proposed additional

aa
Senate

121
May 3, 2017

\$5000 for individuals in this minor category that have been sexually assaulted and that indeed need to have additional services for counseling and mental health needs. Would that be correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Yes, Madam President. I believe it goes from \$10,000 dollars to \$15,000 dollars, which would be the maximum amount and it says up to additional \$5000 dollars. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Exactly and I appreciate that answer from my friend and colleague, the Co-Chair of Judiciary Committee and I stand in strong support of the amendment as well, which becomes the bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Will you remark further. I'll try your minds on the amendment. All those in favor please say aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

aa
Senate

122
May 3, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Opposed? The amendment passes. At this point, I call for Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Madam President, I believe roll call is in order.

THE CHAIR:

Okay. At this time, I'll ask the clerk to call for a roll call vote and the machines will be open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

If all members have voted, all members voted, the machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk, will you call the tally?

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 726.

Total number Voting	34
Those voting Yea	34
Those voting Nay	0
Absent not Voting	2

THE CHAIR:

aa
Senate

123
May 3, 2017

The bill passes. (Gavel). Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 47, Calendar 373, House Bill No. 6008, AN
ACT ESTABLISHING AN INDEPENDENT CONSUMER ADVOCATE
FOR METROPOLITAN DISTRICT OF HARTFORD COUNTY
CONSUMERS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye, good evening.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I move acceptance of
the Joint Committee's favorable report in
concurrence with the House. Did I do that
correctly?

THE CHAIR:

It sounded right. Acceptance and passage in
concurrence.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

I move acceptance and passage and concurrence with
the House.

THE CHAIR:

You did fine, ma'am. Please proceed.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

aa
Senate

124
May 3, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. This bill is very important to members in my community and communities around the metropolitan district --

THE CHAIR:

Ladies and gentlemen -- excuse me, one second Senator -- Senator Bye. Can we lower the volume a little bit? Thank you very much. Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

What this bill does is it establishes an independent consumer advocate for customers in the MDC region. It also makes some changes -- some minor changes to the MDC's ability to borrow money, giving them a slightly longer window in the case that certain communities have trouble meeting their requirements for payment to the MDC to allow them to smooth out those types of rough bumps. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further on this bill? If not, Senator, I --

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Madam President, if there's no objection, I ask that this be moved to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. At this time, we're gonna stand at ease. Senate will come back to order. Senator Duff.

aa
Senate

125
May 3, 2017

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Our final bill of the evening will be the one I had PT'd earlier, which is Calendar page 17, Calendar 187, Senate Bill 655.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 17, Calendar 187, Senate Bill No. 655, AN ACT INCREASING FEES REMITTED TO MUNICIPALITIES FOR MOVING VIOLATIONS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Leone, good evening.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):

Good evening again, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I will. This is an act increasing fees remitted to municipalities for moving violations and quite simply, this bill

increases from \$15 dollars to \$20 dollars -- that's a \$5 dollar increase on the surcharge that is currently paid by people who violate certain motor vehicle laws such as speeding, reckless driving, driving under the influence, countless others. This surcharge paid in addition to the fine or forfeitures of the violations is remitted to the municipality where the violation occurred, so what that means is if you're speeding, you're driving recklessly, you're increasing your speed to evade the police, failing to stop when signal, other common sense approaches -- if you're infracting any moving violations, whatever the fine you would get that goes to the state, there's currently a \$15-dollar surcharge that goes to the municipality. This would increase that surcharge an additional \$5 dollars to go back to the municipality, so in essence, it's an additional incentive for municipalities to crack down on moving violations. What it is not intended for is for municipalities to start going after people for moving infractions when they otherwise would not do. It's not supposed to be something just to increase the revenue coffers of the police to the municipality. In essence, it's really the opposite because what we've heard from towns is that their resources are stretched thin and they don't have enough resources to always enforce moving violations so this additional \$5 dollars would be more money back to the municipalities to maybe put more money towards enforcement, to crack down on people that would otherwise break the law and not be -- and would not be caught, so my hope is that this is something that will pass here in the Senate. I would note that in our Transportation Committee we did talk about this on which way to go. It did pass unanimously with unanimous support in the committee. I would hope that continues. I do

aa
Senate

127
May 3, 2017

understand there might be some concerns but again, this is all about trying to give our municipalities additional dollars to enact enforcement for those that are actually committing a crime by virtue of a moving violation, so I would hope we have support for this bill moving forward. With that, I would rest for the moment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, roll call vote I guess. I'm sorry -- [laughing]. Mr. Clerk, please call for roll call vote and the machine is open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted?
Have all members voted? If all members voted, if all members voted, the machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk, will you call the tally?

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 655.

Total number Voting	34
Those voting Yea	19
Those voting Nay	15
Absent not Voting	2

THE CHAIR:

aa
Senate

128
May 3, 2017

The bill passes. (Gavel). Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Would the clerk please call the items on the Consent Calendar and we will vote on the Consent Calendar please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Page 28, Calendar 264, House Bill 7025. Page 29, Calendar 277, Senate Bill 950. Page 47, Calendar 373, House Bill 6008.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, will you call for a roll call vote on the second Consent Calendar and the machine is now open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered on the second Consent Calendar for today in the Senate. Immediate roll call in the Senate on the second Consent Calendar for today.

THE CHAIR:

If all members voted, all members have voted, the machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk, will you please call a tally?

aa
Senate

129
May 3, 2017

THE CLERK:

On the second Consent Calendar for today.

Total number Voting	34
Those voting Yea	34
Those voting Nay	0
Absent not Voting	2

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar passes. (Gavel). Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. That concludes our business for this evening. I do want to remind Democratic Senators that we have a caucus tomorrow at 12:30 -- 12:30 caucus tomorrow. I now yield for any announcements or points of personal privilege please.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any points of personal privilege? I'm sorry. Senator Somers. Good evening, ma'am.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Senator Frantz would like me to make sure everybody knows he missed today because he had business outside of the Chamber that he had to attend to.

THE CHAIR:

aa
Senate

130
May 3, 2017

Thank you. It will be noted. Thank you. does anybody else -- any other? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. That concludes our business for today. I move that we adjourn subject to call of the chair.

THE CHAIR:

We are now adjourned.

(On motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 6:57 p.m. adjourned subject to the call of the chair.)

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

Thursday, May 4, 2017

The Senate was called to order at 2:44 p.m. in accordance with the provisions of Senate Rule 9(f), and under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

THE CHAIR:

The prayer was offered by Acting Chaplain, Nicole R. Kidney of Ellington, Connecticut.

ACTING CHAPLAIN NICOLE R. KIDNEY:

In these difficult times, may our leaders find in their hearts the guidance and wisdom to do what is best for the people of Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Pursuant to Senate Rule 9(f) the Senate is called into Session, by the Office of the Senate Clerk's under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

It is hereby moved that Senate Agenda Number 1, dated May 4, 2017, is adopted, the items on said Agenda shall be acted upon as indicated and that the Agenda shall be incorporated into the Senate Journal and Senate Transcript.

SY
SENATE

2
May 4, 2017

REPORT RECEIVED - to be referred to the committee indicated.

Auditors of Public Accounts - Department of Education for fiscal years ended June 30, 2009, 2010 and 2011. (Pursuant to Section 2-90 of the Connecticut General Statutes) Date received: May 4, 2017

Referred to Committees on Appropriations and Education

BUSINESS FROM THE HOUSE:

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

BANKING COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7161 AN ACT REQUIRING SERVICE PROVIDERS UNDER CERTAIN RETIREMENT PLANS TO DISCLOSE CONFLICTS OF INTEREST. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 6509))

COMMERCE COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 6749 AN ACT CONCERNING A WORKING GROUP ON A PUBLIC-PRIVATE MARKETING PARTNERSHIP TO RECRUIT BUSINESSES TO CONNECTICUT. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 6558))

COMMERCE COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7230 AN ACT CONCERNING THE SECRETARY OF THE STATE'S ELECTRONIC BUSINESS PORTAL.

HIGHER EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT ADVANCEMENT COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7119 AN ACT CONCERNING THE AUTHORITY OF THE EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR OF THE OFFICE OF HIGHER

SY
SENATE

3
May 4, 2017

EDUCATION RELATING TO TEACH-OUT PLANS AND ON-SITE
REVIEW OF ACADEMIC PROGRAMS.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

HB NO. 6881 AN ACT CONCERNING THE PROVISION OF
ESSENTIAL SERVICES BY LANDLORDS.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7015 AN ACT CONCERNING DEBIT CARD
FRAUD AND PENALTIES FOR COLLECTION OF RENTAL
PAYMENTS ON FORECLOSED PROPERTY.

**HIGHER EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT ADVANCEMENT
COMMITTEE**

HB NO. 7120 AN ACT CONCERNING POSTSECONDARY CAREER
SCHOOLS.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

HB NO. 6002 AN ACT CONCERNING "SEXTING" BY A CHILD.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7037 AN ACT CONCERNING WITHHOLDING
WORKERS' COMPENSATION INCOME FOR CHILD SUPPORT.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7082 AN ACT CONCERNING PROBATE COURT
OPERATIONS.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

HB NO. 7081 AN ACT CONCERNING THE CLAIM AGAINST THE
STATE OF MILLICENT CORBETT.

PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 5756 AN ACT CONCERNING THE STATE
DENTAL COMMISSION. (As amended by House Amendment
Schedule "A" (LCO 6133))

sy
SENATE

4
May 4, 2017

PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

HB NO. 6482 AN ACT CONCERNING THE CONNECTICUT TRAUMA
ADVISORY COMMITTEE. (As amended by House Amendment
Schedule "A" (LCO 6233))

PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE

HB NO. 7093 AN ACT CONCERNING NOTIFICATION TO THE
POLICE OFFICER STANDARDS AND TRAINING COUNCIL.

The Senate at 2:49 p.m. adjourned under provisions
of Senate Rule 9(f) subject to the call of the
chair.

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

Friday, May 5, 2017

The Senate was called to order at 10:42 a.m. in accordance with the provisions of Senate Rule 9(f), and under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

THE CHAIR:

The prayer was offered by Acting Chaplain, Carmela Balducci of Deep River, Connecticut.

ACTING CHAPLAIN CARMELA BALDUCCI:

In these difficult times, may our leaders find in their hearts the guidance and wisdom to do what is best for the people of Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Pursuant to Senate Rule 9(f) the Senate is called into Session, by the Office of the Senate Clerk's under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

It is hereby moved that Senate Agenda Number 1, dated May 5, 2017, is adopted, the items on said Agenda shall be acted upon as indicated and that the Agenda shall be incorporated into the Senate Journal and Senate Transcript.

SY
SENATE

2
May 5, 2017

BUSINESS FROM THE HOUSE:

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

COMMERCE COMMITTEE

**SUBST. HB NO. 5584 AN ACT CONCERNING THE CREATION OF
A SMALL BUSINESS HOTLINE. (As amended by House
Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 6525))**

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

**HB NO. 5943 AN ACT CONCERNING THE UTILIZATION OF
BUILDINGS OCCUPIED BY EXECUTIVE BRANCH AGENCIES.**

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

**SUBST. HB NO. 7063 AN ACT CONCERNING INFORMATION
INCLUDED IN THE NOTICE OF INTENDED ACTION FOR
PROPOSED REGULATIONS. (As amended by House Amendment
Schedule "A" (LCO 6646))**

**HIGHER EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT ADVANCEMENT
COMMITTEE**

**SUBST. HB NO. 5116 AN ACT CONCERNING A HIGHER
EDUCATION DATA COLLECTION AND TRACKING SYSTEM. (As
amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 6673))**

**HIGHER EDUCATION AND EMPLOYMENT ADVANCEMENT
COMMITTEE**

**SUBST. HB NO. 7128 AN ACT CONCERNING THE LEGISLATIVE
COMMISSIONERS' RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TECHNICAL
REVISIONS TO THE HIGHER EDUCATION STATUTES.**

HOUSING COMMITTEE

**HB NO. 6874 AN ACT CONCERNING THE TIMING OF
DISCLOSURE OF HOUSING DISCRIMINATION AND FAIR
HOUSING LAWS TO PROSPECTIVE PURCHASERS OF CERTAIN**

SY
SENATE

3
May 5, 2017

RESIDENTIAL PROPERTY. (As amended by House Amendment
Schedule "A" (LCO 6675))

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

HB NO. 5377 AN ACT CONCERNING NEIGHBORHOOD
REVITALIZATION ZONES. (As amended by House Amendment
Schedule "A" (LCO 6538))

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

HB NO. 7243 AN ACT CONCERNING SPECIAL MOBILE
EQUIPMENT LIENS.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

HB NO. 7250 AN ACT CONCERNING DESECRATION OF AN
ABANDONED CEMETERY.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 6741 AN ACT CONCERNING THE RIGHT OF
COUNSEL TO ACCESS RECORDS IN CERTAIN ABUSE AND
NEGLECT PROCEEDINGS. (As amended by House Amendment
Schedule "A" (LCO 6561))

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

HB NO. 7262 AN ACT CONCERNING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF
THE CONNECTICUT SENTENCING COMMISSION WITH RESPECT
TO VICTIM NOTIFICATION.

PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 5764 AN ACT CONCERNING THE LICENSING
OF BARBERS AND HAIRDRESSERS.

PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

HB NO. 6487 AN ACT CONCERNING LACTATION CONSULTANTS.
(As amended by House Amendment Schedules "A" (LCO
6608), "B" (LCO 6688))

VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

sy
SENATE

4
May 5, 2017

**HB NO. 7176 AN ACT CREATING A MILITARY RECRUITMENT
RIBBON.**

The Senate at 2:49 p.m. adjourned under provisions
of Senate Rule 9(f) subject to the call of the
chair.

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

Monday, May 8, 2017

The Senate was called to order at 1:30 p.m. in accordance with the provisions of Senate Rule 9(f), and under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

THE CHAIR:

The prayer was offered by Acting Chaplain, Noele R. Kidney of Ellington, Connecticut.

ACTING CHAPLAIN NOELE R. KIDNEY:

In these difficult times, may our leaders find in their hearts the guidance and wisdom to do what is best for the people of Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Pursuant to Senate Rule 9(f) the Senate is called into Session, by the Office of the Senate Clerk's under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

It is hereby moved that Senate Agenda Number 1, dated May 8, 2017, is adopted, the items on said Agenda shall be acted upon as indicated and that the Agenda shall be incorporated into the Senate Journal and Senate Transcript.

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

SY
SENATE

2
May 8, 2017

Auditors of Public Accounts - Monthly Loss Report to
the Governor as of April 30, 2017. (Pursuant to
Section 4-33a of the Connecticut General Statutes)

Date received: May 8, 2017

**Referred to Joint Committee on Legislative
Management**

The Senate at 1:35 p.m. adjourned under provisions
of Senate Rule 9(f) subject to the call of the
chair.

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

Tuesday, May 9, 2017

The Senate was called to order at 11:05 a.m. in accordance with the provisions of Senate Rule 9(f), and under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

THE CHAIR:

The prayer was offered by Acting Chaplain, Kathy Zabel of Burlington, Connecticut.

ACTING CHAPLAIN KATHY ZABEL:

May we always be mindful of the respect we owe all beings, in our lives and in our work.

THE CHAIR:

Pursuant to Senate Rule 9(f) the Senate is called into Session, by the Office of the Senate Clerk's under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

It is hereby moved that Senate Agenda Number 1, dated May 9, 2017, is adopted, the items on said Agenda shall be acted upon as indicated and that the Agenda shall be incorporated into the Senate Journal and Senate Transcript.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE GOVERNOR:

Referred to the Committee on Judiciary:

Corrected Letters

sy
SENATE

May 9, 2017

2

May 8, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Section 46b-231 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for reappointment by you the **Honorable David E. Dee** of Avon to be a Family Support Magistrate, to serve for a term of five years from the date of confirmation by you.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 8, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Section 46b-231 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for reappointment by you the **Honorable Norma I. Sanchez-Figueroa** of South Windsor to be a Family Support Magistrate, to serve for a term of five years beginning September 6, 2017 and ending on September 5, 2022.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 8, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Section 46b-231 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for reappointment by you the **Honorable Frederic Gilman** of East Hampton to be a Family Support Magistrate, to serve for a term of five years beginning September 6, 2017 and ending on September 5, 2022.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

SY
SENATE

3
May 9, 2017

May 8, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Section 46b-231 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for reappointment by you the **Honorable Jed N. Schulman** of Farmington to be a Family Support Magistrate, to serve for a term of five years from the date of confirmation by you.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 8, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Section 46b-231 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for reappointment by you the **Honorable Michael L. Ferguson** of Meriden to be a Family Support Magistrate, to serve for a term of five years beginning September 6, 2017 and ending on September 5, 2022.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 8, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Section 46b-231(f) of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for reappointment by you the **Honorable Sandra Sosnoff Baird** of New Haven to be a Family Support Referee, to serve for a term of five years beginning January 8, 2017 and ending on January 7, 2022.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

SY
SENATE

4
May 9, 2017

May 8, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Section 46b-231(f) of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for reappointment by you the **Honorable William E. Strada, Jr.** of Stamford to be a Family Support Referee, to serve for a term of five years from the date of confirmation by you.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 8, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Section 46b-231 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for reappointment by you the **Honorable Harris T. Lifshitz** of East Hartford to be a Family Support Referee, to serve for a term of five years from the date of confirmation by you.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 8, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Section 46b-231 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for reappointment by you the **Honorable Katherine Y. Hutchinson** of Andover to be a Family Support Referee, to serve for a term of five years from the date of confirmation by you.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

SY
SENATE

5
May 9, 2017

May 8, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Article Twenty-Fifth of the Amendments of the Constitution of the State and Sections 51-44a(h), 51-165, and 51-197c of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for appointment by you, the **Honorable Nina F. Elgo** of West Hartford to be a Judge of the Appellate Court and a Judge of the Superior Court, to serve for a term of eight years from the date of confirmation by you, in succession to the Honorable F. Herbert Gruendel, who fully retired.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 8, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Article Twenty-Fifth of the Amendments of the Constitution of the State and Sections 51-44a(h), 51-165, and 51-197c of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for appointment by you, the **Honorable Maria Araujo Kahn** of Cheshire to be a Judge of the Appellate Court and a Judge of the Superior Court, to serve for a term of eight years from the date of confirmation by you, in succession to the Honorable Robert E. Beach, Jr., who elected senior status.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 8, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Section 46b-231 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for reappointment by you the **Honorable Gladys Idelis Nieves** of New Haven to be a Family Support

sy
SENATE

6
May 9, 2017

Magistrate, to serve for a term of five years from the date of confirmation by you.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

SENATE BILL(S) FAVORABLY REPORTED - to be tabled for the calendar and printing.

FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE

SB NO. 623 AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE 7/7 PROGRAM TO ENCOURAGE THE REDEVELOPMENT OF BROWNFIELDS AND UNDERUTILIZED PROPERTY.

FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 1047 AN ACT CONCERNING TAX PREPARERS AND FACILITATORS, THE DEPARTMENT OF REVENUE SERVICES' CHANGES TO THE TAX AND RELATED STATUTES AND ESTABLISHING THE MENTAL HEALTH COMMUNITY INVESTMENT ACCOUNT.

FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE

SB NO. 1048 AN ACT REDUCING THE RATE OF SALES AND USE TAXES ON VESSELS.

FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 1058 AN ACT CONCERNING THE IDENTIFICATION OF EMERGING ECONOMIC TRENDS.

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

Office of Military Affairs - Annual Report for Calendar Year ended December 31, 2016. (Pursuant to Section 32-58b of the Connecticut General Statutes)
Date received: May 8, 2017

Referred to Committees on Appropriations, Commerce, Public Safety and Security and Veterans' Affairs

MATTER(S) RETURNED FROM COMMITTEE - to be tabled for the calendar.

SY
SENATE

7
May 9, 2017

NO NEW FILE

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 106 AN ACT CONCERNING THE DIVERSITY OF BASELOAD ENERGY SUPPLIES IN THE STATE AND ACHIEVING CONNECTICUT'S GREENHOUSE GAS EMISSIONS MANDATED LEVELS.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 287 AN ACT AUTHORIZING THE TESTING OF SHELLFISH AT ALTERNATIVE LAB FACILITIES.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 396 AN ACT CONCERNING THE CHILD FATALITY REVIEW PANEL.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SB NO. 536 AN ACT CONCERNING ESTABLISHING A STATE-WIDE PLAN AND PROCESS FOR SITING SMALL CELL ANTENNA AND DISTRIBUTED ANTENNA SYSTEMS.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 821 AN ACT CONCERNING ROOFING, WINDOW AND SIDING CONSUMER WARRANTIES AND POST-SALE WARRANTY WORK REIMBURSEMENT FOR POWER EQUIPMENT DEALERS.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 861 AN ACT CONCERNING RATEPAYER IMPACT STATEMENTS.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 883 AN ACT REDEFINING MAMMOGRAM AND LIMITING COST-SHARING FOR MAMMOGRAMS, BREAST ULTRASOUNDS AND MAGNETIC RESONANCE IMAGING OF BREASTS.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SB NO. 929 AN ACT EXTENDING WHISTLE-BLOWER PROTECTIONS TO CERTAIN EMPLOYEES.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SY
SENATE

8
May 9, 2017

SUBST. SB NO. 951 AN ACT CONCERNING THE TESTING OF PUBLIC SCHOOL WATER SUPPLIES.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 957 AN ACT CONCERNING THE REGULATION OF GAMING AND THE AUTHORIZATION OF A CASINO GAMING FACILITY IN THE STATE.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 1007 AN ACT CONCERNING THE REPORTING OF DATA RELATING TO SPECIAL EDUCATION EXPENDITURES AND THE INTENTIONAL UNDERBUDGETING OF SPECIAL EDUCATION.

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 1014 AN ACT CONCERNING VARIOUS REVISIONS AND ADDITIONS TO THE EDUCATION STATUTES.

FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 485 AN ACT CONCERNING NOTICE TO THE DEPARTMENT OF CONSUMER PROTECTION REGARDING DEPLETION ALLOWANCES FOR WINE OR SPIRITS, REGISTRATION REQUIREMENTS FOR CRAFT BEER AND FARMERS' MARKET WINE SALES PERMITS.

FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 775 AN ACT CONCERNING CONVEYANCES OF PROPERTY BY RECIPIENTS OF PUBLIC ASSISTANCE.

FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 966 AN ACT CONCERNING ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT PROGRAMS ADMINISTERED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ECONOMIC AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT.

The Senate at 11:10 a.m. adjourned under provisions of Senate Rule 9(f) subject to the call of the chair.

jm
Senate

1
May 10, 2017

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

Wednesday, May 10, 2017

The Senate was called to order at 3:35 o'clock p.m.,
the President in the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will come to order. Ladies and
gentleman, members and guests, please rise. Direct
your attention to Rabbi Lazowski, who will lead us
in prayer.

RABBI LAZOWSKI:

Thank you, dear. Our thought for today is from the
Book of Ecclesiastes, chapter 2, verse 13. "I saw
that wisdom is better than folly, just as light is
better than darkness."

Let us pray. Gracious God, look in favor upon this
circle of Senators and staff. Provide them with
wisdom and fortitude to blaze new trails where we
may walk courageously and with love in our hearts.
Help us to face our problems and give us strength to
rise above them. Out of chaos let the light of
faith illuminate our pathway. Out of darkness let
the light of love ennoble humanity and mankind may
once again walk together in the path of dignity.
Bless our Senators and our nation. Give your

jm
Senate

2
May 10, 2017

protection to our defenders of freedom. Hear us as we pray and let us all say Amen.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Rabbi. At this time I ask Senator Somers to come up and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance, please.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Rabbi, thank you very much. Thank you very much. Thank you. At this time, Mr. Clerk, is there anything on your desk?

CLERK:

In addition to today's calendar I have Senate Agenda No. 1. It's dated Wednesday, May 10, 2017. It's been copied and should be on Senators' desks.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Duff, Good afternoon.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Madam President, I move that all items on Senate Agenda No. 1, dated Wednesday, May 10, 2017, be acted upon as indicated

jm
Senate

3
May 10, 2017

and that the Agenda be incorporated by reference into the Senate journal and transcript.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, would -- will you now move to our marking for the day, one of our Bills. If I can ask the Clerk to please call as our order of the day Calendar page 38, Calendar 392, House Bill 6695.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 38, Calendar 392, House Bill 6695, AN ACT CONCERNING THE PROTECTION OF YOUTH FROM CONVERSION THERAPY.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana, good afternoon, ma'am.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill with the adoption of House A in concurrence.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

4
May 10, 2017

Motion is on acceptance and adoption. Will you remark?

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President, I will. The Bill before us prohibits health care practitioners or providers, or anyone else conducting trade or commerce from practicing or administering what is called or referred to as conversion therapy. That is any practice or treatment that seeks to change a minor's sexual orientation or gender identity.

The Bill specifies certain types of counseling that are not considered conversion therapy such as counseling intended to assist a person undergoing gender transition or facilitate a person's identity exploration. Under the Bill, if a health care provider engages in such therapy it is considered unprofessional conduct subject to disciplinary action. If anyone practices or administers conversion therapy while conducting trade or commerce it is deemed -- it is deemed unacceptable.

Finally, the Bill prohibits public funds from being spent for conversion therapy or related actions. The Public Health Committee had a very long hearing on this particular legislation. We all in Public Health Committee unanimously voted passage of the Bill out of that Committee and it's now here before us in the State Senate. At this time, Madam President, I yield the floor to Senator Beth Bye.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye, will you accept the yield, ma'am?

jm
Senate

5
May 10, 2017

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Yes, I will. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

I want to thank Senator Gerratana for her leadership on this Bill as well as Representative Currey and other members of the Public Health Committee; also to the coalition of advocates, to the assistance of GLAAD and ACLU, to Anne Stanback, and so many other advocates. I also want to express my gratitude to my colleagues, many sitting around this circle in a bipartisan way, 60 percent of this Chamber has signed on as a co-sponsor to this Bill so it's a very important Bill and I think Senator Gerratana did a good job of explaining the three items -- three key policy items.

I want to take a moment to describe why it's important that we pass this Bill to protect, in most cases, youth in Connecticut from this very dangerous practice that has been repudiated by virtually every human service and mental health provider organization in the state. It is particularly important for minors because this dangerous practice which relies on things like shame and discrediting an individual's gender identity or sexual orientation can have a big impact on minors who are eight times more likely to attempt suicide if their families and others reject their orientation or their gender identity; six times more likely to

jm
Senate

6
May 10, 2017

suffer from depression; three times more likely to use drugs; three times more likely to engage in unprotected sex because of some of the damage that comes from not being accepted for who they are. So I think it's a very important Bill and I hope this Chamber will adopt it. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I rise to support this Bill and would like to say that this issue rises to recognize that it is very difficult to deny a person's biology and attempts to do so can be very damaging as was just brought up by my colleague, Senator Bye, and particularly damaging for very young people so I'm happy to support this Bill today and hope that we also have a unanimous vote possibly here in the Senate. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

That'd be nice. Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. First I want to begin by complimenting the proponent of the Bill about the laudable intent of the Bill. Conversion therapy can indeed be a real problem when it becomes coercion therapy and so I salute the proponent of the Bill for that, but I do have some questions I would like

jm
Senate

7
May 10, 2017

to put forward to the proponent of the Bill, if I may, Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. To the proponent of the Bill, first I just want to clarify the facts of the proposed Bill, or the proposed law that it applies only to minors defined as persons under the age of 18, is that correct?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It is meant to address minors. I'm going to just take a moment and make sure the Chair of the Public Health --

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease.

Senate will come back to order. Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I wanted to be sure I was 100 percent accurate with the age. Yes, it is 18, Senator Suzio.

jm
Senate

8
May 10, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

And again through you, Madam Chair, the object of any disciplinary action or penalty for providing such service or therapy to minors is aimed at licensed health care professionals as I understand it, is that true?

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Yes, it is for licensed professionals who are compensated for their care.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

And again through you, Madam President. Now does that mean that if a licensed health care professional were to provide this therapy free of charge that that would not be subject to the sanctions of this Bill? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

jm
Senate

9
May 10, 2017

Through you, Madam President. This applies to licensed professionals who are paid as therapists. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

And again through you. Just -- I want to make sure I get the details correct. So normally the licensed health care professionals will be paid for a service they're rendering but if they waive that payment in the provision of a service such as this would that be subject to the sanctions of this Bill?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Madam President, it is my understanding that this is meant to apply to professionals who are paid in the practice of caring for youth and engaging in that practice. There may be others who provide counseling to youth who are not professionals and are not paid as professionals. It does not apply to them but my understanding is that it applies to paid professions. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

jm
Senate

10
May 10, 2017

Thank you, and again through you, Madam President. Now I also understand that the Bill is not aimed at the parents or the guardians of the minor child who may be receiving such therapy. There is no sanctions or penalties directed towards the parents or the guardians of such minor who receives such therapy? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, yes it does not apply to presidents -- to parents. I want to reiterate, Madam President, that these are professionals who are trained as practitioners and every organization that oversees practitioners of mental health has said this is bad for patients. You can think of it like if somebody was ill with a disease and being treated with something that actually made them more sick, that's the intent here. It's not meant to address parents' rights to maybe offer their opinions to their own children. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

And again through you, Madam President. If a parent of a minor wanted such therapy to be given to their child and this Bill passes they would not be able to

jm
Senate

11
May 10, 2017

acquire it here in Connecticut, but I understand that some nearby states have not outlawed this practice. Would they be able to take the child to a nearby state where conversion therapy has not been outlawed and transport the child to that location, get the therapy for the service for the child, and then come back to the state? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thanks to the Senator for that question. More and more states are banning conversion therapy and -- but they -- it does not speak to the parents' rights and what they can do. It speaks to professionals within the State of Connecticut. Thank you, Madam President. Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and through you again, Madam President. Regarding the nearby states, New York, Massachusetts, and Rhode Island, what laws or regulations do they have pertaining to the practice of conversion therapy? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

12
May 10, 2017

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I have that exact data here but I just need to look for one moment.

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease.

Senate will come back to order. Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. The other states that have passed this legislation to protect children are California, Illinois, New Jersey, Oregon, Vermont, and Washington, D.C., and to the Senator, as well, recently one of these laws was brought to the U.S. Supreme Court which refused to hear the case so it does also have a national footprint in the legal profession. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and again through you, Madam President. So listening to the list of states or jurisdictions that have outlawed or made this practice illegal, I did not hear Massachusetts, Rhode Island, or New York, so I presume the practice is still tolerated or allowed there. Through you, Madam President.

jm
Senate

13
May 10, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. Today, but it is my understanding that in the near future these states are likely to adopt this provision as well to protect youth in their states. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and regarding the State of Connecticut and the current situation, I know there was extensive testimony given regarding this proposed Bill. I would ask what information or data or statistics are available regarding the practice in Connecticut? For example, are there any numbers that were submitted as part of the testimony or evidence regarding the practice of conversion therapy in Connecticut? Are there any statistics on its use or practice? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

jm
Senate

14
May 10, 2017

Through you, Madam President. I anecdotally heard of a couple of cases from constituents, but these -- this kind of data is very difficult because there are laws that protect the privacy in a therapeutic, in a medical, in a public health setting appropriately so it's not like there's data out there but I know that I have and a number of friends have heard of very sad stories about children who've been subjected to this kind of therapy and I think that's why all the organizations, mental health and human service organizations, in Connecticut have signed onto this Bill because they believe it's a problem as well. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and again through you, Madam President. Are there any numbers or statistics or information available regarding professionals who have been offering this therapy in Connecticut? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. Not that I am aware of personally. I did not sit through all the public hearing testimony. I did see some of it but there certainly are cases. The Bill is before us because this is a problem that mental health professionals

jm
Senate

15
May 10, 2017

have seen in their practice and that others in the gay and lesbian and transgender community have heard about. I know that I, myself, was at a PFLAG meeting just two weeks ago in the Hartford area and had five or six of the people attending there for support come up to me and say this Bill is very important because of some of their past experiences. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and again through you, Madam President. So at this point we don't have any studies or statistics or data pertaining to the practice in Connecticut how many children might have been exposed to it, how many practitioners are practicing the therapy? Is that a correct summary of what we know so far? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

My answer remains as the previous one. I am very clearly aware that this practice exists in Connecticut and is a problem for individuals. I'm also painfully aware of some of the challenges that go on for individuals when important people in their lives try to impress upon them that who they are is not who they are and there are long-term consequences to that. Through you, Madam President.

jm
Senate

16
May 10, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and through you, Madam President. I read the testimony of all the persons who showed up regarding this Bill and I could identify only one person who testified about having received conversion therapy and that person did not indicate they had received the therapy in Connecticut. They had mentioned they had actually received it on three different continents over 20 some odd years, so I'm just wondering what information -- how do we know other than anecdotal evidence here or there that the practice is actually being conducted here in Connecticut? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. From mental health associations, from human service organizations, from personal stories I have heard from constituents and I'm sure many of my colleagues who signed on have as well. I think it would be unfair to expect an individual who's had a traumatizing experience, who's dealing with a family rejection of who they are perhaps, to come out at a public hearing and be on TV to testify to that effect, so it's very clear to me that this is a real and present problem in Connecticut and that we can be a leader as if we

jm
Senate

17
May 10, 2017

pass this and other states look to our law as an example. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and again through you, Madam President. We also do not know, at least I don't understand, if there's any studies that have been conducted by Yale -- academic institutions such as Yale, professional medical organizations, regarding this practice in Connecticut. There's no study that I'm aware of. Did the Committee become aware of such a study and, if so, what did that study indicate regarding -- I'm not talking about the specifics of whether it's harmful or not, but just the -- to the extent to which the therapy is being practiced in the State of Connecticut. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. As I stated at the beginning, this Bill is really about professional practice and what is appropriate professional practice when working with youth who are dealing with issues of their sexual orientation or their gender identity. This Bill is about best practices and trying to assure that Connecticut has the best practices in place to protect our youth. Through you, Madam President.

jm
Senate

18
May 10, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and again through you, Madam President. Reading through the testimony that was given during the hearings, I saw testimony from medical professionals indicating that conversion therapy is not effective, that in fact it's more than ineffective. It may be harmful to the recipient of such therapy or advice and I presume those are the main reasons why the proponent is advancing this Bill for passage today. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Yes, through you, Madam President. It's a matter of public health.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and again through you, Madam President. If the practice of conversion therapy is indeed ineffective and harmful would it be appropriately

jm
Senate

19
May 10, 2017

described as quack medicine? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. I would describe it as inappropriate practice in the care of young people.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and again through you, Madam President. In light of the proponent's description of the therapy as being ineffective and during her presentation she actually mentioned it as being dangerous practice, would this be -- would it be appropriate to consider conversion therapy as medical malpractice? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. What this Bill is doing is saying this practice is unacceptable in Connecticut and you could be subject to sanctions

jm
Senate

20
May 10, 2017

through the Department of Public Health for your licensure.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

And again through you, Madam President. But if I understand the rationale for this Bill, the rationale is that this is bad practice, bad medical practice, and it's not only ineffective it's potentially harmful to the recipient. It seems to me that that fulfills the definition of what one might describe as medical malpractice. Would the proponent agree with that? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. I'm describing the Bill as it is before us and the punishments that are written into the Bill before us and I don't want to speculate beyond that. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

jm
Senate

21
May 10, 2017

Thank you, and again through you, Madam President. If indeed this is practice that is -- medical practice that's ineffective and harmful and it fails to meet the prevailing professional standard of care, which is really what medical malpractice is about, then it would seem to me to be considered rightfully to be medical malpractice. The definition of medical malpractice is a breach of the prevailing professional standard of care. Would the proponent of the Bill agree with that? Would that description fulfill the definition of conversion therapy? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. I would just like to refer to my previous answer to this question.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and through you, Madam President. This Bill does limit or prescribe conversion therapy insofar as it's applied to minors. It does not apply to someone who's 18 years old or older who wants to receive such therapy. Is that true? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

22
May 10, 2017

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, yes, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, through you, Madam President. If indeed the practice is ineffective and if it indeed is dangerous as medical practice and therapy, would it not also be dangerous and ineffective for a person who's 18 years old or older? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. As I stated earlier, this Bill is about protecting youth and I think as a legislature when you're making public policy we distinguish between adults making decisions about their own care and decisions that are made about a child's care and this is meant particularly to address young people and young people are particularly vulnerable to some of the repercussions of this sort of bad practice. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

23
May 10, 2017

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and through you, Madam President. So in a situation where a minor and their parent or legal guardians agree that they want this therapy, if this Bill passes, even if everyone's in agreement, the child as well as the guardian, that would not be permissible here in Connecticut. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. No.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and again through you. How does the law -- how would the law apply to adolescents who are confused about their sexual identity? LGBTQ does have lesbian, gay, transgender, and bisexual and questioning, as I understand the Q stands for, which would indicate to me there are some people who are confused or not certain about their sexual identity and my question -- conversion implies that you're taking someone who has -- believes they are, let's say, gay or

bisexual, and you're trying to convert them to be straight, but if someone is not -- they're uncertain of what their sexual identity is, how would this be applied in a situation like that when they're not taking a position that they're gay, bisexual, transgender, etc. and, therefore, there's nothing to be converted from?

Would this Bill apply in the situation where an adolescent is truly confused about their sexual identity? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. I think the term that the good Senator used was coercion in part of how he described and part of framing his question. I think that's a critical word that there is therapy that is coercing a child in one direction or other. A good therapy -- good therapeutic environment is one in which the therapist listens and supports and responds but does not coerce, whether about this or any -- mostly anything else.

I'm afraid the Senator would come up with an example if I said absolutely anything else, but that's the idea here, is that certainly there are young people who are questioning and there is therapy to be supportive of young people and students who are questioning, but as long as there is not a coercive approach the therapist can practice and one day a young person may be questioning their gender identity one way and one day another and as long as

jm
Senate

25
May 10, 2017

they are not coerced into believing one thing or the other by that therapist it would be acceptable practice. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and through you, Madam President. So in a situation in which an adolescent is confused and the therapist is in effect teasing out the information, trying to understand where the adolescent is coming from and if it turns out that through the therapy that that adolescent determines that they're straight, would that therapist be at risk for being prosecuted under this law because the way the law is written is it can't be coercive in a sense of discouraging people who may have bisexual or gay tendencies, but it doesn't say anything at all about the opposite where someone might be inclined to be straight but is confused.

So my question is, and I think some practitioners -- I've been contacted by people who do adolescent counseling and they've expressed some concern about the ambiguity of that kind of a situation and I would ask the proponent if they could elucidate a little bit more in a situation where there's a confused adolescent with, you know, what assurances does the practitioner have that if the child eventually decides they're straight that they won't be prosecuted at some time in the future for providing therapy which results in an adolescent determining that they are straight? Through you, Madam President

jm
Senate

26
May 10, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and through you. The idea here is that the therapist is supportive of the individual's expression of their gender identity and/or their sexual orientation. I think that's the standard. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and through you, Madam President. In terms of the practice of the law if it passes, you did mention before privacy concerns and HIPAA and medical records are subject to privacy issues. If indeed an adolescent were to complain that they had been subjected to conversion therapy what would the procedure be to be able to bring out the facts regarding that and yet not violate the privacy laws regarding health care? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

jm
Senate

27
May 10, 2017

Through you, Madam President. It would be like any other complaint which it would be an investigation. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Through you, Madam President. I'm not familiar with what those procedures are. If the proponent could just educate me a little bit about that I would appreciate it. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. Could the fine gentleman repeat his question?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

I'm not familiar with what the procedures are when there's allegations of medical malpractice. I would ask the proponent if she could explain to me in this particular situation if there's an allegation of malpractice or -- not malpractice, but violating this particular law, how the facts would be brought out in light of the privacy laws and she mentioned -

jm
Senate

28
May 10, 2017

- when I asked that question first she mentioned, well it's the standard procedure when there's medical malpractice, but I'm not familiar with what that is so I ask the good proponent what that might be.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It would go before the Department of Public Health, who holds the license of the professional, and they conduct hearings like they would on any complaint against any health care provider. I think it's -- if the fine gentleman would consider this to be like any other medical or licensed professional who's practicing in a way that puts their patient in danger, this is treated that exact same way. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and again through you, Madam President. This last exchange has brought us back to this whole idea of medical malpractice which I believe if conversion therapy is indeed ineffective and it is indeed harmful, and there was apparently a lot of testimony from medical professionals to that extent -- in fact I know the American Psychiatry Association, I think, is -- has disparaged it -- it would seem to me that the professional bodies have

jm
Senate

29
May 10, 2017

set a standard that conversion therapy would be in violation of and, therefore, it would be potentially medical malpractice and from what I understand when someone feels that they've been the victim of medical malpractice they can approach the Department of Public Health and ask for an investigation and sanctions if they find such conduct, which is exactly what I believe this Bill will do, right? So through you, Madam President, would that not be the same thing?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Senator Suzio has returned several times to this question of medical malpractice and I'm not trying to be evasive. I'm just trying to stay within the law, or the Bill that's before us, to describe it as unprofessional conduct, which is how it's described in the Bill here. Anyone who wants to take it further than that, you know, that's -- that's up -- that's -- I think that's what Senator Suzio is asking about but I'm keeping my comments to the contents of the Bill and the sanctions that are in this Bill for professionals who engage in this dangerous conduct. Through you, Madam President

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you. I have no further questions for the proponent. I will just say that one of my concerns just is that I believe the outcome of this legislation basically would result in the same outcome as if somebody alleged medical malpractice today who had received conversion therapy and indeed apparently there was a great deal of evidence during the public hearing testimony of public health officials and medical professionals that the therapy is ineffective and in fact harmful under some circumstances and, therefore, would likely be considered to be medical malpractice and so if that were the case then the remedies that are provided in this Bill are already available in law and so to some extent the law, I find, to be redundant. Maybe it clarifies certain things and I am leaning towards voting for this right now. I'm waiting to hear the rest of the debate, but those are the questions and concerns I have and I think it's been very informative to engage in a dialog with the proponent of the Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Great to see you on this beautiful spring Wednesday afternoon. First of all, I want to state for the record that I am 100 percent in favor of this Bill and I commend the proponent for bringing it forward before us this year and I have stated to my colleagues and to others that have approached me as recently as today that I have no intention of offering any amendments

jm
Senate

31
May 10, 2017

to this Bill or supporting any amendments if any of my colleagues bring those forward.

Nonetheless, I have been approached by individuals in the last really just 48 hours representing the Connecticut Catholic Conference and indeed those of you who are lucky enough to represent folks here in the circle. Last year we had, to my knowledge, the first time in the history of the Chamber the Archbishop from the Hartford -- Greater Hartford Diocese. Archbishop Leonard Blair came here to our Chamber and offered us a prayer early in the morning and was gracious enough to meet with several of us and was -- is a very nice, kind, good gentleman and he and I actually spoke personally this morning on this Bill as well and so in attempt to create a very clear legislative history I have four questions just for -- for the proponents of the Bill and I offer that to assuage the concerns of some of the folks out there in the State of Connecticut that may have concerns with this Bill, but I for one don't necessarily share all those concerns and feel that the Bill is extremely important and that our young people should not have to confront these kinds of efforts on top of all the other things that are going on in their world and that all adolescents face in one way or another.

So with that as a predicate, if I may, a few questions to the proponent of the Bill, Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much. Number one, does Section 1 limit discussions by clergy or religious educators regarding the teaching of religious doctrine about human sexuality? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. No it does not.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much. Number two, is a religious school nurse restricted by Section 1 from discussing issues of human sexuality that reflect the religious beliefs of that school? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. Can the good gentleman clarify what he means by that question?

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

33
May 10, 2017

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Through you, Madam President. I just have the language before me. Is a religious school nurse, and I think that the school nurse hired by that religious school, restricted by Section 1 from discussing the issues of human sexuality that reflect the religious beliefs of that school, and of course that would apply to a parochial school, that would apply to a Jewish school, that would apply to a Muslim school. There is a Muslim school in Windsor that I had all these terrific adolescents, junior high school and high school age, come and visit me a month ago from one of the towns I represent, Windsor, so we have all sorts of religious schools in our state. I'm just -- that's as best I could explain it.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and I can see where the question is coming from because a nurse is a licensed professional who's licensed by the Department of Public Health but there is also in this Bill -- it talks about unfair or deceptive trade practices in referring to CUTPA so it does not likely apply to clergy engaged in their -- in therapy in the context of free religious counseling and I want to refer to *Reynolds v. Ziska* where the Connecticut Trial Court held that the religious activities of the Roman Catholic Church and Diocese

jm
Senate

34
May 10, 2017

did not constitute trade and -- I'm sorry, trade or commerce and, therefore, were not covered by CUTPA. According to the Court, the CUTPA claim here is based on the allegation that the Defendants engaged in trade or commerce of providing religion. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much. So by way of clarification, I'm still on question two, even though a school nurse is a licensed professional and, therefore, comes under that portion of the proposed Bill, the fact that they're working in a religious school has been determined by the Courts not to be engaging in commerce and, therefore, would not fall under the Connecticut Unfair Trade Practices Act. Is that correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. That is my impression of the Bill and CUTPA. I would just like to say that it is not my impression nor have I heard that nurses in religious schools are engaging in coercive therapy towards students. I think nurses in the schools are engaging in caring for students before them who are sick. Through you, Madam President.

jm
Senate

35
May 10, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much and I appreciate that explanation and I think that probably is much as we're going to be able to get on the legislative record, but I think without a doubt this Bill is not aimed at school nurses in any way, shape, or form, especially those that are involved with a religious school in explaining the human sexuality doctrine of that school.

Question number three, in Section 1, would the proponent please explain what the words "any effort to eliminate or reduce sexual or romantic attraction or feelings toward a person", what does that mean?

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. Could Senator Kissel please refer me to the line so I can see exactly where he is?

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

jm
Senate

36
May 10, 2017

I'm sorry. Thank you, Senator Gerratana, for helping with that. It's line 6 through 8. We work in a very bipartisan fashion at this side of the circle, not that other folks don't.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

I believe, like I covered in my conversation with Senator Suzio, that the therapy is not coercive, that it is supportive of the student and their feelings. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much. So again, by -- just to follow up the third question, even though the words say any effort to eliminate or reduce sexual or romantic attraction or feelings toward another individual, there would also have to be superimposed upon that a coercive effort and absent any coercion no one would be running afoul of this Bill. Would that be correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

37
May 10, 2017

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much. And last -- the fourth question I've been asked to create a legislative history regarding, if a teacher, coach, or camp counselor makes a statement to the class, team, or cabin group advocating that the youths not engage romantically for a certain period of time, would that violate this provision?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. No.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

That being the legislative history I was asked to create, I want to thank Senator Bye for her answers to those questions and Senator Gerratana for bringing this Bill forward, and I commend all the advocates and individuals that cared about moving this Bill forward.

When you have doubts about yourself whether it's your sexuality, whether it's your masculinity or femininity, when it's your ability to exist within certain groups, that can be really daunting. That

can be daunting for adults. Some days that's daunting for me in this circle, believe it. Your tensions run high, you might have a lot on your plate, there may be things going on at home, in your other jobs, with other family members, and it's a lot to juggle. And then to interpose upon that people being critical or coercing you can really tip the scales in a very negative way.

I analogize this to another practice that we do not tolerate and that's bullying and the net result in dramatically terrible cases is that individuals either harm themselves or kill themselves when they are tremendously picked on, coerced, or bullied and what we need to do is be strong and supportive and allow individuals to grow and blossom and become the full self-confident individuals that they are meant to become and so I don't know how prevalent this is in the State of Connecticut but I certainly don't believe it is helpful in the growth and maturation of any young individual and with that I urge my colleagues to support this Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark? Senator MacLachlan.
Good afternoon, sir.

SENATOR MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I stand for questions to the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Bye, for your hard work on this. I have some specific questions about the -- sort of technical question about the business of counseling children in these areas that we're talking about in this legislation.

It seems to be that we're addressing two areas. One that's been around for quite a while and that's counseling -- let me get the language correct -- sexual orientation, and then the rather newer type of counseling that has been less prevalent and less known about is gender identity, and so as I did some research on both of those types of counseling, the counseling for sexual orientation seems to be pretty clear, pretty well established by this time, but not so with gender identity. In fact I'm curious why the psychiatric terminology is not included in this legislation because as I did my research I come across terminology that used to be known as gender identity disorder, which is no longer an acceptable term. It's now known as gender dysphoria.

And in fact when I look at current prevalent acceptable methods of treatment of gender dysphoria in children under 18 I'm coming across a lot of conflict worldwide. It's not just United States where there's conflict in opinion on this. Certainly in Canada there's been a big fight about how to treat gender dysphoria and yet I'm seeing that there's support or suggested support on this Bill from a lot of psychiatric associations.

So could you talk to us a little bit about, if you can, what is the difference, first of all, in that

jm
Senate

40
May 10, 2017

treatment and, secondly, this reported conflict worldwide in the appropriate ways of this treatment? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. I really appreciate Senator MacLachlan's question because words do matter and as he talked to the history of the term gender disorder, gender dysphoria, you can go back to DSM-III, which is a diagnostic and statistical manual, I, II, III, and there are terms regarding homosexuality and gender identity that are words that have been repudiated and no longer in the public discourse, and I think Connecticut picked the word gender identity and the term gender identity based on what we know now is an appropriate term because the term dysphoria, you know, implies some kind of problem like it's a diss, you know. You must talk to that adolescent, diss is not a good thing, to be dissed.

What it really is about, and as we built understanding, as Senator MacLachlan pointed out things change over time. I would argue that there have been just as many individuals struggling with these issues 25 years ago as today but as we built understanding today there is more empathy and compassion for people as they move through life and come to understand their gender identity.

So that term is in this Bill very purposely to say you have to honor and individual's gender identity.

jm
Senate

41
May 10, 2017

There's nothing dysphoric about it. It's their identity. It's who they are and the intent of the Bill is to honor who that individual is and help protect them from some of the consequences when adults in their lives, and maybe professionals, don't honor that identity. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator MacLachlan.

SENATOR MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, through you. Thank you, Senator Bye. We certainly agree in the history that it's been around a long time but it has made some rapid changes in recent years the treatment of children with this challenge. Some of the research that I found, though, and what I would ask for your comment on, is that there was a report of the American Psychiatric Association task force on the treatment of gender identity disorder just about four years. I believe this was published and it was widely disseminated and apparently lots of people had opinions on the task force report, but that task force report was one of the -- I call it industry -- was one of the areas of medicine where sort of like the New England Journal of Medicine is important, this is one of those publications that's important in this field of medicine, and that report seemed to show that the professionals in this area of treatment are not in agreement in what's the appropriate way to handle it.

And I also found stories -- a story in -- the New York Times magazine about a Dr. Kenneth Zucker, who

jm
Senate

42
May 10, 2017

was very controversial apparently, well known, well respected at the time Canadian from Toronto, who was an expert in this field of treatment and was displaced and summarily fired from his professional job in Toronto because his way of treatment was a different way than what is proposed in this legislation.

My point is this: If there appears to be disagreement in the professional community worldwide, not just the United States, why are we putting into State Statute taking a side with that professional argument about which is the right way to treat children with this challenge? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you, Madam President. The good gentleman has pointed out that there is sometimes disagreement among professions -- professionals and that happens in every profession and that's why professional organizations develop professional standards. It's why the APA developed DSM-5, DSM-6, so the professionals will look to professional guidelines.

And the reason that Connecticut is taking this step is really the confluence of evidence about the hazards of this sort of treatment and in front of me I have over 40 organizations, professional organizations, of teachers, doctors, nurses, pediatricians, psychologists, American Family

jm
Senate

43
May 10, 2017

therapists, virtually every mental health organization in the State of Connecticut saying this Bill is very important to protect youth.

So there's a difference between several people that disagree because in our country and in -- certainly in different practices professionals have disagreements but within professional organizations they develop professional guidelines and this Bill is in keeping with the professional guideline. I don't think it's any secret that issues of gender identity, gender expression, and sexual orientation have drawn fire from religious groups, conservative groups. These issues have a lot of influences. What we're trying to do with this Bill is say we're gonna follow best practices from the professionals who've developed guidelines in the State of Connecticut and protect children. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator MacLachlan.

SENATOR MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and thank you, Senator Bye. Protection of our children is clearly everyone's wish and high priority and I concur with that wholeheartedly. The question I offered, though, was more for clarification. If there is professional differences of opinion in how to treat isn't it a long step to take one side of that argument that's a professional argument and drop it into State Statute? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

44
May 10, 2017

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. I would argue that there is not professional argument when there is a group that adopts policies. I would say there is widespread agreement that coercive therapy in this particular practice is not good for patients. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator MacLachlan.

SENATOR MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Bye. I would agree that coercive therapy is totally inappropriate. I got the impression through my research that sometimes it's not coercive therapy but I guess that's -- that would be someone's matter of opinion how it's identified.

Last but not least, if I may, through you, Madam President, is a question regarding the general idea of thoughts out there, a matter of opinion again, is that there are a good percentage of children under 18 who have gender identity challenges and are experiencing that challenge and in that experience they are feeling isolated, oftentimes isolate completely in that they don't share the challenge that they have with others, certainly not with adults. Sometimes the only time they're sharing this challenge is with another child and I think that my concern is if someone 10 or 12 years old is

going through this very earth-shattering challenge it seems to me that this Statute that we're proposing doesn't give this 10 or 12-year-old wiggle room to change their mind and so I wonder if you could address that.

My concern is if a 10-year-old says -- a 10-year-old boy suggests I'm a girl and is seeking some type of therapy for that but no one can say, well, why don't you sit on that decision for a little while and think about it first, could you comment on that concern? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Yes, Madam President. I really appreciate that question from Senator MacLachlan 'cause there are these chances in conversations like this for public education and within the therapeutic practice with young people who are questioning their gender identity and as Senator MacLachlan rightly pointed out there are times when children may feel one way one day and another way another day and the therapist would have to, you know, support where that student is, maybe remind them of where they were and ask questions.

But before any therapist will, I believe, and I'm trying to use the proper word, but for gender identity questioning when you talk to parents of children who have had gender identity challenges or therapists who work with children with gender identity therapists, they use three words:

Insistent, persistent, and consistent. And those are the three tenets of understanding when a child is very clear.

So this Bill is not meant to push a child one way or the other but to support best practices in supporting that student or child where they are as they're moving through youth, and that can certainly be a challenging thing and in our culture some of the gender boxes are so tight and square that young people do question, do I fit if I'm not like this? Am I a boy, and if I'm not like this am I a girl? Some of that's a reaction to the culture, but the role of the therapist is taking that child in a culture and supporting them where they are and paying attention to if they are insistent, persistent, and consistent in their gender identity. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator MacLachlan.

SENATOR MACLACHLAN (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and thank you, Senator Bye, for your answers and I'll continue to listen to the debate.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further? Senator Miner. Good afternoon, sir.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Madam President, my ex-wife and I raised three children and I'm trying to remember back to their earlier years and whether their sexuality was ever an issue and I actually had spent some time in the car this morning and gave it quite a bit of thought and I'd have to say that, no, I never was aware that there was a misunderstanding about what their gender was. So I believe in my heart that we are all born predisposed generally one way or the other and if I believe that then I think I must have some ability to think that there's a possibility that there are some that may be on the bubble for a period of time.

And so as I thought about this legislation I was trying to imagine how a parent might appropriately help their child through what are remembered by me to be some difficult years for a whole bunch of other reasons let alone this. And so when I read the language again today I was thinking to myself, well, as long as there's a reasonable expectation that parents could seek counseling, especially if their child was undecided, seek counseling for some guidance, then what's the harm? We certainly want to send the right message here in the State of Connecticut that we don't believe that health care should be about trying to direct an individual one way or the other 'cause like I said at the onset I believe in my heart that this is how we are born.

But when I read the words I get a little nervous. I heard the good Senator talk about -- as long as the counseling doesn't direct the decision one way or the other that it would be acceptable. Counseling to try and make a determination isn't necessarily steering. But when I read the language on line 8 it very clearly says that as long as you are not

jm
Senate

48
May 10, 2017

directing or guiding the person away from someone of the same gender then you run afoul of this law. So theoretically as long as you are guiding in the direction of your same gender that would be permissible under this law under my reading of it.

Again, I'm not saying that's a bad thing. I'm just saying that's my read of it. In the line before that where it talks about but not limited to any effort to change gender expression, and then in line 7, eliminate or reduce sexual, romantic attraction, one thing I do very clearly remember at the age of 14 or 15 trying to slow down hormones and I wonder under this language if my daughter had been attracted to someone of the same gender and my wife and I sought out counseling in an effort at the age of 14 to slow down this process would we have run afoul of this new language if it was construed in some way to be specifically because they were attracted to someone of the same gender?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. No, I do not believe so. I think this not -- does not apply to parents. It applies to the counselor, that the counselor is not counseling in another direction to push them away from a gender identity they're expressing or a sexual orientation or gender expression that they are expressing, so I do not believe so. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

49
May 10, 2017

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and through you. In line 8 where it speaks about feelings toward the same gender, am I correct that as long as the feelings are toward the same gender and the professional doesn't seek to move them away from that same gender, then it would be permissible under this language and not permissible if my daughter, let's say, was undecided, seeking guidance, troubled perhaps, and the leaning may be in the other direction? So it does clearly say that as long as it's gender similar it's acceptable. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. I believe that is true. I'm try -- there are a couple of reversals in there that I'm trying to make sure -- I'll try to clarify for Senator Miner. The language, my understanding, is that the language is meaning to say that if you brought your daughter who was questioning in to therapy, which is your prerogative as a parent, that that professional does not push your daughter one way or the other, frankly. But this is very specific to gay therapy, banning gay conversion, which is why the language is like that. That the therapist would likely ask your daughter questions and listen and over time be supportive of

jm
Senate

50
May 10, 2017

your daughter figuring out her own identity and her own sexual orientation. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So the gentlelady spoke about conversion therapy being specific to same gender. Is that widely understood? Is there no possibility that conversion therapy, directing someone in that direction when they may be on the bubble as I said, could run afoul of this law? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

They would not run afoul of this law as long as they are following that individual's sexual orientation, gender identity, or gender expression, and I think some of what Senator Miner is trying to get at is that there are young people who are questioning and the therapy needs to be supportive of that phase and that state of gender identity and sexual orientation and gender expression at that age. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The gentlelady spoke about people in that age and the age on line 4 that has been selected is 18 and one of the questions that came to me, why is there no exception for children who may have sought emancipation below the age of 18 and can otherwise make their own decisions? In that case of someone, rightly or wrongly, chose to seek out this type of therapy, is the clinician then still bound by this language or would that circumstance be exempted? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

The age is 18 as stated in the Bill whether they are emancipated minor or not. The idea is to protect children until they get to the age of maturity, which in our culture is considered the age of 18. Even if they are emancipated they can't vote 'til they're 18. They're not considered adults until they are 18 so it's meant to be a protective measure. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The last question that I have actually goes back to, I think, maybe some of the questions that Senator Kissel asked.

Understanding that sometimes, especially amongst young people, you have these relationships that could be on, could be off depending on the day, depending on the week, depending on the month. Who would make the complaint against the clinician? Is it conceivable that the complainant would be either the patient or the parents of the patient? Or could it actually be someone who may have been involved in a romantic relationship that felt there was an attempt being made to separate two people based on their gender? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. I appreciate that question. I think the easiest frame with which to view this is the way we view medical professions who have complaints because that's the place of complaint to the Department of Public Health. If a doctor is practicing, or dentist, in a way that is not appropriate, it could be a patient, it could be a coworker, it could be a family member. Someone makes the complaint to the Department of Public Health that this person is engaging in practice that is not good for their patient. So it's an administrative process and hearing related to that individual's license so I think it should be viewed the way you'd view any complaint against -- about a licensed professional to the Department of Public Health. Through you, Madam President.

jm
Senate

53
May 10, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And so in my earlier example of on again, off again relationship or whether parents are trying to slow down a process regardless of the gender, it appears based on your response that even in a circumstance like that if the attempt was to slow it down and not necessarily send someone in a different direction a complaint could be made against the clinician and then there would be an investigation. If the gentlelady knows, how would that determination be made? How would that be made?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. Through a Department of Public Health hearing process that would be made just like other medical professions. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I thank the gentlelady. I thought about this quite a lot because I do think that there is kind of a tender age where young people especially deserve some protection. It was shocking to me that there's actually a process by which, you know, you make an appointment and then someone had some kind of a direct procedure by which they thought that they could convert someone who, as I said, I think is predominantly born that way.

I've had an opportunity on the Appropriations Committee actually to exchange questions with some people who have testified about how some states handle gender identity very differently than the way we do in the State of Connecticut and how they handle medical procedures very differently than how we do here in Connecticut and I find that in Connecticut we are much more thoughtful about that process, much more inclusive.

I'm not -- I'm not worried about supporting the Bill. In fact it is my intention to support the Bill. I think these are the kind of protections that we want to afford people trying to make some very difficult decisions. I am a little bit concerned that it does seem to have at its language here some gender bias for those that are undecided. Not that we shouldn't be favoring people of the same gender having that opportunity but that we've kind of chosen the side in the language and I guess that would be my point. But I take the gentlelady at her word that conversion therapy is widely understood to be exactly that, trying to convert someone that may have a predisposition to be sexually and emotionally attracted to someone of the same gender as opposed to the opposite. So thank you, Madam President.

jm
Senate

55
May 10, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further? Senator Somers. Good afternoon, ma'am.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Good afternoon. Thank you, Madam President. I am a co-sponsor of this Bill and I wanted to talk to an experience that my brother-in-law had, growing up how difficult it is to come to terms with your own sexuality, coming out as a gay man, and I can't imagine what he went through just in that experience let alone have to go through something like conversion therapy.

Conversion therapy was also known years ago as reparative therapy, something that means you need to be fixed. All the leading medical and mental health professionals have rejected conversion therapy as ineffective and dangerous. Conversion, or reparative therapy, is really based on the false assumption that if you're not heterosexual there's something wrong with you. Conversion therapy effects people with great shame, guilt, hopelessness, and severely impacts their self-esteem, and the research that I've done has shown that youth that have gone through conversion therapy are eight times more likely to commit suicide.

The leading experts agree, again, in the mental health professional field that this practice is not good, it's not good medicine, and it's not effective. One could actually say that it really is unacceptable and it deviates from the standard of care that should be provided by therapists. We would not tolerate another medical professional

jm
Senate

56
May 10, 2017

deviating from the standard of care or providing care that was considered harmful to others whether it be a cardiologist, a dentist, or a nurse.

So I would urge my colleagues to joint me and support this Bill as it's the right thing to do and it sets the tone for Connecticut that we treat all equally. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Senator Markley. Good afternoon, sir.

SENATOR MARKLEY (16TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Thank you very much. I've had a funny history, I guess, with this Bill in the sense that I think when it was proposed I was one of the first people that proponents talked to assuming that I might be one of the people most likely to have concerns about it, and serving on the Public Health Committee I had the advantage of hearing some of the testimony and on the Committee level I was really hearing nothing particularly against it and I supported it on the Committee level and have not had any concerns about it from the aspect of sexual orientation.

What has concerned me, and what was brought up in conversation by Senator MacLachlan, was the question of gender identity and the inclusion of gender identity as a subject to be protected from conversion therapy. It seems to me that there's more controversy about that side of it and I guess -
- I'm not gonna subject Senator Bye to a number of

jm
Senate

57
May 10, 2017

questions. I never -- it's not my way of operating and she's been -- she's answered the one -- she's had very thoughtfully and very kindly, but I do have just a quest -- a couple of things, through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR MARKLEY (16TH):

I would ask the good Senator if she's aware in other states that have passed bans on conversion therapy if that applied solely to sexual preference as opposed to gender identity? In other words, did some states ban conversion therapy for sexual preference but not for gender identity?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. I listed the states who've passed similar conversion therapy Bills, which is the language in my understanding. I don't have the details of each state's language so I can't answer that perfectly, I'm afraid, or maybe even as the good gentleman would like, but I do know that as someone with a background in psychology that gender identity and sexual orientation and gender expression are generally considered sort of the three parts to someone's gender, if you will, and so they're very -- they're considered very similarly in the psychological research. They're different

jm
Senate

58
May 10, 2017

things. As I stated, even in the Statutes they mean different things, but it's all about gender and so the idea here is not to allow professionals to practice conversion about a person's gender identity, expression, or sexual orientation, but I'm not exactly sure what the other laws in the other states say. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Markley.

SENATOR MARKLEY (16TH):

Thank you very much for that answer and let me ask you one other -- let me put one more question to Senator Bye, through you, Madam President, and I don't mean to formulate this as a "got you" by any means, but for my own understanding of it. In the Bill it says conversion therapy includes any practice which would attempt to change gender identity but it does not include under the first part A assisting a person undergoing gender transition. It seems to me that if gender identity is an established thing I'm not sure what the phrase gender transition would mean in that context.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. I do appreciate the good gentleman's question and the intent with which it's offered. What it means is exactly what it says. Conversion therapy isn't about supporting a

jm
Senate

59
May 10, 2017

person who's undergoing a gender transition. It's -
- that's a supportive therapy and the individual is
going through that transition. Through you, Madam
President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Markley.

SENATOR MARKLEY (16TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So that would mean,
through you, the gender transition being the
physical transition -- the transition of the
physical body to match the underlying gender
identity?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes.

SENATOR MARKLEY (16TH):

Thank you very much and thank you, Senator Bye, for
your answers. My concern about the Bill, about the
matter of gender identity, is in part because I
think it's accepted that it's not unusual for
children, preadolescent children, who have had -- to
identify with one gender and then not in the long
run undergo the transition because of -- because
they accept the physical body that they're born
into. The sexual preference is a different
question.

It seems that in that period of youth for the child who is struggling to come to terms with what obviously he or she is experiencing as discontinuity between their inward identity and their physical body that that counseling would have to be of great sensitivity but it would seem like it would have to have a fair amount of latitude not to be coercive but to be -- if I were to say to encourage the child to ask questions which would help to clarify things in their own mind, as I think a counselor would -- in any kind of counseling situation, even if it's a matter of dealing with other problems in one's life, the therapist famously is somebody who continually asks questions and attempts to lead a person to an understanding of their own feelings which brings them to terms one way or another with their own feelings as I understand it.

That's something that I would not want to discourage and I'm always worried, as the people who serve with me here in this circle know, that by passing legislation which to my mind is always a heavy-handed way of doing things that we run the risks of having consequences in the real world which are not what we intend and put restrictions on what can be well-intentioned health care providers that are ultimately not useful for the people that they're trying to help because we're so different. The legislation is before us because we are all so different and just as with medical approaches, different things work with different people, so even more, I believe, with psychological approaches, different things can be appropriate with different people, not to say coercion is ever an appropriate way of working with people.

jm
Senate

61
May 10, 2017

On those grounds, under many circumstances, I'd be inclined to vote against this Bill because I don't want to do the harm of putting something into Statute that I'm not comfortable enough about. I put that against the fact that the advocates for this, I think sincerely, see it as being a Bill which is important to the sense of the legislators - - the legislature's view of their own identity and our own views personally, our society's views, and acceptance of people's identities.

I remember being in the situation 30 years ago more or less on a Bill that had to do with the state investments in foreign countries. My instinct is always to say the one advantage of being a State Senator is you don't have to deal with foreign policy and I don't want to have to deal with foreign policy. I want to leave it aside.

By the same token, at a certain point I understand the sensitivities of the people desirous of seeing us take this action and the unfortunate -- the unfortunate message that they might receive by our rejection of something that they so wholeheartedly have asked us to do for them and for that reason and with concerns about the Bill that I will do my best to come to understand better and to see the effect of going forward I will support this legislation and I thank those who have brought it forward and I think Senator Bye and Senator Gerratana for their courtesy in responding to our questions which in our ignorance may seem ignorant. Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

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

jm
Senate

62
May 10, 2017

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I just have a question.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

I can't imagine these young children that are totally confused or confused about their gender so I did, you know, provided some information and I took the time to read some of it and there's an article from the New York Times which is a very good read and I wish I could have had time -- more time to finish it, but perhaps got halfway through it. It makes a comment regarding 80 to 95 percent of the young children, pre-puberty children, who experience gender identity will be resolved before adulthood. So I guess the question that I have -- that I have is are we taking away a tool, a simple tool such as coping, that counselors would use to help young adolescents perhaps to try to identify and resolve the confusion that they're going through? So I guess, you know, a practitioner who counsels a child who experiences some level of gender identification and who assists that child in coping with his or her biological sex could lose -- could he or she lose their license if we pass this legislation?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

jm
Senate

63
May 10, 2017

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. Any professional, psychologist, or therapist, licensed professional, who's helping a child cope with some of their questions would not be punished under this Bill. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

That's it. Thank you so much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Senator Suzio for the second time.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. One of the great things about being in the circle here is that we can have these debates and discussions about issues and I find many of them very interesting and informative and listening to today's discussion I find to be very thought provoking and as I've listened to the debate go on for the last hour thoughts have been bouncing around in my head.

It seems to me that the question of conversion therapy, if it is considered to be medical malpractice, not meeting the accepted standards of the medical field, it would make this absolutely a no-brainer in the sense that it's already illegal

anyways. But try as I did to coax the proponent of the Bill to acknowledge that this might indeed be considered a violation of standard medical practice she seemed to be reluctant to go that far and acknowledge it, which if we aren't willing to identify it as medical malpractice then it must be accepted medical practice. It may be controversial and may be questionable, but apparently not far enough down the line to be considered to be malpractice, medical malpractice, in which case if we deny the ability of a willing child and parents to subscribe to that kind of therapy then we're denying access to acceptable medical care, again, although it might be controversial.

Even under those circumstances, though, I could see if it's coercive, if parents are forcing or trying to force a child to change their proclivities, I find that extremely objectionable. I don't know if it's possible to do even and I would like very much to hear the good Senator's take as, again, I'm evolving and thinking about this as we've been discussing it and to me, again, it's a no-brainer if it's medical malpractice and it's a no-brainer if it's coercive, but what about the situation -- if we aren't willing to describe it as medical malpractice and if indeed there is a situation where the legal guardians, the parents of the child, and the child themselves want to engage or receive "conversion therapy", you know, is it -- is that precluded? I mean, in other words, is it implied that it's coercive in nature for it to be subject to this particular Bill? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

jm
Senate

65
May 10, 2017

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. In Section 2 of the Bill it describes conversion therapy as unprofessional conduct that shall be subject to disciplinary action under Section 19a-17, 21a-7, and 21a-8 of the General Statute. In our particular culture people sue people over all sorts of things. The reason I'm reluctant to say something or other is medical malpractice because that really depends on the particular case and the testimony of professionals in that particular profession and that is under a different part of our Statute, so I'm trying to stick to what it's -- what this Bill is doing and the penalties under this Bill. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

And again, just a little bit more if I may, Madam President. Is it intended to prevent conversion therapy received by a child under coercion but not -- that are receiving it voluntarily it does not apply? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

jm
Senate

66
May 10, 2017

Through you, Madam President. It's intended to apply to all practice to children under 18 by paid professionals. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Well it's been a very provocative discussion to say the least and I'm thinking about it still. If I come to the conclusion that this is bad medicine then it seems to me that it's a no-brainer again that it shouldn't be allowed and it definitely shouldn't be allowed if it's coercive and what I'm trying to clarify in my head is are there circumstances where it's not coercive and where apparently, as Senator MacLachlan was saying, at least there's some controversy within the medical field about what works and doesn't work when it comes to confusion in terms of gender identity. So I guess I will just be thinking about this for the next few minutes before we vote and I do want to thank the proponent of the Bill for, I think, bringing up a Bill that is designed to accomplish a desirable end, which is to prevent someone from being coerced into therapy that may not only be ineffective but potentially harmful to that young person. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark? Will you remark?
Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, rising to speak in support of the Bill. First of all, I wanted to thank Senator Bye and Senator Gerratana for their very hard work on this issue together with their House counterparts in the debate on the Bill in that Chamber.

I think it is important for us to recognize that what this Bill is about is preventing sort of a overbearing approach based upon an ideology rather than on sound medical practice and I think we should be cognizant of the words in the debate in the House of Representative Petit who is, of course, a distinguished physician, that said that the legislation is trying to prevent a fruitless effort to control something which is biological or genetic and it really makes no sense to try to sanction or approve something that would be looking to overturn natural tendencies that are part of someone's nature, and I think we should be cognizant of that and realize that this legislation will prevent that, that if there is an effort to try to coerce or in some way alter someone's thinking about something that is genetic or biological we are in effect doing violence to the essence of that person under the guise of trying to help them to conform to perhaps something that might be considered in that person's view a more orthodox position in society, but it would be doing great harm to the essence and the integrity of the person who would be a victim of that kind of so called therapy.

So I think, Madam President, that this Bill is important in that way, that it recognizes the integrity of persons that should not be tampered with, should not be interfered with, and that people

jm
Senate

68
May 10, 2017

should not be made to suffer for something which is part of a natural condition. So I would urge the entire Chamber to support this Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? If not, Mr. Clerk, will you call for a roll call vote and the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

If all members have voted, all members have voted? The machine will be closed and, Mr. Clerk, will you please call the tally.

MR. CLERK:

House Bill 6695.

Total number voting	36
Those voting Yea	36
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Bill passes. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

jm
Senate

69
May 10, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move for immediate transmittal to the Governor, please.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Our next item on the Go List will be Calendar page 5, Calendar 119, Senate Bill 126.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, Mr. Clerk.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Madam President, point of order, please.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos, why do you stand, sir?

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Pursuant to Rule No. 9, items not on the Joint Go List can only be acted upon upon the passage of a motion by one of the four leaders to mark such item Go and since this item is not on the Joint Go List I request a roll call on Senator Duff's motion to mark it Go.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

70
May 10, 2017

Stand at ease for a moment. Senate will stand at ease.

MR. CLERK:

There will be a Senate Democratic Caucus in five minutes. There will be a Senate Democratic Caucus in five minutes. A Senate Democratic Caucus in five minutes.

UNKNOWN:

There will be immediate Republican Caucus. There will be immediate Republican Senate Caucus. All Senators please report to the Chamber.

UNKNOWN:

There will be an immediate Democratic Senate Caucus, an immediate Democrat Senate Caucus, an immediate Senate Democratic Caucus. There will be immediate Senate Republican Caucus, an immediate Senate Republican Caucus, an immediate Senate Republican Caucus.

UNKNOWN:

Senate will please come to order. Senate will come to order and Chair recognizes the Majority Leader, Senator Duff, for purposes I believe of withdrawing a previously made motion.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Good evening. Yes, I'd like to withdraw the motion on the Bill that I had marked Go and mark it as PT please.

jm
Senate

71
May 10, 2017

UNKNOWN:

Thank you. On the Motion, all in favor?

SENATORS:

Aye.

UNKNOWN:

Opposed? The motion carries and the -- that is -- the prior motion has been withdrawn. Any additional business? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I move that we adjourn subject to the call of the Chair.

UNKNOWN:

Thank you. The Senate will stand adjourned subject to the call of the Chair.

(On motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 11:04 p.m. adjourned Sine Die.)

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

Thursday, May 11, 2017

The Senate was called to order at 3:50 p.m. in accordance with the provisions of Senate Rule 9(f), and under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

THE CHAIR:

The prayer was offered by Acting Chaplain, Noele R. Kidney of Ellington, Connecticut.

ACTING CHAPLAIN NOELE R. KIDNEY:

In these difficult times, may our leaders find in their hearts the guidance and wisdom to do what is best for the people of Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Pursuant to Senate Rule 9(f) the Senate is called into Session, by the Office of the Senate Clerk's under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

It is hereby moved that Senate Agenda Number 1, dated May 11, 2017, is adopted, the items on said Agenda shall be acted upon as indicated and that the Agenda shall be incorporated into the Senate Journal and Senate Transcript.

SY
SENATE

2
May 11, 2017

COMMUNICATION FROM THE GOVERNOR:

**EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE NOMINATIONS - corrected
letter.**

To be referred to the Senate Committee.

Corrected letter

May 11, 2017

To the Honorable Senate:

Pursuant to Sections 10-500 and 4-5 to 4-8, inclusive, of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate, and with your advice and consent appoint, **David Wilkinson**, of Hartford, to be Commissioner of Early Childhood, to serve at the pleasure of the Governor, but no longer than March 1, 2019.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

COMMUNICATION FROM THE GOVERNOR:

**COMMITTEE ON JUDICIARY - to be referred to the Joint
Committee(s).**

May 11, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Article Twenty-Fifth of the Amendments to the Constitution of the State and Sections 51-44a(h) and 51-165 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for appointment by you, **Matthew J. Budzik** of East Haddam, to be a Judge of the Superior Court, to serve for a term of eight years from the date of

sy
SENATE

3
May 11, 2017

confirmation by you, in succession to the Honorable Jorge A. Simón, who has elected senior judge status.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 11, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Article Twenty-Fifth of the Amendments to the Constitution of the State and Sections 51-44a(h) and 51-165 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for appointment by you, **Margaret M. Murphy** of West Hartford to be a Judge of the Superior Court, to serve for a term of eight years from the date of confirmation by you, in succession to the Honorable Robert J. Malone, who has reached the age of mandatory retirement.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 11, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Article Twenty-Fifth of the Amendments to the Constitution of the State and Sections 51-44a(h) and 51-165 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for appointment by you, **Walter M. Spader, Jr.** of North Haven to be a Judge of the Superior Court, to serve for a term of eight years from the date of confirmation by you, in succession to the Honorable

sy
SENATE

4
May 11, 2017

Marylouise Schofield, who has elected senior judge status.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor
May 11, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Article Twenty-Fifth of the Amendments to the Constitution of the State and Sections 51-44a(h) and 51-165 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for appointment by you, **Tammy T. Nguyen O'Dowd** of Bloomfield to be a Judge of the Superior Court, to serve for a term of eight years from the date of confirmation by you, in succession to the Honorable Edward J. Mullarkey, who has reached the age of mandatory retirement.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 11, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Article Twenty-Fifth of the Amendments to the Constitution of the State and Sections 51-44a(h) and 51-165 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for appointment by you, **Kimberly A. Knox** of West Hartford, to be a Judge of the Superior Court, to serve for a term of eight years from the date of confirmation by you, in succession to the Honorable A. Susan Peck, who has reached the age of mandatory retirement.

SY
SENATE

5
May 11, 2017

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 11, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Article Twenty-Fifth of the Amendments to the Constitution of the State and Sections 51-44a(h) and 51-165 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for appointment by you, **Elizabeth J. Stewart** of Hamden to be a Judge of the Superior Court, to serve for a term of eight years from the date of confirmation by you, in succession to the Honorable Maurice B. Mosley, who has reached the mandatory age of retirement.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 11, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Article Twenty-Fifth of the Amendments to the Constitution of the State and Sections 51-44a(h) and 51-165 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for appointment by you, **Matthew D. Gordon** of West Hartford to be a Judge of the Superior Court, to serve for a term of eight years from the date of confirmation by you, in succession to the Honorable Gerald I. Adelman, who has reached the age of mandatory retirement.

SY
SENATE

6
May 11, 2017

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 11, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Article Twenty-Fifth of the Amendments to the Constitution of the State and Sections 51-44a(h) and 51-165 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for appointment by you, **Barry F. Armata** of Suffield to be a Judge of the Superior Court, to serve for a term of eight years from the date of confirmation by you, in succession to the Honorable Richard E. Burke, who has reached the age of mandatory retirement.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 11, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Article Twenty-Fifth of the Amendments to the Constitution of the State and Sections 51-44a(h) and 51-165 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for appointment by you, **W. Glen Pierson** of Hamden to be a Judge of the Superior Court, to serve for a term of eight years from the date of confirmation by you, in succession to the Honorable Joseph W. Doherty, who has reached the age of mandatory retirement.

SY
SENATE

7
May 11, 2017

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 11, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Article Twenty-Fifth of the Amendments to the Constitution of the State and Sections 51-44a(h) and 51-165 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for appointment by you, **Thomas J. Welch** of Shelton to be a Judge of the Superior Court, to serve for a term of eight years from the date of confirmation by you, in succession to the Honorable Nicola E. Rubinow, who has fully retired.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 11, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Article Twenty-Fifth of the Amendments to the Constitution of the State and Sections 51-44a(h) and 51-165 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for appointment by you, **Ernest Green, Jr.** of Norwich to be a Judge of the Superior Court, to serve for a term of eight years from the date of confirmation by you, in succession to the Honorable John W. Pickard, who has reached the age of mandatory retirement.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

SY
SENATE

8
May 11, 2017

May 11, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Article Twenty-Fifth of the Amendments to the Constitution of the State and Sections 51-44a(h) and 51-165 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for appointment by you, **John L. Cordani** of Wolcott to be a Judge of the Superior Court, to serve for a term of eight years from the date of confirmation by you, in succession to the Honorable John F. Cronan, who has reached the age of mandatory retirement.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 11, 2017

To the Honorable General Assembly:

Pursuant to Article Twenty-Fifth of the Amendments to the Constitution of the State and Sections 51-44a(h) and 51-165 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate for appointment by you, **Shari Murphy** of North Branford to be a Judge of the Superior Court, to serve for a term of eight years from the date of confirmation by you, in succession to the Honorable William T. Cremins, who has elected senior judge status.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

BUSINESS FROM THE HOUSE:

SY
SENATE

9
May 11, 2017

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

BANKING COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 6520 AN ACT RAISING THE ASSET
LIMITATION FOR COMMUNITY BANKS AND COMMUNITY CREDIT
UNIONS.

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7207 AN ACT MAKING REVISIONS TO THE
STUDENT DATA PRIVACY ACT OF 2016.

ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

HB NO. 6329 AN ACT CONCERNING HYDRAULIC FRACTURING
WASTE IN CONNECTICUT. (As amended by House Amendment
Schedule "A" (LCO 6687))

GENERAL LAW COMMITTEE

HB NO. 5077 AN ACT CONCERNING THE RETURN OF
PRESCRIPTION DRUGS TO PHARMACIES. (As amended by
House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 6804))

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7186 AN ACT REVISING CERTAIN STATUTES
CONCERNING THE STATE COMPTROLLER. (As amended by
House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 6809))

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 5442 AN ACT CONCERNING THE LEGAL AGE
TO MARRY IN THIS STATE.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 5743 AN ACT CONCERNING HATE CRIMES.
(As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO
6814))

sy
SENATE

10
May 11, 2017

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7214 AN ACT CONCERNING HARASSMENT OF A GUIDE OR ASSISTANCE DOG OR THE HANDLER OF SUCH DOG.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7284 AN ACT CONCERNING STATE IDENTIFICATION FOR INMATES UPON REENTRY.

INSURANCE AND REAL ESTATE COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7003 AN ACT CONCERNING SURETY BAIL BOND AGENTS. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 6241))

LABOR AND PUBLIC EMPLOYEES COMMITTEE

HB NO. 6219 AN ACT CONCERNING COMMUNITY REENTRY BY PERSONS WHO WERE INCARCERATED.

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HB NO. 7046 AN ACT CONCERNING THE CLOSURE OF CERTAIN BUILDING PERMITS. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 6294))

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

HB NO. 7296 AN ACT AUTHORIZING THE FUNDING OF UNFUNDED ACCRUED MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES' RETIREMENT SYSTEM LIABILITIES BY MUNICIPALITIES. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 6676))

PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 6266 AN ACT CONCERNING BOXING EVENTS AND MIXED MARTIAL ARTS MATCHES.

The Senate at 3:55 p.m. adjourned under provisions of Senate Rule 9(f) subject to the call of the chair.

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

Friday, May 12, 2017

The Senate was called to order at 1:30 p.m. in accordance with the provisions of Senate Rule 9(f), and under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

THE CHAIR:

The prayer was offered by Acting Chaplain, Kathy Zabel of Burlington, Connecticut.

ACTING CHAPLAIN KATHY ZABEL:

May we be filled with loving kindness. May we be peaceful and at ease. May we be happy with the things we have.

THE CHAIR:

Pursuant to Senate Rule 9(f) the Senate is called into Session, by the Office of the Senate Clerk's under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

It is hereby moved that Senate Agenda Number 1, dated May 12, 2017, is adopted, the items on said Agenda shall be acted upon as indicated and that the Agenda shall be incorporated into the Senate Journal and Senate Transcript.

SENATE RESOLUTIONS FAVORABLY REPORTED - to be tabled for the calendar.

EXECUTIVE AND LEGISLATIVE NOMINATIONS COMMITTEE

SY
SENATE

2
May 12, 2017

SR NO. 14 RESOLUTION CONFIRMING THE NOMINATION OF DAVID WILKINSON OF HARTFORD TO BE COMMISSIONER OF EARLY CHILDHOOD.

BUSINESS FROM THE HOUSE:

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

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HJ NO. 63 RESOLUTION CONCERNING THE DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN CLAIMS AGAINST THE STATE PURSUANT TO CHAPTER 53 OF THE GENERAL STATUTES.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HJ NO. 67 RESOLUTION VACATING THE DECISION OF THE CLAIMS COMMISSIONER TO DISMISS THE CLAIM AGAINST THE STATE OF JAMIE GENOVESE, ADMINISTRATOR FOR THE ESTATE OF TONI MARIE GENOVESE AND REMANDING THE CLAIM TO THE CLAIMS COMMISSIONER FOR A HEARING ON THE MERITS.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HJ NO. 73 RESOLUTION VACATING THE DECISION OF THE CLAIMS COMMISSIONER TO DENY THE CLAIM AGAINST THE STATE OF MELISSA STEINHILPER, ADMINISTRATRIX OF THE ESTATE OF AMANDA MONINGTON AND REMANDING THE CLAIM TO THE CLAIMS COMMISSIONER FOR A HEARING ON THE MERITS.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HJ NO. 74 RESOLUTION VACATING THE DECISION OF THE CLAIMS COMMISSIONER TO DENY THE CLAIM AGAINST THE STATE OF MARIAN O'SHEA, EXECUTRIX OF THE ESTATE OF MICHAEL O'SHEA.

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

EDUCATION COMMITTEE

SY
SENATE

3
May 12, 2017

SUBST. HB NO. 7155 AN ACT REQUIRING THE OFFICE OF EARLY CHILDHOOD TO DEVELOP A PROPOSED EARLY CHILDHOOD EDUCATOR COMPENSATION SCHEDULE.

ENERGY AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

HB NO. 7105 AN ACT CONCERNING WATER COMPANY RATE ADJUSTMENT MECHANISMS.

ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

HB NO. 6353 AN ACT DESIGNATING THE SHORELINE OF THE TOWN OF STRATFORD AS A "NO KILL OR HARVEST ZONE" FOR HORSESHOE CRABS. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 6296))

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7196 AN ACT CONCERNING NONADVERSARIAL DISSOLUTION OF MARRIAGE.

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7299 AN ACT CONCERNING STRENGTHENING LAWS CONCERNING DOMESTIC VIOLENCE. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 6881))

PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 6356 AN ACT CONCERNING PUBLIC NOTICE OF TREE REMOVAL ON MUNICIPAL PROPERTY. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 6826))

PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE

HB NO. 7238 AN ACT CONCERNING TECHNICAL REVISIONS TO STATUTES CONCERNING THE COMMISSIONER OF EMERGENCY SERVICES AND PUBLIC PROTECTION.

PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7171 AN ACT CONCERNING ATHLETIC TRAINERS. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 6884))

VETERANS' AFFAIRS COMMITTEE

HB NO. 7102 AN ACT PROTECTING PERSONAL INFORMATION OF MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND VETERANS. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 6820))

sy
SENATE

4
May 12, 2017

The Senate at 1:35 p.m. adjourned under provisions of Senate Rule 9(f) subject to the call of the chair.

sy
SENATE

1
May 15, 2017

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

Monday, May 15, 2017

The Senate was called to order at 11:00 a.m. in accordance with the provisions of Senate Rule 9(f), and under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

THE CHAIR:

The prayer was offered by Acting Chaplain, Carmela Balducci of Deep River, Connecticut.

ACTING CHAPLAIN CARMELA BALDUCCI:

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

THE CHAIR:

Pursuant to Senate Rule 9(f) the Senate is called into Session, by the Office of the Senate Clerk's under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

It is hereby moved that Senate Agenda Number 1, dated May 15, 2017, is adopted, the items on said Agenda shall be acted upon as indicated and that the Agenda shall be incorporated into the Senate Journal and Senate Transcript.

COMMUNICATION FROM THE GOVERNOR:

COMMITTEE ON THE JUDICIARY - to be referred to Joint Committee(s)

sy
SENATE

2
May 15, 2017

May 15, 2017

TO THE HONORABLE GENERAL ASSEMBLY:

Pursuant to Section 31-276 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate, and with your advice and consent, appoint **Brenda D. Jannotta** of Southport to be a Workers' Compensation Commissioner to serve for a term of five years from the date of confirmation by you.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

May 15, 2017

TO THE HONORABLE GENERAL ASSEMBLY:

Pursuant to Section 31-276 of the Connecticut General Statutes, I have the honor to nominate, and with your advice and consent, appoint **Robert A. D'Andrea** of Litchfield to be a Workers' Compensation Commissioner to serve for a term of five years from the date of confirmation by you.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor

SENATE BILL(S) FAVORABLY REPORTED - to be tabled for the calendar and printing.

FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE
SUBST. SB NO. 787 AN ACT CONCERNING REVENUE.

FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE
SUBST. SB NO. 788 AN ACT AUTHORIZING AND ADJUSTING BONDS OF THE STATE FOR CAPITAL IMPROVEMENTS, TRANSPORTATION AND OTHER PURPOSES.

FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE
SB NO. 1051 AN ACT CONCERNING CTNEXT PLANNING GRANTS-IN-AID AND INNOVATION PLACE DESIGNATION

sy
SENATE

3
May 15, 2017

APPLICATIONS, INVEST CT FUND TAX CREDIT
TRANSFERABILITY AND STATE INVESTMENTS WITH VENTURE
CAPITAL FIRMS.

FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE

SUBST. SB NO. 1056 AN ACT ESTABLISHING A WORKING
GROUP TO DEVELOP A PLAN TO FOSTER THE MICROBIOME
SECTOR IN THE STATE.

BUSINESS FROM THE HOUSE:

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

ENERGY AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7106 AN ACT CONCERNING AUDIT REPORTS
FILED WITH THE PUBLIC UTILITIES REGULATORY
AUTHORITY. (As amended by House Amendment Schedule
"A" (LCO 6941))

ENERGY AND TECHNOLOGY COMMITTEE

HB NO. 7208 AN ACT CONCERNING THE COMMERCIAL
PROPERTY ASSESSED CLEAN ENERGY PROGRAM.

GOVERNMENT ADMINISTRATION AND ELECTIONS COMMITTEE

HB NO. 7164 AN ACT CONCERNING ENDORSEMENTS OF TOWN
COMMITTEE MEMBERS AND CLARIFYING RESIDENCY
REQUIREMENTS FOR CERTAIN STATE OFFICE CANDIDATES.
(As amended by House Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO
6878))

INSURANCE AND REAL ESTATE COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 7126 AN ACT CONCERNING MOTOR VEHICLES
IN LIVERY SERVICE, TAXICABS AND TRANSPORTATION
NETWORK COMPANIES. (As amended by House Amendment
Schedule "A" (LCO 6917))

PUBLIC HEALTH COMMITTEE

SUBST. HB NO. 6012 AN ACT CONCERNING CONSUMER
PROTECTION IN EYE CARE. (As amended by House
Amendment Schedule "A" (LCO 6882))

sy
SENATE

4
May 15, 2017

The Senate at 11:05 a.m. adjourned under provisions of Senate Rule 9(f) subject to the call of the chair.

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

Tuesday, May 16, 2017

The Senate was called to order at 10:30 a.m. in accordance with the provisions of Senate Rule 9(f), and under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

THE CHAIR:

The prayer was offered by Acting Chaplain Noele R. Kidney of Ellington, Connecticut.

ACTING CHAPLAIN NOELE R. KIDNEY:

In these difficult times, may our leaders fingers and a palpable radial pulse. In their hearts the guidance and wisdom to do what is best for the people of Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Pursuant to Senate Rule 9(f) the Senate is called into Session, by the Office of the Senate Clerk's under the authority of the President Pro Tempore and the Senate Republican Leader.

It is hereby moved that Senate Agenda Number 1, dated May 16, 2017, is adopted, the items on said Agenda shall be acted upon as indicated and that the Agenda shall be incorporated into the Senate Journal and Senate Transcript.

SY
SENATE

000949
2
May 16, 2017

MATTER(S) RETURNED FROM COMMITTEE - to be tabled for
the calendar.

NEW FILE

APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE

**SUBST. SB NO. 130 AN ACT ESTABLISHING A
SURCHARGE ON ANIMAL ADOPTION FEES TO FUND THE
SECOND CHANCE LARGE ANIMAL REHABILITATION
PROGRAM.**

The Senate at 10:35 a.m. adjourned under provisions
of Senate Rule 9(f) subject to the call of the
chair.

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

Wednesday, May 17, 2017

The Senate was called to order at 3:42 o'clock p.m.,
the President in the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon everybody. The Senate will please
come to order. Members and guests, please rise. I
direct your attention to Reverend Bonita Grubbs, who
will lead us in prayer.

REVEREND BONITA GRUBBS:

Let us pray. Holy God, you made this day with its
possibilities and opportunities like a clean canvas
on which to paint a picture of integrity, fairness,
and compassion. With it comes a renewed sense of
awe and promise like the rainbow Of hope, harmony,
and beauty. Your word calls us to rejoice and be
glad in it. But how, when yesterday was full of
missed opportunities and missteps, bad and troubling
news, disturbing developments and disagreements, and
discord and disbelief?

The answer is that every morning your mercies are
new. Your faithfulness is great. Your ways are
just and you call for justice. Your promises are
true and you call for mercy. Your power, presence,
and peace are real and you call for righteousness.
Therefore, I give you thanks for this day, this day

jm
Senate

2
May 17, 2017

of new beginning in these hallowed halls. The task at hand is to make decisions that are difficult yet delicate on behalf of the citizens of this state with a preferential focus on those who are most vulnerable. The challenge is to find common ground and a way forward with purpose and honor. Lead us all to be glad and rejoice in the accomplishments and agreements of this day and in you every day. Amen.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Reverend. Would Senator Cassano please come forward to lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

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:

The Chair will entertain points of personal privilege or announcements, and I would recognize Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise for point of personal privilege.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

jm
Senate

3
May 17, 2017

Thank you very much. Madam President and members and colleagues of the Senate, I'm very happy to introduce to you a wonderful student from Southern Methodist University, a resident of Connecticut, grown up here, gone to public schools here, graduated, and he is going to be with us for the rest of the session to watch how government works. He has a tremendously positive image and interest in the political process. If you would give Dylan Carruthers I warm welcome would really appreciate it. Thank you. [applause]

And Madam President, although he's not in the Chamber right now, we also are joined by a young man from Naugatuck High School. Gonna be a senior next year and he also was present and that was Ben Wierzbicki, and so just for the record he also was here present and is enjoying being with us as I know that I am always -- really enjoy being with all of you. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and food afternoon. I rise for a point of personal privilege, please.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

jm
Senate

4
May 17, 2017

Thank you so much. I'd like to introduce my great intern who has worked over the session. David Schultz [phonetic] is -- is here with me today and has done yeoman's work with my aide, Kim, and me over the session. He's graduing -- graduating Manchester Community College with an Associate's of Science in general studies very shortly.

He got accepted to Trinity College in the fall where he'll be studying public policy and pre-law. He's a hardworking young man typical of many of the young people here in the State of Connecticut that works hard at the Capital Grille to put himself through school. He's a -- in a band. Maybe we'll have him play later, but he's also volunteered to work after the intern program has finished. He's working with us for the rest of this session so I hope that the Senate Chamber would give a warm welcome to my young intern, David Schultz [phonetic]. [applause]

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, for purposes of an announcement.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I just wanted to let the Chamber know that on your desk today was a

jm
Senate

5
May 17, 2017

packet of information regarding the upcoming Council of State Government's Eastern Regional Conference annual meeting that will be held here in the State of Connecticut. The ERC has 18 different jurisdictions which include Canada and goes all the way down to Puerto Rico and the American Virgin Islands, and each of these jurisdictions takes a turn each year to host the annual meeting. It's Connecticut's turn.

I'm very excited about this. I'm a co-host along with Senator Formica and also Representatives Ryan and Staneski in the House. Should be an interesting annual meeting. We're asking members, of course, to register for the conference since it's right here in our state at the Mohegan Sun this year and also to help in any way, either volunteer or help with a sponsorship, so I would appreciate it. Please contact me or any of the other host Committee Chairs. Thank you so much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Are there any other points of personal privilege or announcements? Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise for a moment of silence. I think most of you here last week heard the passing of John Marvell. He was a dedicated public servant. He served here in the -- at the State Capital for 33 years to the General Assembly faithfully spending most of his time in the Banking Committee so, you know, I'd like to ask the Chamber

jm
Senate

6
May 17, 2017

to rise just for a moment of silence on behalf of
John. [pause]

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Are there any other points of personal
privilege or announcements? Seeing none, the Chair
would recognize Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President and good afternoon.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you for actually a point of personal privilege
but we don't have the members in the Chamber at the
moment, but I -- I will hold off 'til later 'cause
we have exciting news for two of those members who
are not in the Chamber at the moment.

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

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda No. 1 dated
Wednesday, May 17, 2017.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

jm
Senate

7
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. I move that all items on Senate Agenda No. 1 dated Wednesday, May 17, 2017, be acted upon as indicated, that the Agenda be incorporated by reference into the Senate Journal and Transcript.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'd like to mark items on our Consent Calendar, please.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On calendar page 2, calendar 49, Senate Bill 755, I'd like to place that item on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered without objection.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On calendar page 10, calendar 160, Senate Bill 723, I'd like to mark that item on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

8
May 17, 2017

So ordered without objection. Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On calendar page 17, calendar 229, Senate Bill 962, would like to place that item on a Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered without objection. Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On calendar page 23, calendar 280, Senate Bill 954, I'd like to place that item on a Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered without objection. Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On calendar page 24, calendar 285, Senate Bill 983, I'd like to place that item on a Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered without objection. Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 28, calendar 317, Senate Bill 1030, I'd like to place that item on the Consent Calendar.

jm
Senate

9
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

So ordered without objection. Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On calendar page 28, calendar 319, Senate Bill 887, I'd like to place that item on a Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered without objection. Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On calendar 33 -- I'm sorry, calendar page 33, calendar 354, Senate Bill 817, I'd like to place that item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered without objection. Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On calendar page 34, calendar 362, Senate Bill 1045, I'd like to place that item on a Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered without objection. Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

jm
Senate

10
May 17, 2017

On calendar page 45, calendar 429, House Bill 6520,
I'd like to place that item on a Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered without objection. Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 61, calendar 75, Senate Bill 811,
I'd like to place that item on a Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered without objection. Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page -- calendar page 51, calendar 75,
Senate Bill 811, I'd like to place that item on a
Consent Calendar -- 61 -- I'm sorry, did I just do
that? It's 51, thank you. Calendar 75, Senate Bill
811, I'd like to place that item on a Consent
Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered without objection. Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On calendar page 51,
calendar 111, Senate Bill 45, I'd like to place that
item on a Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

11
May 17, 2017

So ordered without objection. Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And finally, on calendar page 55, Senate Bill 155,
Senate Joint Resolution 38 -- I'm sorry, on calendar
page 55, calendar 154 -- try that again, yeah --
Senate Joint Resolution 38, I'd like to place that
item on a Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered without objection. Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Will the Senate stand at ease please?

THE CHAIR:

Senate -- The Senate will stand at ease.

Senator Duff, for what reason do you rise?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I
would like to --

THE CHAIR:

Let me call the Senate back to order. I'm sorry,
Senator.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

jm
Senate

12
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Will the Clerk please call on calendar page 14, calendar 204 -- I'm sorry, calendar page 14, calendar 204, Senate Bill 41, please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 14, calendar 204, Senate Bill No. 41, AN ACT CONCERNING PHLEBOTOMISTS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

jm
Senate

13
May 17, 2017

Thank you. Madam President, before I proceed with the Bill, the Clerk has an Amendment. If he would please call LCO No. 6395.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, I believe that there's an Amendment to be called.

CLERK:

LCO No. 6245, Senate Amendment Schedule A offered by Senators Somers and Boucher.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana, please continue.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Madam President, unfortunately that is not the correct LCO. I need LCO No. 6395.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Certainly.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease.

jm
Senate

14
May 17, 2017

The Senate -- the Senate will come back to order.
Mr. Clerk, do you have an Amendment?

CLERK:

LCO No. 6395, Senate A, offered by Senators
Gerratana, Somers, and Representatives Steinberg and
Srinivasan.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This Amendment simply
adders -- excuse me, adds two more organizations for
certification of phlebotomists. I urge passage of
the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

I'll try your minds. All those in favor of passage
of the Amendment please indicate by saying Aye [Ayes
voiced]. Any opposed? Amendment passes.

Please continue, Senator.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

jm
Senate

15
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. This Bill specifically allows individuals practicing as phlebotomists in the state to obtain certification from a number of different entities which are delineated in the Bill. The Bill also defines phlebotomists as a person who draws blood for diagnostic testing, transfusions, research, or blood donations. I urge the Chamber to pass this legislation. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any other remarks? Are there any other remarks? Seeing none, Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Without objection --

THE CHAIR:

I'm sorry. Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I stand for purpose of a question.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue. Senator Gerratana, prepare yourself.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Senator Gerratana, I see an objection in the public hearing testimony

jm
Senate

16
May 17, 2017

from the American Red Cross and wonder if your Amendments or their concerns have been -- if your Amendment addresses their concern and, if not, if you could just share with us your feeling about the concern of the American Red Cross. As I understand, they're the largest collector of blood in the State of Connecticut. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Thank you. Yes, Madam President, yes we do. They were concerned that we'd be establishing licensure or certification for a phlebotomist. I believe that was the original Bill. We are not doing this under the Bill. I did speak with -- or during the testimony that was given to our committee, I did speak with the individuals who testified and had concerns about this so instead we're just putting a definition into Statute. There's no requirement for licensure or certification other than the fact that phlebotomists should and could be -- I think the language is made -- receive certification through the number of entities that we are mentioning in the legislation. So they would be certified but the State of Connecticut would not certify or license them. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN (24TH):

jm
Senate

17
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator Gerratana. I'll be supportive of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Is there any further comment? Are there any further comments? Are there any further comments? Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection I would ask this item be placed on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any objections? Seeing none, so ordered.
Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If the Clerk can now call calendar page 20, calendar 249, Senate Bill 901.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 20, calendar 249, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 901, AN ACT CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC HEALTH'S RECOMMENDATION REGARDING ADOPTION OF AMODEL FOOD CODE.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

18
May 17, 2017

Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. We're going along here. This is very good for our committee. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The Clerk has an Amendment, LCO No. 6260. If he would please call and I be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 6260, Senate Amendment Schedule A offered by Senators Gerratana and Somers.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

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

jm
Senate

19
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Madam President, this is a Strike All Amendment; however, what has been done in cooperation with the LCO is that it does reflect the underlying Bill but the organization, if you will, of the language has been changed in the order the LCO had suggested. Otherwise it still does what the original Bill did and that is the adoption of the FDA, the Federal Drug Administration's model food code here in the state.

Our Department of Public Health, of course, oversees our use of food and how it is used particularly amongst public settings and adopting the model food code updates and helps many of our businesses as well as others in producing and making and preparing food in our state for commercial reasons and also in schools and in other settings. It's delineated in the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Any comments on the Amendment?
Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

I'd like to say that this is a good Amendment. It clarifies language so that the state is in accordance with the FDA guidelines. It makes it

jm
Senate

20
May 17, 2017

simpler for folks moving forward and I would urge that everyone support this. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Are there any further comments on the Amendment? If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor of the Amendment indicate by saying Aye [Ayes voiced]. Any opposed? Any objections? Seeing none, so ordered. Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Madam President, I believe at this time I would have to yield to the -- to Senator Duff who will refer it to the Judiciary Committee.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam --

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move -- we refer this item to the Judiciary Committee please.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

jm
Senate

21
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. Our next two Bills are calendar page 3, calendar 91, Senate Bill 136, and to follow by calendar page 6, calendar 123, Senate Bill 916; both be taken out by the Republican Co-Chair of the Veterans Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 3, calendar 91, Senate Bill No. 136, AN ACT CONCERNING VEHICLE NUMBER PLATES FOR CERTAIN VETERANS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

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

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. The Bill simply creates a farming license plate for those who use vehicles for strictly farming purposes from the Department of Motor Vehicles. The registration and the number plates issued by the DMV are available to either the

jm
Senate

22
May 17, 2017

veteran, a surviving spouse of a veteran, or a current member of the armed forces.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any comments? Senator Logan, do you stand for a comment? Thank you. Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Madam President, if there's no objection I move this Bill be place on a Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any objections? Seeing none, so ordered.
Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 6, calendar 123, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 916, AN ACT CONCERNING MINOR AND CONFORMING CHANGES TO STATUTES CONCERNING VETERANS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Madam President, thank you. Madam President, I rise -- I move the acceptance of the Committee's Joint Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

jm
Senate

23
May 17, 2017

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

The Bill requires each veteran service officer to complete a course in veterans' benefits for no later than a year after commencing employment instead of within the one year and also the Bill makes technical and clarifying changes to the Department of Veteran Affairs Statutes.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any comments? Are there any comments?
Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'm just wondering if you could describe some of those changes. I understand it might allow minors and others in --

THE CHAIR:

Excuse me, I believe that's a different Bill, Senator Cassano. This is minor and technical changes but it is not the technical cha -- is not allowing minors into Veterans. Thank you. Are there any other comments? Are there any other comments? Seeing none, Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Madam President, if there's no objection I would move this Bill be moved to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

24
May 17, 2017

Are there any objections? Seeing none, so ordered.
Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if I
can mark two more items please.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you. The first will be calendar page 23,
calendar 276, Senate Bill 912, taken out by the
Democratic Co-Chair, followed by calendar page 10,
calendar 167, Senate Bill 911, taken out by the
Republican Co-Chair of the Education Committees.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 23, calendar 276, Substitute for Senate Bill
No. 912, AN ACT CONCERNING REVISIONS TO THE STAFF
QUALIFICATIONS REQUIREMENT FOR EARLY CHILDHOOD
EDUCATORS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

jm
Senate

25
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Madam President, and good afternoon.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

I move the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

Thank you, Madam President. At this time the Clerk has in his possession LCO No. 6846. I would ask that it please be called and I be granted leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 26 -- 6846, Senate A, offered by Senators Slossberg and Boucher.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue, Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

jm
Senate

26
May 17, 2017

Thank you. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The Bill before us -- the Amendment before us a Strike All Amendment and it addresses issues with regard to staff qualifications for our early childhood educators. As many of you know, and many in this Chamber have worked on for a long time, we've been trying to address the qualifications of our early childhood educators, but to do so in a way that works with all of our early childhood educator facilities.

The system we have currently has had some challenges and this Bill seeks to address those challenges through the changes in the Amendment. At this time if I may, I'd like to yield to Senator -- to Senator Boucher.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Boucher, do you accept the yield?

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Yes, Madam President, I do.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Madam President, I rise to support the Amendment and the good work of our Chairs and other members of our committee on this very important Bill. I know a lot of time and effort has gone into this in working very hard to expand the pool of preschool teachers that we need in the state and the qualification issue has been something that's been raised year after year. I think this goes a long way to achieving both the -- two aims, and one is to make sure we have qualified people working with our most important population in education, and also in a way to expand the pool of qualified individuals. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Are there any other comments or questions on the Amendment? Seeing none, I'll try your minds. All those in favor of the Amendment please -- please say Yea. Any opposed? Senator Slossberg. Amendment passes.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

Thank you, Madam President. At this time I just want to clarify what the Bill actually does now the Amendment's been adopted. So basically this gives -- gives a -- creates a definition for a concentration in early childhood education. It provides that from now into July 1, 2018, early childhood educators can be hired with an associate degree with a concentration in early childhood education from an institution of higher education that is regionally accredited or similarly a bachelor's degree with a concentration in early

childhood education from an institution of higher education that's regionally accredited.

From July 1, 2018 to June 30, 2021, that requirement changes and it goes to a requirement that 50 percent of the individuals with primary responsibility for a classroom are out of one of four -- are able to do so one of four ways where they've been issued an early childhood teacher credential that is defined in the Statute, or that they hold at least a bachelor's degree with a concentration in early childhood education from an institution of higher education that is regionally accredited, or they have a teaching certificate in early childhood, or they are otherwise grandfathered as per the Statute.

As of July 1, 2021, it makes that -- it continues our obligation to move to 100 percent of the individuals with primary responsibility in the classroom to have those credentials and I've -- I share the background on this because it's been very confusing for a lot of our early childhood educators and I want to make sure that I've made it very clear for the record what this Bill does so thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Slossberg. Are there any comments on the Bill as amended? Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Question to the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

29
May 17, 2017

Prepare yourself, Senator Slossberg. Continue,
Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President, and I want to first
express my gratitude to Senator Slossberg for her
work on this and her diligence to make sure every
word did exactly what it was meant to do.

My question just for the record is to ask Senator
Slossberg at what point, what year do we require all
early childhood lead teachers to have a bachelor's
degree? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

That would be on or after July 1, 2021.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you for that answer. The reason I ask that
question, now I'll have some comments, thank you,
Senator Slossberg, is that I've been up here a
number of years and a proponent to make sure that we
have the proper credentials for early childhood
providers. This state has been moved back several
times from 2017 to 2019 to 2020 to 2021. I just

jm
Senate

30
May 17, 2017

want to state for the record that the point of improving credentials is to improve care for our youngest children.

The current work force is not able to meet those standards primarily because the wages in early childhood are so low. It is in fact the lowest paid profession in the United States of America. Clergy used to be paid less but now early childhood professionals have outpaced them and I would argue that the early childhood education system in the United States and in Connecticut is funded on the backs of low wage working women who cannot afford to feed their own families in many cases.

I think this is really important to make a hard line that this is when a bachelor's is required and people in the circle agree that that is a date that will not be changed again and that as a state we will put young children first and their teachers first. We have very strict guidelines for who can teach children in elementary schools and middle school and high school and I would argue that, and science proves that the brain is actually more vulnerable in the first five years of life, that these years are actually more important than the college years when it comes to long-term outcome for children, yet we continue to try to develop a high quality early childhood workforce with care for kids paying \$3.50 an hour while we have \$40 an hour minimum -- minimum hourly wage if you're working on a state construction project, so I ask people in this circle to think about women's wages and women's work and how we reward those as a state as we build the infrastructure of our future workforce. So I just say vehemently that we should never push the BA requirement out again. Thank you, Madam President.

jm
Senate

31
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Bye. Senator Leone.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just a quick question to the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg, prepare yourself. Continue Senator.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):

Thank you. And first I also want to give my gratitude and thanks to Senator Slossberg and Senator Boucher for working on this Bill. It's such an important Bill and wide ranging in scope and sorely needed so I commend all the efforts that have been brought forward.

My simple question, and just for clarity just so that I fully understand it and I can say so when I go back to my district where this is very important, that a regionally accredited approval also goes across state lines, the region cuts across the state lines so that where -- because if you're too close to the border your region may be across the state line. We want to be able to pull qualified candidates from across the borders if necessary. Would that be correct? Is that my understanding?

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

32
May 17, 2017

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Through you. Yes, that is correct. Regionally accredited means in a region which is larger than just our state.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):

Thank you, and I know that it was probably overly simplistic from my standpoint but I do want to thank the proponents of this Bill for all their efforts and I would urge my colleagues for full support. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If I may, a question to the proponent of the Bill as amended?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg, please prepare yourself. Please continue, Senator.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you to Senator Slossberg, there's a lot of reference to specific Statute numbers beginning with the 10s, which are our Education Statutes, right up through the 17 Statutes. Not being familiar with each one of those

jm
Senate

33
May 17, 2017

and they're not spelled out specifically what they do, my question to you is how would this impact or differentiate between daycare centers and early childcare centers? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

Thank you. If I may, Madam -- Madam President, I would just take a moment and review and make sure that I give him the correct answer.

THE CHAIR:

Please do so.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

Thank you. Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

Please continue, Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

So, you know, this would relate to any school program that's a school readiness program, that is a head start program that is receiving state funding that address -- that is receiving state funding. So that's -- those are the centers that would be affected.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

34
May 17, 2017

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I see that it's really particular for age 3 and 4 and potentially 5 if they're not in a -- enrolled in a kindergarten program, if you will. But what happens if a -- a facility holds itself out as a dual purpose program where they offer the early childhood education resources to some but also have a lower aged group for others? Would they still be required to offer those or that is negated by the age limits contained within the Bill? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

No, this affects that those programs that are accepting state funds for infant, toddler, and preschool spaces do need to meet the requirements for this Bill, which is actually the current law.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you. So through you, Madam President, if somebody was monitoring an infant room in the year 2021, I believe it is, and they are required to have

jm
Senate

35
May 17, 2017

a bachelor's degree in early childhood education, is that correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG (14TH):

Yes, I believe so.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I thank the gentlewoman for that answer. You know, I have a concern that I can understand the premise behind requiring those individuals that will offer some type of instruction to our students that are preparing at an early age pre-K, if you will, they're going to their formal education through kindergarten or wherever they attend school, but I have a grave concern that we may be limiting the resources available to parents like that now when they want to send their child to a daycare facility that the individuals that may be watching their infant or 1 or 2-year-old is required to have a bachelor's degree. That doesn't necessarily make them a better caregiver, I believe personally, than those that do not and while I was hopeful that the -- that the good Chairwoman of the Education Committee was gonna tell me it's only particularly the 3, 4, and 5-year-old classrooms, we find that that's not the case. So unfortunately I'm

jm
Senate

36
May 17, 2017

not gonna be able to support the Bill today. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Witkos. Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise to support the Bill as amended given that we've been very fortunate in our -- both Chambers, in the House and the Senate -- to have individuals that have in their private lives worked in many facets of our professional sectors and we do have that here in the Senate with regards to early childhood education. For many years we also have it in the House, both on the part of a republican representative and a democrat representative, some of which were -- are in leadership positions on our Education Committee.

So when we deliberate on issues such as this, they bring with them quite a bit of experience, personal knowledge, and we also been the beneficiaries of some good data and research by individuals that sat on the Commission on Children that really educate us to the growing scientific body of knowledge that explains how we learn, when we start to learn, and it was staggering to find out that our research is showing that between the ages of 0 and 5 that nearly 80 percent of what we learn and the rapid growth of the brain during that period of time is so extraordinary that it becomes a foundation really of the basis of the rest of our educational lives and as we develop as mature adults, so that we cannot minimize the need to have good education background to be able to be engaged in that area.

I think as mothers, and fathers probably, I have been surprised to learn how much that baby that you're carrying might even be growing and learning in vitro and in essence in utero and be able to come out even with mannerisms that become something that characterizes them going forward as well. The things that we say and do around an infant that can't yet verbalize is still being internalized and it is remarkable. I think if I knew then what I know now I might have been a better parent or been able to engage more early, especially given the huge changes in pace of our society in the technology that is really surrounding us right now.

So I think that the -- it's laudable that we are trying to work towards getting a higher -- a higher trained workforce in this area. I can understand the frustrations of Senator Bye as she's seen this requirement be delayed year after year. I think we feel the same way about our graduation requirements for our high school as well as we saw that as we were trying to elevate the standards, do better than we did before, and not let the status quo become our future.

So for that reason I do support the Bill as amended and I can understand the frustrations that are being expressed because we do have a shortage in the workforce. That's probably the rationale while this has been delayed so much in the past. There is this constant, you know, divide and tension between wanting to have high standards and being able to fill those classrooms with individuals that, you know, are ready and able to work and when we have a decrease in that it causes a great deal of concern. That's why I think it's really important to have, as

jm
Senate

38
May 17, 2017

I said, membership that -- that works in that field has been able to see it on the ground floor of what's actually happening to their -- their sector and be able to weigh in on it in order to make it work better. So for that reason I am standing to support the Bill as amended. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Are there any further comments? Are there any other further comments? If not, the Clerk shall announce the pendency of a roll call vote. The machine is open. Please cast your vote.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Please check to see if your votes have been properly recorded. If so, the machine shall be closed and the Clerk shall announce the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 912.

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

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

39
May 17, 2017

Thank you very much. Senator Flexer, for what reason do you rise? Oh, I'm sorry. Twenty dollars to vote first [laughing]. The Bill passes. Thank you. Senator Flexer, for what reason do you rise?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise for a point of personal privilege.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, today is a very special day. Today one of a great members of our staff is celebrating his significant birthday, Robin Bumpen, who's the Clerk of the Environment Committee and Senator Kennedy and Senator Minor and myself are thrilled that we get to work with him on the Environment Committee, and Senator Somers as well, and we just wanted to take this opportunity to wish Robin a very happy birthday, so if the Chamber would please rise and give him a great ovation. Thank you. [applause]

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, we also have a few more celebrations as well. Would certainly like to take a moment to wish Senator Bye

jm
Senate

40
May 17, 2017

a happy birthday and her wife, Tracy, as well. They both share the same birthday. And on Mother's Day Senator Slossberg had her birthday as well so we want to certainly take a moment to -- to wish them happy birthdays and wish them all the best and thanks to Senator Bye for spending her day with us. We appreciate it and hope that we make it a fun day for her. So if we can just rise and congratulate them on their birthdays and wish them the best in their day today. [applause]

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I believe I have already marked the next Bill for -- for a Go, but before that I wanted to make sure that when you closed the machine you read off the vote and what it was if all set?

THE CHAIR:

Yes.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Okay, then. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

That part I got right.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

jm
Senate

41
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. There was some --

THE CHAIR:

I'm still working on it.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

There was a question. You're doing fine, thank you. We appreciate it. Madam President, thank you, and I'll ask the Clerk to call next Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 10, calendar 167, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 911, AN ACT CONCERNING SERVICES FOR GIFTED AND TALENTED STUDENTS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

jm
Senate

42
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of LCO 6442. I ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 6442, Senate A, offered by Senators Boucher and Slossberg.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Boucher, please continue.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the Amendment and waive reading and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Connecticut currently has a law in place that mandates the identification of talented and gifted students by every school. However, there are many low income minority students that reside in some districts where we don't always get the information needed and it should be noted that many gifted and talented

students come from all socioeconomic and culturally diverse groups. Some also have disabilities and for others English is not their first language. Without proper identification, talented and gifted students are placed in classrooms that don't necessarily align with their educational, linguistical, or social needs.

Senate Bill 911 works to provide some enhancements to programs in school districts. It does so by first providing some guidelines needed to include the best practices for addressing the intellectual, social, and emotional needs of gifted and talented students in schools as well as providing some important training and professional development related to gifted and talented students. The Department of Education would make these guidelines available to local and regional Boards of Education no later than January 1, 2018.

This is really important because it does call attention that we should have someone at the Department of Education that is responsible for this area, is responsible for providing information and assistance to local and regional Boards of Education and to the parents of those students. We received over 22 pieces of testimony in favor of this proposal. There were zero in opposition. No -- there was no state or local fiscal impact whatsoever on this Bill.

The advocates have been coming to us for many years in a row trying to call attention to this population that oftentimes is invisible, particularly in our urban centers that need some identification and services directed at them so we can try to elevate our academically advanced students and provide them

jm
Senate

44
May 17, 2017

with a better instructional environment. So for that reason, Madam President, I urge adoption of this Amendment and hopefully the support of this Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any comments or questions on the Amendment? If not, The Chair will try your minds. All those in favor please indicate by saying Aye [Ayes voiced]. Any opposed? The Ayes have it and the Amendment is adopted.

Please continue, Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if there's no objection I would ask that we move this to the Consent Calendar if possible?

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Thank you very much, Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Much appreciated.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

jm
Senate

45
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to mark a few items as Go.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On calendar page 14, calendar 205, Senate Bill 923, Go. Calendar page 25, calendar 292, Senate Bill 377, Go. Calendar page 25, calendar 293, Senate Bill 922, Go. Calendar page 18, calendar 230, Senate Bill 963, Go. Calendar page 12, calendar 188, Senate Bill 818, Go. Calendar page 37, calendar 383, Senate Bill 366, Go. Calendar page 38, calendar 389, Senate Bill 980, Go. Calendar page 55, calendar 99, Senate Joint Resolution 25, Go. And if the Clerk completes call in that order.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 14, calendar 205, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 820, AN ACT CONCERNING ELIGIBILITY OF PRIMARY CARE PHYSICIANS UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS EXPRESS PROGRAM.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

jm
Senate

46
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. It's calendar page 14, calendar 202, Senate Bill 923. It's a Planning and Development Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 14, calendar 202, Senate Bill No. 923, AN ACT CONCERNING THE POSSESSIONS OF DECEASED TENANTS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano. Good afternoon, sir.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. How are you?

THE CHAIR:

Great.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Good to see you back.

THE CHAIR:

Thanks.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

jm
Senate

47
May 17, 2017

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee Favorable Report and move passage of the Bill, waiver to read, and seek to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Motions on acceptance and passage. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, this is a Bill that has been -- come affectionately known now for the last four years as the possessions of deceased tenants. I was just kidding with Senator Fasano, four years ago we passed this Bill. We passed this Bill because of a request from a Manchester landlord. Under the law he had a single tenant and that tenant passed away with no relatives. By law he could not remove those items from the tenant's apartment and he had to actually file with the Probate Court a Motion to -- that she had to sign within 30 days. Obviously the dead tenant could not sign the Bill and now we affectionately call it the dead tenant's Bill. That was the first. Since that time there have been 12 of these situations in the State of Connecticut, 12 different situations where, by law, the dead tenant has to sign because of a quirk of a referral in the system.

This Bill changes that. The Bill has been passed unanimously every year and it's one of those that waits all day the last day of the session but is not quite important enough to get passed so we're trying to get it out early and would urge everybody to join the Committee which has been unanimous in supporting this Bill for the last four years.

jm
Senate

48
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill? If not, Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Well I would ask that it be placed on the Consent Calendar. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

On page 25, calendar 292, Senate Bill No. 377, AN ACT AMENDING THE CHARTER OF THE ODD FELLOWS HOME OF CONNECTICUT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Logan. Good afternoon, sir.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. The Clerk is in possession of LCO No. 6267. I ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

I'm gonna ask to hold for one second, sir, just to stand at ease a moment until we get the Board fixed.

jm
Senate

49
May 17, 2017

Senator Logan, I'd ask if you'd ask for acceptance and passage.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Yes, I will clarify, excuse me.

THE CHAIR:

Please.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

I move acceptance of the Committee's Joint Favorable Report and passage of the Bill No. 377.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The motion's on acceptance and passage. Will you remark further?

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Sure.

THE CHAIR:

Now you can call your Amendment, sir.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you. So as I mentioned before, the Clerk is in possession of LCO No. 6267.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, will you call the LCO number please?

jm
Senate

50
May 17, 2017

CLERK:

LCO No. 6267, Senate Amendment Schedule A, offered
by Senator Somers.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption of the
Amendment, waive the reading, and seek to summarize
the Amendment, but in order to understand the
Amendment I will have to describe the Bill as well.

THE CHAIR:

Motion --

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is to adopt the Amendment. Please proceed,
sir.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Sure. The Amendment itself is changing one word and
the word is -- strike the word assess. The Bill
itself clarifies the tax exempt status of the Odd
Fellows Home, which is located in Groton. Odd
Fellows Home is a nonprofit acute care home

jm
Senate

51
May 17, 2017

established by the Order of the Odd Fellows by way of a special act of the legislature back in 1893, which ironically happens to be the last time that the Senate was tied.

This Bill aims to make current law less ambiguous. The word that's being striked is *assessed* and what that does, effectively it changes -- it makes the value of the property was at issue -- market value as opposed to some sort of assessment by someone locally.

THE CHAIR:

Motion -- motion is on the acceptance Senate A and I try your minds. All those in favor Senate A, please say Aye [Ayes voiced]. Opposed? Senate A is adopted.

Senator Logan, would you like to speak further on the Bill?

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

I have no further comments in terms of the Bill itself and I urge adoption of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill? If not, Senator Logan, would you like to place this on the Consent Calendar?

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

I move to place this on the Consent Calendar.

jm
Senate

52
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objections, so ordered, sir. Thank you,
Senator Logan.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 25, calendar 293, Substitute for Senate Bill
No. 922, AN ACT CONCERNING TEMPORARY HEALTH CARE
STRUCTURES.

THE CHAIR:

Okay. Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, Madam President. Good to see you again.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Same here, sir.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

I move acceptance of the Joint Committee Favorable
Report and passage of the Bill and waiver to
reading.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

53
May 17, 2017

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, this is a Bill in fact brought to us by Senator Osten when it was called the Granny Pod Bill. Today we're finding that particularly seniors, people with disabilities, and so on are really finding it tough to find a place to live and their families want to bring them in but the house just isn't big enough.

What Granny Pod is, it's a small unit that can be attached to any home. It's 500 square feet maximum. They can have kitchen facilities, toilet facilities, a bedroom, and so on within that 500 feet. Municipalities have the right to decline their presence if they would like to. This allows relatives, family members, and it can only be someone that is related to have care, have shelter, and be close to their families. It's something that is growing across America. It's passed 21-nothing in the Committee and I would urge adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Senator Osten.
Good afternoon, ma'am.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. I would just -- I rise to support the Bill. This is a piece of legislation that allows another tool in the toolbox to stop our family members from entering convalescent homes. In many cases people own homes that cannot be rehabbed to have a ADA bathroom and

jm
Senate

54
May 17, 2017

this can provide that mechanism and allow people to stay out of convalescent homes, so it does many different things. It's more humane, it's cheaper, and it allows another option in order to keep our loved ones home with us just that much longer, and I urge the circle to adopt this piece of legislation. Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you -- will you -- will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Good afternoon.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Just a quick question for the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

So if I understand this correctly, we're talking about a -- a outbuilding outside the house that would be -- I guess my question is different communities have different zoning regulations. Are we, by this Statute, would they be allowed in all

jm
Senate

55
May 17, 2017

zoning -- residential zones? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

It would be allowed and if there are difficulties they could either go through zone change if necessary, but they also have -- the community has the right to opt out so that none would be there. The real hope is that they would be attached basically to a home simply because it would be much cheaper in the vet used facilities.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Through you, Madam President. So would there be a foundation or would there be -- would it be on, you know, piers, so to speak?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

I would have to defer to Senator Osten on that. She knows more about the construction.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

56
May 17, 2017

Senator Osten, will you accept the yield, ma'am?

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Yes, Madam President, I will. Could you repeat your question, Senator Martin?

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

I'd just like to know, are we talking about a outbuilding that would be with a foundation or on piers? Through you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Through you. This would be a temporary building. It could come in on wheels or it could not have wheels. It doesn't need a foundation and when it's not in use any longer it has to be removed within 120 days, so it does not have -- it will not end up with communities having temporary medical health care structures dotted about for decades. It is a requirement of the Bill that once the person who was authorized to use such a structure is no longer using that structure then the structure must be removed. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

jm
Senate

57
May 17, 2017

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you. So the law -- we approve this, will each municipality have to go through its zoning and approve or adopt this? From what I understand, yes, but if -- will they have to go -- each municipality have to approve this?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President, and through you. A municipality, if they don't want to do this, would have to take an action to opt out, but they do not have to pass this at their zoning. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

I just want to clarify 'cause I know I'm gonna get some questions when I go back to my district so thank you so much. I think it's a great idea and there's definitely a need for that. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

jm
Senate

58
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. Just if I may, a couple of questions to the proponent of the Bill or if they want to yield that's fine.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. The way I read the language, as long as the individual that applies to the municipality for a permit and follows the conditions set forth therein, meaning that they have to send -- they pay their money, the structure has to be less than 500 square feet, they have to be one of the -- mentally or physically impaired individual, and they let their voters know, there's nothing that a municipality can do to stop this from happening. Is that correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

The municipality does have the right to opt out if it chooses.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

jm
Senate

59
May 17, 2017

Thank you, and I -- I didn't see anything when I was just looking at the Bill. It says that the municipality does not have to hold a public hearing but then it says the municipality shall not deny the permit if the applicant provides proof of compliance with this Section, which is Section 1. So if the good Senator could point out where that -- the language would say that a municipality does not have to participate in said program. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

On the very first para -- second paragraph in the middle, *Unless a municipality opts out of the requirement* -- I'd like to find the actual opt out.

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease for a moment.

Senate will come back to order. Senator Cassano.

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

Yes, line 71, *A municipality by a vote of its legislative body, or the municipality where the legislative body is a town meeting, by vote of the Board of Selectman may opt out of the provisions of this Section and the provisions of the Subsection A of Section A-2 of the General Statutes as amended.*
Page 3 in the --

jm
Senate

60
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I'm just quickly reading. I was looking at Section 1. I wasn't looking in the pdf format so I didn't have any line numbers. Okay, I see what the good Senator is talking about and I'm appreciative of that. Thank you.

I want to make sure that the local municipality has the ability to do that and my fear was that in some municipalities they don't allow mobile homes or RVs or things to be parked in someone's front lawn and I believe that this would allow them to do that because they certainly fall within the parameters of what would be allowed because it's a temporary structure, generally less than 500 square feet. It certainly in my mind makes sense for a comfortable granny pod -- would be to -- be able to reside in an RV on a caregiver's front lawn.

So if a -- if a community has an existing restriction on a mobile home or recreational vehicles, would they still be allowed to participate in this specific program as long as they go through the permitting process for the caregiver aspect of it? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Cassano.

jm
Senate

61
May 17, 2017

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

I would think that the community would have to meet with the proposed owner of the pod because the regulations clearly for the granny pod would be dramatically different from, let's say, a motor home or whatever it might be, a trailer. Different circumstances, plumbing, all those things are different, different regulations. They may deny them now or they may allow them now. They may deny trailer homes as an example but allow these because of the size and the family relationship and so on, but it will be up to those individual communities and then they have the right to opt out if they want.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I thank the -- the Senator for those answers. You know, I think this gets to -- gives us a solution to a problem that many families face in that how do you take care of a loved one that may be needing to be relocated so somebody can take care of them but yet still respect their privacy and their individualism so they can live as independently as they possibly can and I think this is a good measure and I would urge my colleagues to support it. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Bill?
Senator Logan.

jm
Senate

62
May 17, 2017

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

I'd just like to indicate that I think this Bill further helps to encourage good family values and I support this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Logan. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill? If not --

SENATOR CASSANO (4TH):

No other comment, I'd ask to place on the Consent Calendar. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

On page 18, calendar 230, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 963, AN ACT CONCERNING EDUCATIONAL AND ENVIRONMENTAL ISSUES RELATING TO MANUFACTURING. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Boucher. No, I'm sorry. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Senate stand at ease.

jm
Senate

63
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease.

Senate will come back to order. Senator Hartley,
good afternoon, ma'am.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you
remark?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes indeed, thank you, Madam President. Madam
President, there is an Amendment. The Clerk is in
possession of LCO 6965. I ask that the Clerk please
call and I be granted leave to summarize, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 6965, Senate Amendment Schedule A, offered
by Senators Hartley and Frantz.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

64
May 17, 2017

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on adoption. Will you remark, ma'am?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes, yes indeed. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the LCO before us very simply strikes Section 1 and the reason for that actually is the action of this body last week when we in fact adopted that Bill through an education proposal that was before us, so I move adoption, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on adoption of Senate A. Will you remark? Will you remark? If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor please say Aye [Ayes voiced]. Opposed? Senate A is adopted.

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The underlying Bill now as it exists is the result and the work through the manufacturing caucus in the State of Connecticut to address low level infractions that do not affect health and human safety so there would be a suspension for first-time violations that had to be

jm
Senate

65
May 17, 2017

remedied within a defined period of time, Madam. I
move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you
remark further on the Bill? If not, Senator
Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam, and without objection it's --
this could be considered for the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 12, calendar 188, Substitute for Senate Bill
No. 818, AN ACT CONCERNING THE SUSPENSION OF CIVIL
PENALTIES IMPOSED BY THE DEPARTMENT OF ENERGY AND
ENVIRONMENTAL PROTECTION ON CERTAIN BUSINESS
ENTITIES PURSUANT TO STATE REGULATIONS. There are
Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz, good afternoon, sir.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President, and thank you for
the floor. So there is one Amendment, I believe,
Mr. Clerk, and is that correct?

jm
Senate

66
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

There's two, sir.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

There are two, okay.

THE CHAIR:

Just call one.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Okay. So if -- gotcha. 6403? Okay, so Madam President, I move acceptance of the Committee's Joint Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If I could, I'd like to introduce an Amendment first and then go back and discuss the underlying Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Thank you. The Clerk is in possession of LCO No. 6967.

jm
Senate

67
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 6967, Senate Amendment Schedule A, offered
in -- offered by Senators Hartley and Frantz.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. I move
adoption of the Amendment. We've --

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on adoption.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

We're prepared to proceed with that.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So what LCO 6967 simply
does is, if you're looking at the Bill, it strikes
lines 23 to 26 in their entirety and we'll come back

jm
Senate

68
May 17, 2017

and revisit what 23 and 26 is when we describe the Bill. So I urge adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark on the Amendment? Will you remark on the Amendment? If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor of the Amendment please say Aye [Ayes voiced]. Opposed? The Ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted.

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So the underlying Bill, Senate Bill 818, is a response to a lot of criticism that we've heard over literally the decades having to do with Connecticut having a very onerous regulatory system, particularly in the area of the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. It's one of the single biggest complaints that I've received, having been involved with economic development for far longer than I'd like to remember, and so this Bill is -- is meant to address that.

And simply what it does is, and is only within the purview of DEEP, what it does is -- is it calls for there to be a waiving of any penalties for a first-time violation, any civil penalties of a first-time violation found by DEEP provided that the business entity who is -- that is being assessed within 30 days after that penalty is assessed agrees to take reasonable measures to ensure that the condition that caused the violation in the first place would be remedied within a reasonable period of time up to

jm
Senate

69
May 17, 2017

six months as per the Bill. And then if that is in fact the case, then what DEEP does at that point is they will suspend the civil penalty unless -- unless there's willful -- willful or gross negligence in terms of that violation or for a violation that harms human health or the environment, or it's something that -- or if something is required by federal law or regulation as -- including as a condition of receiving federal funding for that particular -- for that particular part of the regulation.

So the idea is to make this -- make this a little bit more business friendly. I think the business community, if this were to pass, would cheer this because they -- they feel that they're being unfairly targeted so I think it's a good Bill as amended.

The Amendment, by the way, what that does is it strikes out lines 23 to 26, which was a provision that allowed you to take a -- a violation that you felt was incorrect and take it to the Superior Court system, but that's gone now, making the Bill a much more realistic one at this point.

So at this point, Madam President, if there is no objection I would move that this Bill go to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kennedy, would you like to speak first, sir?

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

jm
Senate

70
May 17, 2017

Yes, Madam President. If I could, I -- I have a few questions for the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz, will you prepare yourself, sir.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

I am prepared, thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kennedy, proceed.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. First of all, I want to thank my colleague, Senator Frantz and Senator Hartley, for all that they do to try to expand and make our current business climate more attractive in our state and I think that the idea of this Bill may sound like a good idea but in fact it's actually rewarding polluters who ignore the law and it -- it really undermines the basic tenet that we have in our environmental laws in our state, the legal enforcement recognition -- mechanisms by allowing polluters to benefit by -- from their own penalty payment.

So I don't think it's fair to reward companies who violate the law until they're caught, which is what this proposed Bill does, and I think it's unfair to the many companies who comply with the law and spend a lot of time, effort, and energy on expenditures to comply with the law, so it -- it actually gives polluters, I believe, an unfair financial and

jm
Senate

71
May 17, 2017

competitive advantage over the other regulated entities.

So I just have a couple of questions, if I could, to the proponent of the Bill. So first of all, through you, Madam Chair, Senator, are -- are you aware that DEEP can already offer violators an opportunity to clean up their mess without paying a fine? Are you aware that they're already able to do that? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you. The answer is yes but my understanding after being exposed to the sets of issues for over two decades, or about two decades now, is that they rarely do that.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

How -- how many cases do you -- do you -- do you know how many cases on like an annual basis people are fined civilly when you're -- you're -- you want to change the law now, longstanding law that we have in our state -- how many businesses every year would -- would be potentially affected by this change that you want to make? Through you, Madam Chair.

jm
Senate

72
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you. The answer is I don't have the answer there but this is purely for a first-time violation and anybody who's into manufacturing typically is -- is gonna -- probably have been around for a while. You don't get too many start-ups in the State of Connecticut these days in manufacturing, so I think everybody's become very familiar with what DEEP's regulations and requirements are and they all try to comply as best they possibly can, but I've seen -- I've witnessed several cases where it's just unbelievable how difficult it is to get themselves out of a position of noncompliance because it -- you know, they did something else wrong in trying to fix the original problem and then they get fined for that and it just snowballs into the point where the company is literally gonna have to go out of -- out of business if they don't get the fines removed. So I don't have an answer for you, sorry.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Yes, I'm sorry, through you, Madam President. Just a few more questions for the proponent of the Bill. The -- do you know how the fine levels, the level of fines that these businesses that you say are -- are being needlessly burdened by these regulations and

jm
Senate

73
May 17, 2017

need to fix the problem, like what kind of -- what kind of fines do you think the State would not collect as a result of this particular measure? Through you, Madam Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. I think the answer varies. There's a wide range. I mean some of the -- the smallest fines, I believe, are, you know, the thousand dollar range for some sort of polluting violation and then it can snowball into -- into fines that go back retrospectively because the problem wasn't -- wasn't solved to the satisfaction of the DEEP folks quick enough or sufficiently enough and so you get up into the, you know, several hundred thousand dollars per year being assessed on some of these -- some of these companies which is completely unmanageable -- unmanageable for some of them.

That's a different story than a first-time violation. This is, you know, this is a company that's clearly, you know, being pushed around and kind of being beat -- beat up by DEEP, which does happen unfortunately.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

jm
Senate

74
May 17, 2017

So -- so if a fine -- I want to make sure I understand this. If a fine is waived for a first-time violator of these civil penalties do you imagine that -- that DEEP would enter into some kind of an agreement, some kind of consent agreement, with that violator to say you can clean up this mess but if you don't do that we're going to assess a fine? Do you -- do you envision that there'll be some kind of an agreement between DEEP and the first-time violator? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Sure, thank you, Madam President. Through you. I think the answer there is that just -- just if the Bill were to pass I think that alone obviates the need for a Consent Decree, you know, or letter of some sort because the condition is you have to fix that problem to 100 percent of their -- to 100 percent satisfaction of DEEP, otherwise the penalty goes right back into place after six months.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

I thank my good colleague for that answer because there are -- been a number of attempts in the General Assembly over the last couple of years to in fact alter the way that DEEP and other agencies use the Consent Decree process, the Consent Order

jm
Senate

75
May 17, 2017

process, and I think if we're about to embark in a new regulatory scheme to enter into what is essentially a relief of a fine to fix the environmental problem I think that we're gonna need to use the Consent Decree process and so I -- I really don't want to see that Consent Decree process watered down anymore.

So I just -- a couple more questions. In terms of the -- the views of many of the environmental organizations in our state, through you, Madam President, why is it that you think that so many environmental organizations are -- are upset by not just this Bill, there's a couple lookalike Bills that are circulating in the General Assembly about the idea of, in essence, rewarding polluters who -- who violate the law? Why -- why do you think that's the case?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

I think it's -- through you, Madam President. Through you, I think it's wonderful that there are that many groups and I belong to many of them. I know you probably belong to all of 'em, but -- and thank God for them because they're wonderful stewards of the environment and I think there might be a little bit of a misunderstanding with many of those different groups and individuals in that we crafted this Bill so that there's -- there's a way out so if there is damage to the environment, if there is gross misconduct, that -- that DEEP can in

jm
Senate

76
May 17, 2017

fact impose those civil penalties without any obstruction.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

No, and I must say I do appreciate, through you, Madam President, your willingness and the proponent's willingness to -- to make those changes that will address the willful or grossly negligent violations and other -- and other accommodations, so to speak, from people who are concerned about this change in policy.

I -- I am concerned about -- on line 6 of the Bill, that the Commissioner of Energy and Environmental Protection shall suspend any civil penalty. You may note that there's a -- a lookalike Bill that was passed in the House very recently, House Bill No. 7063, that -- that did pass the House. That was a *may* instead of a *shall* so this -- this piece of legislation that you're proposing is -- is -- is significantly different because of that obviously one minor word change and I would probably support this Bill if it were more permissive instead of directive.

I just have a couple of -- I'm wondering if my good colleague is aware of the -- this document, the civil penalty policy of the State of Connecticut Department of Environmental Protection?

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

77
May 17, 2017

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Through you, Madam President. No.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Well it's a very interesting read. I recommend it to all my colleagues here and it's -- it basically outlines -- it's about a 25-page document. It's about 20-year-old document that really sets forth the civil penalty policies for the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection, and I'll just read a couple of sentences in the introduction. They say, *Penalties are extremely important to the success of the Department's programs. The goal of any Department enforcement action is to bring the violator into compliance with these requirements and to assure that they will stay in compliance. Penalties are critical to this goal since without penalties the only risk a violator takes is that if he gets caught he will have to do what the law already requires him to do.*

In the meantime, he has saved money, time, effort by not complying, and has gained a competitive advantage over others who have incurred the costs necessary to comply with the law. The penalty estimates the incentive to violate by recouping any money to the violator -- the violator saves by noncompliance and so in essence their -- their civil penalty policy is -- really tries to make

jm
Senate

78
May 17, 2017

noncompliance more costly than compliance. That is the fundamental principle of the civil penalty policies.

I'm not gonna go over and over and over. I think I've sort of made my point here. But they -- they -- currently DEEP, you know, takes into consideration the -- all sorts of factors when they weigh a decision whether or not to offer, you know, these kinds of relief to the potent -- to the potential violators, to the violators. How long has the violation occurred, for example. How large is the violation? How bad is the violation from a public health perspective? How toxic the violation?

They get into examples of you can spill a certain number of gallons of -- of pollution but if -- if it comes out one pipe versus perhaps out of five different pipes shouldn't the agency be able to make a -- distinguish -- differentiation between perhaps something that is a widespread problem in the business and what may -- may just be one -- stray kind of violation.

So I'm just -- I'm just wondering if you -- if you -- when you think about the violations that you're envisioning, you know, do you think about sort of the range of potential violations or are you -- are you -- it sounds to me by your comments that you're anticipating that these are kind of minor viola -- these are almost kind of nuisance violations. Is -- is that -- is that your -- your position here today?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

jm
Senate

79
May 17, 2017

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. Yes, Senator, that would be my position today. You know, we're not talking about, you know, Millstone dumping nuclear rods into Long Island Sound or anything like that. We're talking about typically a smaller manufacturing company that may not have the staff or scientists or other personnel on board to do everything perfectly right.

You take a -- as a real life example, a furniture building company and refinishing company in Bridgeport, Connecticut, which was on its way to be very big in its -- in its business and industry and because it was measured in parts per million a particular -- particular, you know, leftover from a chemical process that went through the filtration system and several filtration systems, but because they found that it was, you know, this high over the allowable limit that they started to assess them fines and then it turned into, you know, them trying to fix the problem and they didn't do it exactly right to their new standards and it just got worse and worse and worse until literally they were looking at hundreds of thousands of dollars. I think it actually got to a million dollars at one point that they owed to DEEP, a never-ending downward death spiral for the company.

So the quick answer to your question is we envision smaller violations and certainly none that include any sort of grossful, you know, gross, you know, negligence or anything, but small things. And again, in the Bill's language here it says if there is any damage to the environment or human health

jm
Senate

80
May 17, 2017

that DEEP is -- is justified in giving the civil --
civil penalties.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

I just have two more questions for the proponent of
the Bill. Through you, Madam President. Would you
favor -- this is a hypothetical question. Would you
favor the publishing of a list of the businesses
that availed themselves of this type of relief that
you're proposing so it's publicly disclosed which
businesses can avail -- have availed themselves of
this program? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you. I think
all of that information would be publicly available
through the FOI process or maybe just, you know,
reviewing DEEP's website if they wanted to publish
that, but I wouldn't like go out and promote the
companies that, you know, took advantage of this.
We want to be a much business -- more business
friendly state. We're one of the worst, as you
know, in the entire country, and we need to show
that we really do care, that we will respect all the
environmental laws out there without a doubt. We
all love the environment. There are some more than
others, and we'll do anything we can to preserve it.

It's an amazing state and amazing Long Island Sound
that we have and the lakes and rivers and everything
else are tremendous, and we gotta protect those for

jm
Senate

81
May 17, 2017

sure. But we also have to make sure that we've got a friendly business environment so that we have a -- an economy, a state economy. Otherwise we won't be able to afford to take really good care of all of those different assets. So that's where I stand.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

And then one final question --

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

-- through you, Madam President. There are many federal laws and other states have laws that -- that permit violators of pollution laws to -- you actually take that penalty and have to give it to an environmental organization that's, say, trying to clean up Long Island Sound or trying to expand open space or something like that. Are you -- would you be in favor of that kind of program?

In other words, would still be the same idea, taking money instead of that money going into the state to pay a fine, having those business entities actually pay for other environmental organizations locally to help fix the problem that they're -- are facing because I think -- I've heard of many programs like that but I've never heard of a proposal like this which is basically allowing polluters to benefit from their own violations of the law. But would -- would that be something that you could conceivably support? Through you, Madam President.

jm
Senate

82
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you. The answer there is yes, absolutely, but that's sort of step two in terms of the timeline of this Bill. This would also -- if they had that kind of program in place would basically say, you know, the -- the civil fine or the required contribution to, you know, save the environment on X, Y, Z is waived because this is your first offense. You've done absolutely everything in this somewhat minor offense to remedy the -- the situation and everything is hunky-dory.

Now if there's a further violation down the road and it's a legitimate civil penalty that they impose on them and they want to have them give to an environmental group instead, fine, absolutely.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Thank you. Because I think that this proposal allows the "penalty" to inure to the benefit of the provider and because I think it allows businesses to gain a financial and competitive advantages over other regulated entities, I will not be able to support this Bill and I urge my colleagues to -- to reject this Bill for those reasons. Thank you very much, Madam President.

jm
Senate

83
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Indeed I would like to remark and I would like to thank Senator Kennedy for his input as well as my Co-Chair, Senator Frantz, who has worked so diligently with the Committee on this. And we should note that this is the work of the manufacturer's caucus and I think that if you can go around this circle to even the 36th senatorial district you will find manufacturers in every single one of our districts.

The intention of this was to work in a collaborative but positive way and yes indeed we are all stewards of the environment and so in no way is there any intent to elevate, reward, or allow polluters to abscond. And the testimony that we heard in the manufacturing caucus was varied but I'll share with you an example or two.

In fact this was a manufacturer from the Southeast District who talked about the fact that in the recycling or returning of their fluorescent light bulbs that they were supposed to have sent them FedEx. They mistakenly sent them UPS and they were cited and fined for that. There was other testimony that talked about the -- the posting of signs with regard to egress and -- and procedure on the manufacturing floor that were posted in the wrong places. They were cited for that.

jm
Senate

84
May 17, 2017

So very clearly in this Bill you will see that it is affirmatively stated that this should not be applicable to any instances where there is a violation of -- which harms human health or the environment or whatever is required by federal law or regulation. So it's not about noncompliance. It's really -- and it's not about any overt action most of the time, at least in the testimony that we heard. It is about the unintentional first-time instance and it's about trying to in some respect work together more collaboratively and so I thank the Chamber and all those who worked on it and ask for your support on this. Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President, through you, a question to the proponent of the Bill?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir -- ma'am.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. My hair's short so maybe that's it, I don't know. Senator Frantz, through you, Madam President, does this in any way impact the Transfer Act in regards to polluted properties? Through you, Madam President.

jm
Senate

85
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Through you, Madam President. I think the answer to that question is no, it does not.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

So if a property is polluted as a result of the owner this in no way abdicates their responsibility in cleaning up or in some way finding some resolution to the problem that they leave behind? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes, that is correct, Senator, yes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

jm
Senate

86
May 17, 2017

Thank you very much. Thank you, Madam President.
Thank you very much, Senator Frantz.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. My colleague, Senator Kennedy, had used some phrases about benefitting or rewarding polluters and I just want to clarify for the record what this -- this legislation would do. It's my understanding that if the violation does result in pollution, harm to the environment, or harm to human health, that this Bill does not apply. Through you, Madam President, to the proponent, is that a correct understanding of the Bill?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Yes, through you, Madam President. The answer is yes, that is correct.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, and through you, Madam President. I see, too, that the Bill says that the suspension of the penalties does not apply in cases of willful or

jm
Senate

87
May 17, 2017

gross negligence such as, for example, I -- I would say somebody who might be storing chemicals on their property perhaps improperly that the chemicals haven't leaked onto the enviro -- onto the property so there's no damage caused but nonetheless if there's gross or careless storage of chemicals that might be harmful to the environment, that may result in damage to the environment. Under those circumstances, if it's considered to be gross negligence or willful then DEEP would still impose their penalties. Is that a correct understanding?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes, that is correct.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you. So then it's fair to say that if you're a polluter, if the activity that -- that DEEP is potentially going to fine, if that activity has harmed the environment, if there is indeed pollution on a site, then this particular Bill would not waive the penalties. I just want to make absolutely certain I understand that. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

88
May 17, 2017

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. The answer is yes again.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

So if I can engage in a theoretical, if -- if a DEEP inspector is on -- on a site and there's perhaps dozens of drums of chemicals, potentially hazardous chemicals stored, and one of those drums was improperly sealed, let's say it's an open container, but all other drums were sealed properly, that may not be considered to be willful or gross negligence. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Could you ask the last part of the question again?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio, would you repeat that?

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

jm
Senate

89
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. Let's take a theoretical situation where there's hundreds of drums of chemicals that are stored on a property and one particular drum is open. It's not being properly stored but all other drums are properly sealed and stored. Would that be considered to be a willful or gross case of -- a case of gross negligence? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Through you, Madam President. I think the answer to that would be there would have to be an investigation to see what went wrong. Why is there that one con -- open container on the property? And after doing their investigation they might determine that it was, you know, willful negligence on the part of someone -- someone, an employee of the company or it could have been just, you know, some -- an oversight. Or maybe it's just a -- it was a bad container, you know, top to the container that rotted out over the course of time and then you go after the manufacturer, I think, you know, of the container itself. So it's hard to say. I think the investigation would have to occur before you can say it is gross negligence or not.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

jm
Senate

90
May 17, 2017

Thank you and through you, Madam President. In a situation where a company has dozens of drums of chemicals or hazardous and they're carelessly stored there, open, and they're in bad condition, even though no harm has been caused to the environment at that point in time the fact that the chemicals have been improperly stored and -- and it's -- appears to be a widespread practice, that would be -- that would not be subject to waiving the -- the DEEP violations. Is that a correct understanding? Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes, that is correct.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you. I have not further questions for the proponent. It does seem to me that the Bill does give some latitude in terms of companies that might have unintentionally violated a DEEP regulation but have not caused harm to the environment. Obviously once harm to the environment has been caused this Bill does not apply according to the proponent and moreover, again, even if harm hasn't been caused to the environment but if the practices of a particular company are widespread or viewed to be grossly

jm
Senate

91
May 17, 2017

negligent or willful, even then the -- DEEP would be still free to impose its penalties.

So I -- I believe this is the kind of Bill that we need to encourage Connecticut to get back on its economic feet and I don't think it betrays environmental concerns. I think it -- it still in fact reinforces those environmental concerns 'cause -- because it makes it very clear that if there's willful or gross negligence or if there's actual harm done to the environment no penalties are waived whatsoever. The full brunt of the law and the enforcement by DEEP would still apply. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Senator Somers. Good afternoon, ma'am.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Good afternoon. Thank you, Madam President. I would like to urge my colleagues to support this Bill. It's a business friendly Bill and I want to give you an example of a small business that could benefit from something like this.

A small private company that actually applies pesticides for peach trees and apple trees and they do it and they don't actually get written confirmed consent from the person doing the job and they allow the person to stay a little bit longer in the area than they should. DEEP assessed a civil penalty for them because they did not actually get the written signed consent. It was just under \$19 hundred dollars but it's still \$19 hundred dollars for a

jm
Senate

92
May 17, 2017

small business that if they were given an opportunity -- perhaps it was something that they didn't realize they actually had to get the signed consent -- they gave it orally but not signed -- they would have an opportunity to, in this case, perhaps waive that fine on a small business, learn from their mistakes, and not be a violator in the future.

So civil penalties are applied in many different areas and I think it's something that we should look at as a business friendly initiative here in Connecticut and we all know we need to be more business friendly with all of us working on the budget here. So I would just like to have everybody consider that. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further? Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Good evening. Nice to see you.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN (24TH):

I stand in firm support of this Bill and the Amendment. I'm grateful to the Commerce Committee leadership for their work on this, persistence, as I understand this has been around now for at least

jm
Senate

93
May 17, 2017

three or four years and they've tried to fine tune it, I guess, even with an Amendment today that took out the ability to appeal to the Superior Court.

I did hear concerns of some of my colleagues about a polluter being let off the hook and I think if we look at the language of the Bill, lines 18 to 22, it makes it perfectly clear that a polluter is gonna pay. It is someone who perhaps has a paperwork violation or a simple violation, as Senator Hartley had discussed, that we're talking about here.

But if you are a polluter and a willful negligent polluter this doesn't apply to you. It doesn't apply to anyone who is harming humans or the environment and it certainly doesn't apply if federal law trumps this particular violation in question. So I hope that we can engage enough members of the Senate to approve this. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further -- don't run, don't run, don't run. Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise to support the Bill. Madam President, what is clear, and I think Senator Somers and Senator McLachlan and Senator Frantz had said it, is we have to make Connecticut more business friendly. I will tell you those of us who have businesses on the shoreline, those of us who represent clients or

constituents on the shoreline have experienced heavy-handedness by DEEP.

And what I mean is it's my understanding when you read the Statute is the only entity or organization or agency that can issue a Cease and Desist Order is the AG. And DEEP personnel frequently issue Cease and Desist Orders. They're not authorized to do it. The reason why they did and how that came about was that they're supposed to go to the AG and say, hey, this is a violator. We need a Cease and Desist, and if the AG felt it rose to a certain level I guess they would issue the Order. If they didn't, they would say, look, you guys gotta work that out. We're not involved.

So the agency slowly took over by using a -- a form and changing some dates and putting some things in, adopted their own Cease and Desist. There's no authority in the Statute. And we all know one thing. If you've ever dealt with DEEP on a constituent DEEP it is like fighting the IRS. They have more resources to throw at you than you could ever come up with, more ability to stop you, annoy you, and send you into debt than any other agency besides the DRS. So people shake when it happens.

Now, with this -- let's put this Bill in perspective. All this Bill says is if you are a first-time violator and you haven't offended the environment, you correct the problem and we don't fine you. What is so wrong about that? To think we even have to do this Bill suggests that DEEP is not even doing what logical, right-thinking, right-minded people believe they should be doing. We actually have to put it into law to tell them to do something that we all would say, yeah, why are you

jm
Senate

95
May 17, 2017

bothering with that? Why are you bothering with that?

I will give one example to me. Long before I was in this Chamber, these cars were going into this creek so I put a rock in the creek before the creek on top so the cars can't roll into the creek so people don't get hurt. Well apparently that rock, according to DEEP, displaced a certain amount of water which could cause flooding to some house along the shoreline. Assuming I even understood that, they wanted to fine me for doing it. What, really? I'll move the rock. Nope, that wasn't good enough. That was not good enough. Now, I paid because I wasn't gonna fight it.

But those are the illogical things that DEEP does and those are the things that hurt the State of Connecticut. Those are the things that don't advance us forward. We're not talking about the constant violator. We're not talking about someone who has cheated and has profited from that cheating on an ongoing activity. I would argue that is a continuous practice for which they should be fined. We're talking about a business, an association, an LLC, who has inadvertently made a mistake that doesn't affect the environment. There's no reason to rake them over the coals. And we have to pass a Bill to say that. That's lunacy. That speaks about a bureaucracy out of control. So Madam President, I do support this Bill. It's the right way to go. I thank Senator Hartley. I thank Senator Frantz for bringing this out and I look forward to its passage.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

96
May 17, 2017

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?
If not, Mr. Clerk, will you call for a roll call
vote? The machine will be open.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

All members have voted. All members have voted.
The machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk, will you
please call a tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 818.

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

THE CHAIR:

The Bill passes. Mr. Clerk. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The next item which is
calendar page 37, calendar 383, Senate Bill 366, I'd
like to mark that TR, please, and if the --

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

jm
Senate

97
May 17, 2017

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

-- Clerk can move on to the next Bill, please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 38, calendar 389, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 980, AN ACT CONCERNING TAMPERING WITH A WITNESS. There is Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Doyle. Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. What this piece of legislation does, we currently have one Statute that deals with tampering a witness. This divides that and creates two Statutes that kind of -- it divides the current one into two in a first -- a second and

first degree, and basically the existing Statute does not reference -- it talks about attempting to -- induce or attempt a witness not to testify but there's no violence involved.

What this Statute does -- or what this Bill does is the new second degree is kind of current law that says if you are inducing or attempting to get a witness to testify falsely that is a second degree and it's a Class C felony. The new Statute, which is the first degree has the same content of what I just said in the sense that tampering with a witness but it adds in the component when there's -- when a person physically harms or threatens physical harm to the witness, that becomes --

THE CHAIR:

I'm sorry, Senator Doyle. Thank you. Now I can hear you, thank you. Please go.

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Sorry. So the -- the new first degree, as I said, deals with the added component is really a person physically harming or threaten to physically harm the witness or the person. It's an important piece of legislation. One of our colleagues presented it to the Judiciary Committee and it certainly is a significant problem and it makes perfect sense that if a person -- one thing is to tamper with a witness. The second one is to induce -- I mean the second one is to threaten or actually physically harm the witness would justify the second -- the first count and I urge our Chamber to approve this new crime. Thank you, Madam President.

jm
Senate

99
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Great to see you this afternoon. I stand in strong support of this Bill as well. It makes perfect sense to have heightened penalty available for state's attorneys if an individual actually attempts to tamper with a witness by threatening the use of physical force or actually using physical force and I'd like to thank Senator McCrory for bringing this matter to our attention in the Judiciary Committee and I just can't imagine how one would feel if someone actually says you go and you testify against me and I'm gonna hurt you or actually does some harm to scare you, punches you or threatens your life, who knows? So we need to do everything we can as a law abiding society to address these issues if they ever come to our attention and, again, I would urge my colleagues to support this Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Bill?
Will you -- Senator Suzio -- oh, Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

I apologize, Madam President. It's an oversight on my part. The Clerk does have an Amendment. I should have called it. I apologize to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

100
May 17, 2017

Please go forward.

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Thank you. The Clerk has an Amendment, LCO 6620.
May the Clerk please call and I be allowed to
summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

~~LCO No. 6620~~, Senate A, offered by Senators Doyle,
Kissel, and McCrory.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Thank you, Madam President. This Amendment is to
strike everything amended but what it does is --

THE CHAIR:

Want to move to adopt?

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Sorry. Move -- move adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on adoption. Please proceed, sir.

jm
Senate

101
May 17, 2017

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Yes, so what the Amendment does, it changes it from a Class C felony to Class B felony for the person guilty of intimidating a witness and I urge the Chamber to accept the Amendment before us. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark on the Amendment? Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President, and the Amendment merely clarifies the points that we had raised earlier in supporting the Bill and I would urge its adoption as well.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark on the Amendment? Will you remark on the Amendment? If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor please say Aye [Ayes voiced]. Opposed? The Amendment passes.

Are there any questions on the Bill? Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I, too, stand in support of the Bill. I wanna compliment Senator McCrory. This tampering with a witness or intimidating a witness is a fundamental threat to the operation of our system of justice and it's a very serious crime as far as I'm concerned that

jm
Senate

102
May 17, 2017

threatens to undermine the integrity of the entire judicial system. I strongly support this -- this law, this proposed Bill, I should say and, again, I wanna thank the good Senator for proposing it. Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further? Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

Yes, Madam President. If there's no objection I move this Bill to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

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

CLERK:

On page 90 -- I'm sorry, page 55, calendar 99, Senate Joint Resolution No. 25, RESOLUTION MEMORIALIZING CONGRESS TO RECOGNIZE WOMEN IN THE CADET NURSE CORPS DURING WORLD WAR II AS VETERANS.

THE CHAIR:

Good aft -- good evening. Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee Favorable Report and adoption of the Resolution.

jm
Senate

103
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and adoption. Will you remark?

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Madam President, this Resolution is before us today because of the great advocacy of a group of women led by Senator Cathy Osten. This Resolution memorializes Congress to recognize the women in the Cadet Nurse Corps who served during World War II under the Public Health Services. These women were shortchanged their ability to be called veterans.

This Bill, or this -- excuse me, this Resolution asks Congress to recognize them for the tremendous service that they did to our country -- for our country during World War II and to make them eligible for veterans' benefits that all of the other veterans who served alongside them are eligible for. I urge the Chamber to support this Resolution.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President, and I want to thank my colleagues in the Veterans' Committee and in particular Senator Flexer for bringing this forward. This group of women who helped us during World War II were -- should have been always eligible for military benefits. Without having the

jm
Senate

104
May 17, 2017

Nurse Cadet Corps our ability to save lives in World War II would have been negatively impacted. The -- the 112th Congress brought a Bill forward to recognize these women as military members as that is what they are.

I still have people today who served in the Nurse Cadet Corps in my district and are spry and could talk about what they did for our country in terms that would surprise every one of us around the circle. This is the only group of veterans who have not been recognized by Congress and I would highly recommend that we correct wrong before we correct it posthumously for women who served our country.

Women in the Nurse Cadet Corps served both in-country and overseas. They were needed by our country and it was an Act of Congress that established them. That Act of Congress said that we need nurses and this was the beginning of nurses serving in the military. It is an injustice to these women to not recognize that they are members of the military and it hurts not a single person to have them recognized.

As a female veteran, I get -- I'm lucky enough to get to go around and talk to American Legions and veterans of foreign wars and when I talk to people, other veterans, about this injustice, male or female, does not matter which branch of the Service they were in, they all think that these women deserve recognition. As a matter of fact, to not have that recognition is an injustice to every other veteran. It diminishes what we do, what we did, and what our active military folks are doing today.

jm
Senate

105
May 17, 2017

I urge my colleagues to support this Resolution and I hope that the Congress will take it seriously and finally correct this egregious wrong. Thank you very much, Madam President, and thank you, Senator Flexer.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, and thank you for your service. Will you remark? Senator Martin. Senator Martin, please, thank you.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Madam President. Just very quickly, you know this -- this Act of Congress was established in 1946 and at the request of Franklin -- President Franklin Roosevelt and its purpose and the Cadet Nurses -- their purpose was really to make sure that the country at home and abroad -- that we had nurses to take care of -- to take care of those in need during the war and I can't say enough. I want to echo Senator Osten's word of the great justice that they did, but also they really do need to be recognized as a vet because that's what they were. They were vets. So I stand in support of this -- this Resolution. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

You're welcome. Will you remark further? Senator Leone.

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I just want to brief comment on the Bill. I want to thank the Chairs of

jm
Senate

106
May 17, 2017

the Veterans' Committee and also Senator Osten for bringing out this Resolution. And my simple comments are thus: As a former Chair of the Veterans' Committee and as a veteran, I fully support this endeavor to recognize the women who served our country, not just today and going forward, but also in the past and when we look back through our history, look back to the past, obviously back then this was a world war where everyone participated in one form or another and that means the female gender as well.

They stepped up. They entered into the -- into the fray just as all our men have done over the years and I think for their effort they should be recognized in the same way that our -- our -- our male counterparts are recognized for their efforts in the military. So this is most likely more of an oversight given how the thought process was back then but we've come a long way and we should be able to rectify those -- those mistakes and so I fully support recognizing all members who contributed in our efforts in the great wars, not just then but moving forward, because it is -- it is an effort that no matter what gender you have you should be recognized for those efforts serving your country. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, and thank you for your service. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Seeing not, Senator Flexer.

SENATOR FLEXER (29TH):

jm
Senate

107
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection I move that we place this item on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, ma'am. Mr. Clerk.
The Senate will stand at ease.

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, a few more items to mark --

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

-- as Go. Calendar page 8, calendar 136, Senate Bill 808. Calendar page 9, calendar 145, Senate Bill 24. Calendar page 10, calendar 170, Senate Bill 928, to be taken out by the Republican Co-Chair. Calendar page 11, calendar 174, Senate Bill 806, taken out by the Democratic Co-Chair. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 9 --

jm
Senate

108
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

8.

CLERK:

Page 8, calendar 136, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 808, AN ACT INCREASING THE MINIMUM AMOUNT OF INSURANCE COVERAGE REQUIRED TO ISSUE A MOTOR VEHICLE OPERATOR'S LICENSE OR CERTIFICATE OF MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Larson. Senator Larson, please.

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

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

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. This Bill increases the minimum amount of automobile insurance a person must maintain to receive or retain driver's license or registration. Specifically it increases the minimum amount of liability coverage, bodily injury to others and property damage, and for

jm
Senate

109
May 17, 2017

uninsured and underinsured motorist coverage, bodily injury to the vehicle owner, relatives living with owner, and passengers injured in a hit and run accident or an accident caused by a driver who is uninsured, who has insufficient bodily injury coverage.

THE CHAIR:

Would you like to remark further?

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Yes, Madam President. I understand that there is an Amendment, LCO 6621, and I'd ask the Clerk to call the Amendment and I ask to seek leave of the Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 6621, Senate A, offered by Senators Larson and Looney.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Larson.

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President. This Amendment --

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

110
May 17, 2017

Will you move the adoption?

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

I move the adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on adoption. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Yes, thank you again, Madam President. This Amendment increases the amount of coverage required per person to 30,000, increases the amount of coverage per accident to 60,000, and makes a technical change regarding the effective date which leaves the minimum amount needed for coverage for bodily injury at 25,000, which was in the original Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark on the -- on the Amendment? Will you remark on the Amendment? Senator Kelly. I'm sorry, Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. I also rise in support of the Amendment and also for the leadership of Senator Larson on this issue in working the Bill through Committee. One of the things that we gotta keep in mind here is that we haven't had a change in the minimum insurance requirements since 1971, the Nixon administration. So this is something that's long overdue just from an inflation perspective and

jm
Senate

111
May 17, 2017

it's something that I think is important to make sure that we have adequately insured motorists on our roads. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Speaking in support of the Amendment. I wanted to thank Senator Larson for his work on this Bill and the Amendment, and Senator Kelly also. And I think the points made are critically important in terms of this Bill. As Senator Kelly pointed out, there has not been an increase in the limits since the law was first passed in the early 1970s.

Even with this Bill and even with the Amendment proposed we are still far behind in terms even in inflation-related adjustment for what the -- those rates would be if we were to truly replicate the mo -- contemporary equivalent of what they were in 19 -- in the early 1970s, but it is at least progress. And the consequences of having the thresholds as low as they are involve in many cases people having to bring claims against their own insurance policies for underinsured motorists and that really is -- is not fair to those people who have adequate coverage and are injured by people who have minimal coverage. So at least we will have some greater equity in the whole system as a result of this Amendment and this Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

112
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Senator. Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. I apologize for speaking after the President pro tempore. I just had a question. Was there any testimony during the public hearing as to how this may impact premiums --

THE CHAIR:

This is on the Amendment, sir?

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

On the Amendment, which increases the coverage so I wanted to know if there was any testimony as to the extent on how, if any, insurance holders or policy holders would see an increase in their -- in their premiums. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Larson.

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President. It's been a while but, yes, my understanding was that in the original amounts there was some, mostly favorable testimony. The fact that it's been, I believe, since 1974 that we've even looked at this and that when we were asked what the -- what the overall determination might be or the impact on rates, it was too hard to ascertain other than having individuals possibly go

jm
Senate

113
May 17, 2017

back to their own carriers and try to figure out what was going on so there was -- there was discussion about that but there was no definitive sort of percentage or dollar amount. I've heard anecdotally from several people that when they've checked their own coverage it appears as though that they're somewhere between a 7 to 9 percent increase in -- in the amended limit of liability.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I thank Senator Larson for that answer and I -- I'm gonna support the Amendment and ultimately the Bill. I'm just concerned that, you know, with the rising costs of everything else and I know we're trying to bring ourselves up to a vast majority of the states in this country to have the same limits, but I hope we don't see a large percentage of our population because of a 9 percent increase in their insurance rate decline or just not be able to afford insurance on their automobile, so I'm gonna support it and let's just hope for the best and bring ourselves in line. 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 those in favor please say Aye [Ayes voiced]. Opposed? Amendment passes. Now onto the Bill. Senator Larson.

jm
Senate

114
May 17, 2017

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection I'd ask that the Bill be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection --

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

I'm sorry.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you. Senator Larson, you say the increase is between 7 and 9 percent overall for the policy?

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

That was an anecdotal sort of -- that was not statistically given. Several people that I've spoken to had effectively checked with their own local carriers and automobile situations and tried to get a -- an estimate so that's where that number comes from. That was not given to me by the industry or the lobbying concern.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

jm
Senate

115
May 17, 2017

So I have some concerns over the increase so I would ask for a roll call vote.

THE CHAIR:

A roll call vote will be had. Any other discussion on the Bill? Seeing none, Mr. Clerk, will you please call for a roll call vote and the machine will be open.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

All members have voted. All members have voted. The machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk, will you please call the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 808.

Total number voting	36
Those voting Yea	34
Those voting Nay	2
Absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Bill passes. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

jm
Senate

116
May 17, 2017

On page 9, calendar 145, Senate Bill No. 24, AN ACT
REDUCING THE TIME FRAME FOR URGENT CARE ADVERSE
DETERMINATION REVIEW REQUESTS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Larson.

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

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

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President. This changes the current Bill's language of 72 to 48 hours for the time an insurance provider has to respond by accepting or denying an appeal from a patient for urgent care from the health carrier.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill? Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and thanks to Senator Larson for bringing this Bill forward in the Insurance and Real Estate Committee. This Bill has

jm
Senate

117
May 17, 2017

somewhat of a history, Madam President. It does decrease the time frame for expedited reviews when an insurer denies a service so the patient will get an answer sooner. Also I worked with Representative Yaccarino on this issue, who had proposed a -- a 24-hour limit.

Under the current law the insurer has 72 hours to respond to an urgent care request and as we know in some cases 72 hours can put a patient in serious danger of a negative outcome and this Bill, as a compromise, would reduce the time frame to 48 hours and unfortunately that time frame was -- was lengthened to 72 hours back in -- in 2011.

The Affordable Care Act requires that the longest time allowed for an urgent care request is 72 hours and prior to that Act the time frame was two business days and that requirement really isn't consistent with the -- with current federal law because on requests that include weekend days two business days can actually exceed 72 hours.

So in -- in 2013, in Public Act 13-3, THE ACT CONCERNING GUN VIOLENCE PREVENTION AND CHILDREN SAFETY, we decreased the time frame to 24 hours for an insurer to respond to an urgent care request regarding mental health and substance abuse denials, and objecting to a 24-hour requirement some of the health carriers at the time asserted that -- that if the time frame was moved to 24 hours for all urgent care requests that it might result in more denials but the American Medical Association and the American Hospital Association have announced joint policy goals which included 24-hour time frame for urgent care requests and clearly I think 24 hours would be the most superior policy but 48 hours would

jm
Senate

118
May 17, 2017

be, I think, a significant and reasonable improvement from current law and also represents a very reasonable compromise on this issue. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark further on the Bill? Will you remark further on the Bill? If not, Senator Larson.

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President. If there's no objection I'd ask this Bill be placed on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 10, calendar 170, Senate Bill No. 928, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A TASK FORCE TO STUDY METHODS OF DEVELOPING, EXPANDING, AND IMPROVING THE INSURANCE INDUSTRY WORKFORCE IN THIS STATE.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

119
May 17, 2017

Senator Kelly. Good evening, sir.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

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

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. What this Bill does is something straightforward and it's something that came out of an insurance forum that I had with the insurance industry in December where I asked the insurance industry what is it we can do for you as a General Assembly? And one of the things among many that the insurance industry came back to me with was that we have an aging workforce in insurance. It's a workforce that is highly qualified.

We have some of the best and the brightest working right here in Hartford in the insurance industry but, like manufacturing, we are not getting and capturing the excitement and interest of our youth and there was an analogy that what we need to do for our insurance industry is the same what we did for manufacturing and to look at that and see what we could do to encourage more individuals, not only to go into insurance, but to work with our insurance industry to find what we can do to develop and encourage our workforce development here in Hartford so that we can maintain good paying jobs, good

jm
Senate

120
May 17, 2017

paying insurance jobs and that's basically what this Bill is going to do.

It's gonna work with the industry to study this issue and hopefully report back with a plan on how we can partner together, both the state government and our insurance industry, to make it more robust and to create more jobs here in Connecticut for our families.

To that end, Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of LCO No. 6682. I ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 6682, Senate A, offered by Senators Kelly and Larson.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. This Amendment --

THE CHAIR:

Would you like to adopt this Amendment, sir?

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

jm
Senate

121
May 17, 2017

Oh, pardon me. I move adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thanks. This Amendment basically in the appointment of the task force basically resembles the tie in the Senate and makes it equal between both leadership of -- of the Senate and I would move its adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? Will you remark on the Amendment? If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor please say Aye [Ayes voiced]. Hello?

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Thank you very much. Those against, please say Nay. The Ayes have it. Senate A is adopted.

jm
Senate

122
May 17, 2017

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you, Madam President. If there is no objection I move this Bill be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR KELLY (21ST):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 11, calendar 174, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 806, AN ACT ESTABLISHING THE CRUMBLING FOUNDATION ASSISTANCE PROGRAM AND ASSISTING HOMEOWNERS WITH CRUMBLING FOUNDATIONS. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Larson.

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

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

jm
Senate

123
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you
remark, sir?

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Thank you. As been presented, there is an
Amendment. I'd ask leave of the Chair to call the
Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, call the Amendment, please.

CLERK:

LCO No. 6832, Senate A, offered by Senators Larson,
Looney, Duff, et al.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Larson.

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Move adoption?

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Pardon me?

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

124
May 17, 2017

Motion on adoption.

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Motion on adoption. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Thank you. I -- I wanted to speak to the Amendment,
LCO --

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Continue?

THE CHAIR:

It's been called so you don't have to repeat the
number.

SENATOR LARSON (3RD):

Okay. First time, I wanted to alert the Chamber
that this is not final action. We are referring
this to Finance and just to develop the -- the
Amendment clarifies the policyholder's
responsibility for surcharges when issued or
renewed, describes two different types of insurers

jm
Senate

125
May 17, 2017

and their methods of remittance, and makes conforming changes to mime -- mime -- makes conforming changes to mirror changes made in Section 1 that clarify which party is responsible for surcharges, et cetera.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment? If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor please say Aye [Ayes voiced]. Opposed? The Ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted.

At this time Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move that we refer this item to the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if we can now get a vote on our first Consent Calendar, please? If the Clerk can please call the Bills on the Calendar, followed by a vote.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, please call the long list of Consent Calendar. Thank you.

jm
Senate

126
May 17, 2017

CLERK:

On page 2, calendar 49, Senate Bill No. 755. Page 3, calendar 91, Senate Bill 136. Page 6, calendar 123, Senate Bill 916. Page 9, calendar 145, Senate Bill 24. On page 10, calendar 160, Senate Bill 723. Also on page 10, calendar 167, Senate Bill 911. Page 10, calendar 170, Senate Bill 928. Page 13, calendar 199, Senate Bill 948. On page 14, 204, Senate Bill 41, and calendar 202, Senate Bill 923. On page 17, calendar 229, Senate Bill No. 962. On page 18, calendar 230, Senate Bill 963. On page 23, calendar 280, Senate Bill 954. On page 24, calendar 285, Senate Bill 983. Page 25, calendar 292, Senate Bill 377, and calendar 293, Senate Bill 922. On page 28, calendar 319, Senate Bill 887. Also on page 28, calendar 317, Senate Bill 1030. On page 33, calendar 354, Senate Bill 817. On page 34, calendar 362, Senate Bill 1045. On page 38, calendar 389, Senate Bill 980. On page 45, calendar 429, House Bill 6520. On page 51, calendar 75, Senate Bill 811. Also on page 51, calendar 111, Senate Bill 485. On page 55, calendar 154, Senate Joint Resolution No. 38, and on page 55, calendar 99, Senate Joint Resolution No. 25.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, will you please call for a roll call vote on the first Consent -- Consent Calendar?

CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call on today's first Consent Calendar has been ordered in the Senate.

jm
Senate

127
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

All members have voted. All members have voted.
The machine will be closed. Excuse me. Hold on.
It's the Consent Calendar. I'm sorry, the machine
is closed.

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. There was a Bill
mistakenly put on the Consent Calendar and if we can
have a re-vote of the Consent Calendar --

THE CHAIR:

You want to reconsider your vote, sir? Since you
were on the --

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I was on the prevailing side.

THE CHAIR:

Prevailing side, right.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Though not a mistake of any of the -- any of the
Senators, a vote -- a Bill was put on the Consent
Calendar so we need to re-vote the Consent Calendar,
please.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

128
May 17, 2017

First --

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Reconsider --

THE CHAIR:

Reconsider. So I can ask for a voice vote on reconsidering the Consent Calendar. All those in favor? [Ayes voiced]. Opposed? Motion carries. At this time --

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

Yes.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I probably should mention which Bill that was we're taking off.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, that would be a great idea, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

129
May 17, 2017

Senate will stand at ease.

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. The offending Bill was calendar page 13, calendar 199, Senate Bill 948.

THE CHAIR:

At this time that Bill will be removed without objection. Seeing no objection, at this time, Mr. Clerk, will you call for a roll call vote on the first Consent Calendar again? Machine is open.

CLERK:

~~Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.~~
Immediate roll call on the real Consent Calendar No. 1 for today.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio. Senator Suzio. Senator Kennedy. Senator Kennedy. Vote please. Thank you. Senator Fasano. We haven't gotten them all yet, sorry. Thank you, Senator Miner.

All members have voted. All members have voted. The machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk, will you please call the tally.

CLERK:

On the real Consent Calendar No. 1 for today.

jm
Senate

130
May 17, 2017

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

THE CHAIR:

And this time it passes. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, for some referrals please and other markings?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On calendar page 4, calendar 105, Senate Bill 769, I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 7, calendar 124, Senate Bill 917, I'd like to refer that item to the Judiciary Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

jm
Senate

131
May 17, 2017

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 15, calendar 212, Senate Bill 996,
I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations
Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I'd like -- on calendar page 17, calendar 224,
Senate Bill 501, I'd like to refer that item to the
Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 20, calendar 246, Senate Bill 973,
I'd like to refer that item to the Finance
Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 25, calendar 290, Senate Bill 602,
I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations
Committee.

jm
Senate

132
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 27, calendar 309, Senate Bill 1033,
I'd like to refer that item to the Judiciary
Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 32, calendar 350, Senate Bill 364,
I'd like to refer that item to the Finance
Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 37, calendar 386, Senate Bill 1025,
I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations
Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

jm
Senate

133
May 17, 2017

On calendar page 38, calendar 387, Senate Bill 12,
I'd like to refer that item to the Appropriations
Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 57, calendar 51, Senate Bill 760,
I'd like to remove that item from the footnote of
the calendar and refer that to the Appropriations
Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 57, calendar 69, Senate Bill 757,
I'd like to remove that item from the footnote of
the calendar and refer that item to the
Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 57, calendar 72, Senate Bill 770,
I'd like to remove that item from the footnote of
the calendar and refer the item to the
Appropriations Committee.

jm
Senate

134
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 57, calendar 73, Senate Bill 771,
I'd like to remove that item from the footnote of
the Committee and refer that item to the
Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 57, calendar 93, Senate Bill 503,
I'd like to remove that item from the footnote of
the calendar and refer it to the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 58, calendar 112, Senate Bill 752,
I'd like to remove that item from the footnote of
the calendar and refer the item to the
Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

jm
Senate

135
May 17, 2017

On calendar page 58, calendar 152, Senate Bill 376,
I'd like to remove that item from the footnote of
the calendar and refer that item to the
Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 58, calendar 169, Senate Bill 927,
I'd like to remove that item from the footnote of
the calendar and refer that item to the
Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 59, calendar 183, Senate Bill 873,
I'd like to remove that item from the footnote of
the calendar and refer that item to the
Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 59, calendar 200, Senate Bill 971,
I'd like to remove that item from the footnote of

jm
Senate

136
May 17, 2017

the calendar and refer ~~that item to the~~
Appropriations Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 59, Senate Bill -- calendar 222,
Senate Bill 261, I'd like to remove that item from
the footnote of the calendar and refer that item to
the Finance Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On calendar page 60, calendar 247, Senate Bill 3,
I'd like to remove that item from the footnote of
the calendar and refer that item to the Finance
Committee.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And that completes our markings and will the Senate
stand at ease for a moment?

THE CHAIR:

Senate will stand at ease.

jm
Senate

137
May 17, 2017

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I'd like to immediately transmit those items to the -- their respective committees, please.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President and now if the Senate will stand in recess.

THE CHAIR:

Senate will be in recess.

CLERK:

There will be an immediate Senate Republican Caucus, an immediate Senate Republican Caucus.

There will be a almost immediate Senate Democratic Caucus, Senate Democratic Caucus.

There will be an immediate Senate Democratic Caucus, an immediate Senate Democratic Caucus, an immediate Senate Democratic Caucus.

The Senate will convene immediately. The Senate will convene immediately. Senate will convene immediately.

jm
Senate

138
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The Senate will come to order. Senate will come to order. The Chair will recognize members for purposes of announcements or points of personal privilege.

Chair recognizes Majority Leader, Senator Duff, for purposes of markings.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Senator Looney. Good to see you up there.

THE CHAIR:

Good to be here.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I have for markings on Go's for the rest of the evening. On calendar page 2, calendar 76, Senate Bill 766, I'd like to mark that item as Go. On calendar page 2, calendar 79, Senate Bill 129, I'd like to mark that as Go. On calendar page 4, calendar 95, Senate Bill 865, I'd like to mark that as Go. On calendar page 5, calendar 108, Senate Bill 894, I'd like to mark that as Go. On calendar page 7, calendar 126, Senate Bill 906, I'd like to mark that item as Go. On calendar page 7, calendar 129, Senate Bill 823, I'd like to mark that item as Go. Calendar page 8, calendar 142, Senate Bill 522, I'd like to mark that item as Go. On calendar page 13, calendar 193, Senate Bill 974, like to mark that item as Go. On calendar page 14, calendar 205,

jm
Senate

139
May 17, 2017

Senate Bill 820, I'd like to mark item as Go. On calendar page 15, calendar 208, Senate Bill 506, like to mark that item as Go. On calendar page 16, calendar 213, Senate Bill 998, like to mark that item as Go. On calendar page 16, calendar 216, Senate Bill 871, like to mark that item as Go. On calendar page 17, calendar 220, Senate Bill 975, like to mark that item as Go. On calendar page 17, calendar 223, Senate Bill 345, like to mark that item as Go. Calendar page 19, calendar 237, Senate Bill 260, like to mark that item as Go. On calendar page 50 -- on calendar page 30, calendar 340, Senate Bill 1020, I'd like to mark that item as Go, and if Senate could stand at ease for just a moment, I have to find a page number.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, on calendar page 13, calendar 199, Senate Bill 948, I'd like to mark that as Go, and on calendar page --

THE CHAIR:

Could you announce that one again?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Calendar page 13, calendar 199, Senate Bill 948, I'd like to mark that item as Go.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

140
May 17, 2017

Okay, thank you.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

And on calendar page 14, calendar 203, Senate Bill 944, I'd like to mark that item as Go. And if the Clerk can call those in calendar order, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Majority Leader. The Clerk -- if the Clerk would begin calling the items beginning with the first item marked by the Majority Leader, calendar page 2, calendar 76, Senate Bill 76 --

CLERK:

Calendar page 2, Senate Bill 766, AN ACT EXTENDING CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES REPORTING DEADLINES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

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

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Moore. Will you remark?

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

jm
Senate

141
May 17, 2017

Yes I will, thank you very much. This Bill, AN ACT EXTENDING CERTAIN DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE AND DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES REPORTING DEADLINES. The purpose of this Bill is to change the dates of reporting from January 2 to February, which would allow time for them to gather data that comes through in the month of December.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Moore. Is there any additional comment on the Bill? Additional comment on the Bill? If not, Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you. If there's no more comments I'd ask that this be put on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Moore has moved the item to the Consent Calendar. Is there any objection? Seeing none, the Bill will be placed as the first item on Consent Calendar No. 2.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Moore. If the Clerk would call the second item, also calendar page 2, calendar 79, calendar 129.

CLERK:

jm
Senate

142
May 17, 2017

Page 2, calendar no. 79, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 129, AN ACT AUTHORIZING THE TAKING OF MUSHROOMS AT STATE PARKS AND ON OTHER STATE PROPERTY.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Just looking for the file here. Yes, thank you, Mr. President. Good evening. I move acceptance of the Committee's Joint Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

The Bill has been moved. Is there comment? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, the Environment Committee heard a Bill which would permit the taking of mushrooms for personal use only on state lands. I don't know if the Chamber is aware, but there are some regulations that speak specifically to the taking of plants and other vegetation. It is under the -- under the current regulative process not permitted. We had testimony, very limited testimony, however, in favor of the Bill and I move passage.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

143
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Senator. Is there additional comment on the Bill? Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I just -- first of all, I want to thank my -- my colleague and friend, Senator Miner, for raising this Bill. I just have a couple of questions for the proponent of the Bill, Senator Miner. Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kennedy. Senator Miner, would you prepare yourself for the questions? Thank you.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

So Senator, the -- the taking -- the picking of the mushrooms in the state parks, is that for a commercial use or for a personal use? Through you, Mr. Chair, Mr. President.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. President. That would be explicitly for personal use, personal use only.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Thank you for that question. And one of the questions that had -- were raised in the Committee was, through you, Mr. President, is is this permitting to anyone to take any other items out of the state park such as fiddleheads, wildflowers, berries, or is this only for the personal

jm
Senate

144
May 17, 2017

consumption of mushrooms? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Through you. So the Bill speaks only to mushrooms. I believe all the other items that you have spoken about are also covered under regulation. Currently they are not allowed to be picked so, for instance, you're not allowed to pick fiddleheads or wildflowers. You're not allowed to pick any -- you know, anything that would be a plant material that's not explicitly allowed, and I'm not aware that anything is allowed, which was the reason for this Bill. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Kennedy, you have the floor.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Just one final question about the -- the possibility was raised by several members in the circle about poten -- somebody potentially eating a poisonous mushroom and if in fact the state would have liability if someone were to mistakenly eat a poisonous mushroom. Could you please offer your comments and thoughts on that question? Through you, Mr. President.

jm
Senate

145
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kennedy. Senator Miner, will you respond?

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Certainly, Mr. President, and thank you. Through you. On lines 27, 28, and 9, the State explicitly says that they will have no liability for the consumption of mushrooms. We did have a discussion about this in Committee, in fact, and as I recall in order for someone to bring suit against the State of Connecticut it actually takes, I think, legislative authority. So it's my understanding with the passage of the Bill the State would not be liable. Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Thank you very much for your answers to those questions. I learned when we were having the hearing on mushroom hunting in state parks that in fact over a dozen states actually permit this practice and it's enjoyed by many, many people throughout the country and so I am in support of this piece of legislation and I encourage my colleagues to support it as well. Thank you very much, Mr. President, and thank you to my friend and colleague, Senator Miner.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

146
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Senator Kennedy. Additional comment on the Bill? Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I rise for a few questions to the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Senator Miner, would you prepare yourself for Senator Osten's questions?

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Certainly.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. Through you. In regards to the consuming of wild mushrooms, is there literature that's available to park-goers that talks about the different kinds of mushrooms and what is good, what is not good, and what the side effects are vis-a-vis consuming a mushroom that is - that would have bad side effects? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

jm
Senate

147
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Mr. President. Through you. I am aware that there are a number of publications. In fact you can go online. There's a lot of information online as well. I was at the DEEP facility in Burlington about three weeks ago and they in fact had offered a course there which I was kind of interested in because apparently there are people that are doing this now and they thought maybe they better get ahead of the curve, I don't know. So as far as I know, there is a lot of information available both on the internet and in print. There are mycological societies throughout the state and throughout the nation that would be willing, I'm sure, to provide information.

In fact when we heard testimony the day of the public hearing there was a woman there who actually is a volunteer with the Poison Control Commission and so if calls come in relative to mushrooms she's the go-to person and I think Senator Kennedy may have asked her a question about, in fact, where that may have occurred and as I recall she indicated that the mushroom came off of the person's neighbor's property. Don't know if that helps. Mr. President, through you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Miner. Senator Osten, you have the floor.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President, and I appreciate my colleague's answers but in order to protect the public I have an idea for a possible Amendment and

jm
Senate

148
May 17, 2017

if the Clerk has there LCO No. 7300, I seek to summarize the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, is the Clerk in possession of LCO 7300?

CLERK:

LCO No. 7300, Senate A, offered by Senators Looney and Duff.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I move adoption of the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten, if we might stand at ease for a moment?

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

jm
Senate

149
May 17, 2017

Thank you very much, Mr. President. I would seek to withdraw the Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Senate Bill -- Amendment LCO 7300 is withdrawn. Is there further comment on the Bill? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I will -- I'll ask the Clerk to call LCO 7300 and yield to Senator Osten.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Majority Leader? That Amendment has been withdrawn. If we might stand at ease.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I will stand at ease.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Is there additional comment on the Bill? Further comment on the Bill? If not, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. If there is no opposition then I would ask that the Bill be put on Consent.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

150
May 17, 2017

Is there objection to placing the Bill on the Consent Calendar? Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Roll call on the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

We will order a roll call vote on the Bill. We have to get the Bill appearing properly on the board.

Thank you. The Bill has been properly registered on the board. If the Clerk will please call for a roll call vote on Senate Bill 129.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

All Senators have voted. Mr. Clerk, would you announce the tally?

CLERK:

On Senate Bill No. 129,

Total number voting	36
Those voting Yea	31
Those voting Nay	5
Absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

151
May 17, 2017

The Bill passes.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Mr. President? Mr. President?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, just for a few more markings, please?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. On calendar page 5, calendar 108, Senate Bill 894, I'd like to mark that PT. Thank you. On calendar page -- on calendar page 52, calendar 128, Senate Bill 821, like to mark that as Go, and then on calendar page 7, calendar 129, Senate Bill 823, like to mark that as PT.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Majority Leader.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

152
May 17, 2017

I believe the next item marked Go, proceeding with the list previously announced by the Majority Leader, is calendar page 4, calendar 95 --

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Yes.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

We're gonna -- we're gonna mark that as PT for now and move on to the next item which is calendar page 7, calendar 126, Senate Bill 906.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Majority Leader. If the Clerk would call calendar page 7, calendar 126, Senate Bill 906.

CLERK:

On page 7, calendar 126, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 906, AN ACT CONCERNING LEAD GENERATORS OF RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LO -- LEAD GENERATORS OF RESIDENTIAL -- OF RESIDENTIAL MORTGAGE LOANS.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Mr. Clerk. Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

jm
Senate

153
May 17, 2017

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. This is a Bill that comes to us from the Banking Committee. What it does is it sets forward --

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield, would you -- would you move the Bill?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yeah, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill. Sorry.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. So this is a Bill that comes to us through the Banking Committee. It establishes requirements and fees for initial licenses and for the renewal of those licenses. It establishes record retention and notification requirements. It gives the Banking Commissioner the pow -- the ability to do investigations and enforce licenses. It prohibits mortgage professionals from using unlicensed lead generators and it -- and it -- that is what it does. And Mr. President, there is a LCO. It's LCO 6935. I'd ask the Clerk call it and I be granted leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. The Clerk will please call LCO No. 6935.

jm
Senate

154
May 17, 2017

CLERK:

LCO No. 6935, Senate A, offered by Senators Winfield and Martin.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, Mr. President. This Amendment --

THE CHAIR:

Senator, would you move the --

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. I move acceptance of the -- I move Acceptance.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Would you remark further on the Amendment?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. This is an Amendment that is a Joint Amendment with the Chairs and Ranking Member of the Banking Committee. It's largely technical. It does things like, for instance, clarify that -- misrepresentation that is spoken about in the Bill -- is misrepresentation in connection with lead generators' license and makes corrections to periods, commas, and strikes out some

jm
Senate

155
May 17, 2017

language that was agreed upon by the Chairs. I move acceptance.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Is there additional comment on the Amendment? Additional comment by the members on LCO 6935? Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I rise in support of not only the Amendment but the underlying Bill. The Bill creates new license category for the lead generators which the Banking Department had no authority of before this and basically the lead generators are individuals who sell information, identifying new customers for residential mortgage loans, and authorizes the Banking Commissioner to have regulatory authority over these individuals. So I urge my colleagues to support this Bill and Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Martin. Is there additional comment on the Amendment? If not, would try your minds. All in favor of the Amendment please indicate it by saying Aye [Ayes voiced]. All opposed, Nay. The Amendment passes.

Senator Winfield on the Bill.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. If there's no objection I'd ask this be moved to Consent.

jm
Senate

156
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The Bill as amended has been moved to the Consent Calendar. Is there any objection to placing the Bill as amended on the Consent Calendar? Seeing not -- seeing none, the Bill will be added to Consent Calendar No. 2. Thank you. The Clerk will proceed with the call of the Go list.

CLERK:

On page 8, calendar 142, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 522, AN ACT AUTHORIZING BEAR HUNTING IN CONNECTICUT.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff, did you have -- should be recognized?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Could we just PT this for now and move on to the next Bill, please?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. The item will be passed temporarily. Mr. Clerk, if you would proceed to the next item marked Go, I believe that is calendar page 13, calendar 193, Senate Bill 974.

CLERK:

On page 13, calendar 193, Senate Bill No. 974, AN ACT REQUIRING THE STUDY OF ENERGY SOURCES. There is an Amendment.

jm
Senate

157
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Mr. President, can I be given a second?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The Chamber will stand at ease.

Thank you, Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable -
- Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The Bill has been moved. Further
discussion. Senator Winfield, will you remark
further?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. What this Bill does
is it requires a study of energy sources. There is
a -- by the Chairperson of the -- of PIRA. There is
an Amendment. The Amendment number is 7087. I'd
ask it be called and I be granted leave of the
Chamber to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

158
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Senator Winfield. If the Clerk would please call LCO 7087, designated as Senate A.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7087, Senate Amendment Schedule A, offered by Senators Looney, Duff, et al.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. What this Amendment -- I move acceptance, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Winfield. Will you remark?

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes. Mr. President, what this Bill does is after line 3 it -- after the word *sources* it inserts language that adds to the study of broadband internet access service and data privacy and I move acceptance.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Is there additional comment on Senate Amendment Schedule A? If not, will try your minds. All those in favor please indicate it by saying Aye [Ayes voiced]. Opposed? The Amendment passes.

Senator Winfield. Senator Duff.

jm
Senate

159
May 17, 2017

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President, I move this item be referred to the Judiciary Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. The item will be referred to the Committee on the Judiciary, the item as amended. Thank you. Mr. Clerk, if you would proceed to the next item marked Go.

CLERK:

On page 14, calendar 205, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 820, AN ACT CONCERNING ELIGIBILITY OF PRIMARY CARE PHYSICIANS UNDER THE SMALL BUSINESS EXPRESS PROGRAM. There is an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Hartley. No, Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

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

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. The item has been moved. Will you remark further? Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

jm
Senate

160
May 17, 2017

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. The Bill I will get into in a -- in a minute, but we do have an Amendment on file, LCO No. 7233. If the Clerk could please call that.

THE CHAIR:

Clerk will please call LCO 7233.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7233, Senate A, offered by Senators Frantz and Hartley, et al.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. I move adoption of the Amendment, waive the reading, and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Senator.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Thank you, Mr. President. Very simply, what LCO No. 7233 does is after the last section of the Bill's language is it adds the following, and that is that

jm
Senate

161
May 17, 2017

the Commissioner of the DECD in consultation with the Connecticut State Medical Society shall review the application process, not applications, but application process for the Small Business Express Program to ensure that said program facilities -- facilitates the participation of physicians and physicians' offices in the program and, if necessary, modify such application process to facilitate and reduce unnecessary barriers to physicians and physician -- physicians' offices participation in this program. And I -- and I would -- I would urge adoption of the Amendment and ask for a voice vote.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Is there further discussion on the Amendment, on LCO 7033? Further discussion? If not, will try your minds. All those in favor please indicate by saying Aye [Ayes voiced]. Opposed? The Amendment is adopted.

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I appreciate that. So Senate Bill 820, now amended by 7233, is a Bill that is intended to recognize that in Connecticut we have a problem with physicians and physicians' practices growing and -- and becoming stable in the State of Connecticut. We tend to lose doctors over the course of time because it's not the easiest state to perform these services in.

So Small Business Express, which is a large program now -- it's well over a quarter of a billion dollars

jm
Senate

162
May 17, 2017

-- has been very successful in getting money out into the private sector to support these different industries and companies but it has not done a great job in terms of supporting the physician and physician -- clinic industry and so the -- the Bill here aims to do exactly that. And what it does, it lowers the requirement from 12 months to 6 months for in-state physicians or physicians' offices that provide primary care services to adults or children in the state and in order to be eligible for the Business Express Program in the first place, just like all other businesses in the program, they have to employ 100 or fewer people and on at least 50 percent of their working days during the preceding 12 months be in good -- and be in good standing with payment of all state and local taxes with all state agencies.

It's a good Bill in that it tries to -- tries to encourage physicians, many of whom are educated here in the State of Connecticut, to stick around and start their practices here. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Frantz. Is there additional comment on the Bill as amended? Additional comment on the Bill as amended? Senator McCrory.

SENATOR MCCRORY (2ND):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of this particular Bill 'cause I like to see that physicians do get the help and become part of the Small Business Express Program. However, in general I have a problem with the Small Business

jm
Senate

163
May 17, 2017

Express, and even though we're making that exception and changing the rules from 12 months to 6 months, I do support this particular Bill. However, there is a deeper problem with the Small Business Express Program personally.

Like what was said by my colleagues, hundreds of millions of dollars have gone out from the State of Connecticut to businesses across this state. However, when I look at the data I notice there is not a lot of businesses of color that is receiving money from the State of Connecticut to support small businesses, urban communities specifically. I can walk down streets of Hartford or Main Street, Albany Avenue, Blue Hills Avenue, and those communities have not been economically developed by the Small Business Express Program or any other program.

So I will support this particular legislation but it's the same thing. I can walk on Wigely [phonetic] Avenue or Dixie Avenue, New Haven. I can walk Stratford Avenue in Bridgeport. I can walk North May Ave -- North May Street in Waterbury, and those communities have not been economically developed. And hundreds of millions of dollars are going out there so I challenge the State Department, the DECD, to put more programs or funds -- funds in those urban communities so they can develop themselves so those people in those -- in those communities have opportunities for economic development and community uplift.

So, again, I -- I support this initially even though we're changing the rules to have other doctors to become part and get access to these dollars -- there's a whole lot of dollars that's going out here and they're not reaching the communities that they

jm
Senate

164
May 17, 2017

need to reach and we need to do something about it. We need -- I'm challenging all of us to help us change that trajectory. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McCrory. Is there additional comment on the Bill as amended? Additional comment on the Bill as amended? Senator Gomes.

SENATOR GOMES (23RD):

I rise in favor of the Bill as Senator McCrory has spoken, but what he had spoken about, the small business enterprise, things we need a decision of, vote on right now, does not result in anything in the City of Bridgeport. He is talking about Hartford. I'm talking about Bridgeport, and I'm sure if somebody was here from Waterbury or one of the other major urban areas you would find out the same thing. And I, just like Senator McCrory has said, I challenge him to come down to Bridgeport as well as any other urban city in here and do something for people of color. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thanks, Senator Gomes. Is there additional comment on the Bill as amended? If not, Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ (36TH):

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. I for one appreciate the comments that were just made by the two previous Senators and that's been heard loud and clear by the people on the Commerce Committee as well as the Finance Committee and there has been a lot of effort

jm
Senate

165
May 17, 2017

put into trying to reach the urban areas with these economic development programs. You're sitting right next to a proponent of CTNext, which was one of the highest priorities last session and I think that's gonna make a big, big difference, but you raise some very valid points here and I for one appreciate that.

So, Mr. President, if there's no objection I'd like to move that this goes to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Frantz. The item has been moved to the Consent Calendar. Is there objection to placing it on the Consent Calendar? Seeing none, the item will be added to Consent Calendar No. 2.

If we might stand at east for a moment before calling the next Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senate will return to order and the Clerk will call the next item on the Consent Calendar -- I mean on the -- excuse me, will call the next item. Oh, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if the Clerk can now call calendar page 8, calendar 142, Senate Bill 522.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

jm
Senate

166
May 17, 2017

CLERK:

On page 8, calendar 142, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 522, AN ACT AUTHORIZING BEAR HUNTING IN CONNECTICUT and there are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

And we need to have that post. Thank you. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Just give me one moment. Just need to find that file, please. All right, I got it.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner, do you need us to stand at ease?

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

All set, thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, the Environment Committee heard the Bill, Senate Bill

522, this year. It's not the first time we've had a Bill concerning chall -- char -- challenging the DEEP with developing regulations about the taking of bear in Connecticut. The bear population has increased to almost 700. The DEEP has a policy where black bears in Connecticut are pretty much limited to the Connecticut River and west, in the I-84 corridor and north. They are beginning to show up below 84. They are beginning to show up in the eastern part of the state but it has been the policy of the State of Connecticut, the DEEP not to move the bears outside that geographic area that they are currently in.

A couple years ago the DEEP commissioned a study. The study was done jointly with UConn and it was trying to identify whether this population was going to be stabilized at a certain level or whether it was gonna continue to grow. And what I think the agency found out was that there is no relief in sight, I guess is the best way to put it. The bear population has continued to grow. It's expected to grow to about 3,000. The report said that the bear population, once they get past the first year, has almost a 95 percent survival rate until maturity.

And so when you think about that, 12 years or so for a bear, that's a lot of reproductive capacity. That's a lot of offspring. That's a lot of bear. And I think most of us on the Committee when we reviewed this Bill took the challenge pretty seriously. The agency gave us a lot of information, was not an issue that was easy. It's still not an issue that's easy today. I think most of us when we see bear on television we think that they are soft, cuddly, friendly animals and that is not the case.

jm
Senate

168
May 17, 2017

I had an opportunity about two months ago to go on a -- an actual survey where they have females collared. There are about 30 of them in the state and they know where they are. They know how many offspring they have and they know what their survival rate is. They actually put a chip in to try and determine where those bear go in the future. It really is a science and the biologists take this very seriously. The number of bear killed on an annual basis by automobiles is in excess of 40. That's the recorded number of deaths. The number of bear that are killed that are not reported are probably even larger than that.

And so when I was asked to take a look at this issue by my constituents, and then again by some of your constituents, the issue wasn't whether or not the population was sufficient for Connecticut at this point. It was how do we control them to try and make sure that the bear/human incidents didn't become worse. Some of you may have seen on television bears pressed up against the window. I think there was one the other night, bears on a trampoline.

Those are all circumstances where they kind of elicit a smile, I think, in most cases but the fact of the matter is they're wild animals. The female that was collared was about 270 pounds. The cubs were probably about 10 pounds. But within a year they get up over 100 pounds and the amount of damage that they can do is considerable. I have constituents that have said to me, I've lost livestock. The bee industry, as much as it is not a huge industry in Connecticut, is always impacted by bears. Every spring they come out of the den, every

jm
Senate

169
May 17, 2017

spring they're looking for forage, and every spring people lose pretty valuable property in beehives.

So, Madam President, the Bill is, as it is drafted, is pretty simple. It charges the agency with developing regulations. It sets out a maximum of 5 percent in the first year so that if the bear population, which is what they believe is happening, is growing at a rate of excess of 10 percent, at 5 percent it would be a well-managed modest process.

I do have one Amendment and if I might, through you, Madam President, the Amendment is File No. 241, LCO 6744. If the Clerk would call it and I be allowed to summarize, please.

THE CHAIR:

The Clerk does not have that Amendment, sir. Please hold -- please stand at ease.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

6744.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner, what is the LCO number on that?

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

LCO No. 6744.

THE CHAIR:

We do not have that Amendment.

jm
Senate

170
May 17, 2017

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 6744, Senate A, offered by Senator Miner.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

And seek permission to summarize?

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

And seek permission to summarize, I'm sorry.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Senator Miner, please proceed.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, what the Amendment does is strikes the language on line 66 beginning with letter B and then goes down to line 70, ending there, and converts Section C to Section B, and what that does is it -- it actually sets a very specific procedure by which the DEEP would manage bears. I thought that that was probably not the best idea. I had communication with the DEEP about that subsequent to the Bill's

jm
Senate

171
May 17, 2017

passage. They asked me to remove that language and that's what this does and so I would ask the Chamber's support for that Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any comments on the Amendment? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President, and through you, Madam President. I just want to make sure I understand the Amendment. So by striking Section B, what are we actually -- what are we -- what are we making this Amen -- this Bill do?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Winfield. Senator Miner, are you prepared?

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Yes I am, Madam President. Through you. What that language by being removed would do would be allow the agency to make a determination where they think the most effective place to allow hunting to occur and how they allow it to occur. We had heard testimony that some of the largest population may in fact be in areas that are Canton, Farmington, Avon, and the concern was, at least initially, is that an area where we would like to have hunting or wouldn't like to have hunting?

The agency said we allow deer hunting there. We allow all other hunting in those locations and if

jm
Senate

172
May 17, 2017

they do the restrictions as they would with deer hunting, which seemed rather likely, that it would be limited to private land in excess of 10 acres and so I was -- I thought that was a good management decision rather than have the legislature decide how it should be done. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and through you. Just one more question. As I'm looking at the language that's being struck, it also -- there is a part about why you're removing those bears, the interaction between the bears and the public, and I think -- I'm not on the Committee, I don't know -- but it seems like that's kind of important to me so -- and -- and looking to give the Department some freedom, I'm just trying to figure out why we would take that language out as well. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner, are you prepared?

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

I -- I am, Madam President. And so, through you, by taking the language out what we allow is the biologists and those that do animal management to make a determination how we can best affect the population where they have problem areas as opposed to where someone may want to perhaps hunt bear.

jm
Senate

173
May 17, 2017

There are a lot of places in Connecticut where no one expects bear hunting to occur. In fact, we have different regulations on deer hunting. Fairfield County, for instance, where we had a very large population of deer, there were established very specific, very special regulations for very prescribed areas.

And so in this case rather than have me as a legislator tell the agency how we think this should be done, I chose instead to delete this Section and allow the professionals to determine how it should be done. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any other remarks on the Amendment? Are there any other remarks on the Amendment? Are there any other remarks on the Amendment? Seeing none, I'll try your minds. All those in favor indicate by saying Aye [Ayes voiced]. Any opposed? Any abstentions? Amendment is passed.

Senator Miner, do you have any further comments on the Bill as amended?

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

jm
Senate

174
May 17, 2017

No, no thank you, Madam President. Not at this time.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. A couple of questions to the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner, prepare yourself. Senator Bye, please continue.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I received a large number of emails about this Bill and these are some of the questions that my constituents were concerned about. One, for my clarification, can the gentleman explain what taking a bear means in a statutory framework? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

So this language, through you, Madam President, this language as drafted is inserted into what is currently the deer hunting section of the Statutes and so the taking of bear would be through hunting only, regulations to be adopted by the agency. Once

jm
Senate

175
May 17, 2017

again, it's the way they developed regulations for everything else that we have a hunting season for in the State of Connecticut. So it would be hunting only.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Senator Miner, and through you, Madam President. So the Senator is saying that taking of bear really means hunting bear. Is that accurate? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes, that's exactly accurate.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you for that answer. One of the questions that came to me from a constituent is are there particular protections for bear cubs or no? Are they considered a bear like a large full-grown bear or are they considered differently? Through you, Madam President.

jm
Senate

176
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and I thank the gentlelady for her question. When the deer hunting regulations were established the agency made a determination that hunting a deer at an age prior to when they had weaned was not appropriate and the regulations specifically prohibit the taking of deer at that age. I would expect that that very same process would occur here with the hunting of bear. Bears stay with their mother, a sow, for about a year-and-a-half and so I would expect that a year-and-a-half old bear, which is about the time that she would begin the process again, May or June would be a time. In the fall of that year they would be eligible to be taken when they're no longer with their mother. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. But just for clarification, through you. So nothing in the statutory framework prevents the hunting of bear cubs?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

jm
Senate

177
May 17, 2017

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So the statutory framework for the hunting of deer or the hunting of turkey or the hunting of rabbits are left in all those cases to the professionals, to the biologists, and I would imagine that before the regulations came back to regs review that there would be communication about how that process would occur, the hunting, where it would occur, to what extent it would occur. Statutorily, that language is not here. I would expect if the agency wanted something included in the Statutes that there would be time for them to do it prior to establishing regulations and right now it is not in this language and it was not anticipated that the hunting of cubs would occur. I don't think the agency would permit it. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, and through you, Madam President. Can Senator Miner explain if there are any rules considered in this -- in these Statutes around hunting in remote areas versus hunting in areas where bears are being found in more suburban areas? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

jm
Senate

178
May 17, 2017

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you. So the way the agency described the situation to me was that there are large parcels of property even in areas of dense population and dense bear population where the taking of bear, hunting of bear, would be permitted provided it met the acreage requirement provided, for instance, that they develop regulations similar to what they have with deer hunting. You're not allowed to hunt on someone else's property without express written permission. I would imagine that those are the same guidelines that would occur here.

I've had constituents say to me, I'm not a hunter, but I would love to give someone permission to do this on my property. And so I think the agency would view this very similarly. While it's not in this language primarily because we didn't have statutory language for the deer hunting regulations either, this seemed to be the cleanest way to do it and allow the biologists and the agency staff to determine how best, where, and how often. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. I appreciate that thoughtful answer. One other question related to the agency. Did this Bill and this idea for this Bill come from the Department of Environment and -- Energy and Environmental Protection or did this have

jm
Senate

179
May 17, 2017

a legislative origination? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So in the past the legislation has been requested by residents of Connecticut. In the past the agency had said to me and others we would prefer to do a more developed study of the population, try and see what the trends are before developing regulations. In this case this year when we had a conversation with the agency as the Environment Committee leadership has had in the past, this Bill was already in consideration and the agency actually had responded affirmatively to it this year. It's not something that's come easily to them.

I think most people, biologists especially, are very concerned about how we develop some of these procedures politically and in this case I think most of the people, and there are some biologists that work with the bear population that have had a long history of participation with the DEEP here, have said to me the time has come. If there was some other way to change the population, redirect the population -- no one in Massachusetts wants them, no one in New York wants them, then certainly many of those ideas were worthy of consideration. Again, they don't really wanna -- they don't wanna move them across the river and they certainly don't wanna take them to Fairfield County. So I would say this

jm
Senate

180
May 17, 2017

time it was kind of a joint effort. Through you,
Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you for that answer. Through you, Madam
President. I have two more questions. One is
related to mother bears who may be nursing and are
there prohibitions on hunting bears, mother bears,
who have cubs? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Again, this language is
not overly prescriptive because in Connecticut we
count on the DEEP to develop those regulations. In
some states the legislature actually is very
specific. They are very prescriptive. They don't
allow the agency to make determinations about take
possession, that sort of stuff, it's all done by
Statute, but for some reason in Connecticut this
seems to be how we've done it. And so I would fully
expect that part of the regulatory procedure, there
would be a prohibition on bears at that stage of
their life. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Bye.

jm
Senate

181
May 17, 2017

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And my final question for Senator Miner before I make a comment is about bear baiting. This was a big concern of some of my constituents about what they feel is a very unfair hunting practice. I know it's been a matter of debate for many years in Maine so my question is is there anything in this Bill that prohibits the practice of baiting bears? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Another very good question. Through you, Madam President. So again, the language is specifically vague because my conversations with the agency have been such that they don't anticipate approving a regulation or adopting a regulation that would do a lot of what may be done in other states. For instance, in some states bears are tracked with dogs. They're trapped. They are baited. The only place that I'm aware of that the agency has allowed through regulation the baiting of deer, for instance, is in Fairfield County and so I don't expect that that would occur here. I didn't hear anything from the agency where they thought that that would be something they would recommend. I believe that they view this as an opportunity for people that would regularly hunt in areas where bear may be found but it would be more of a stalking procedure similar to the way people hunt deer or

jm
Senate

182
May 17, 2017

turkeys or other animals. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

I thank the gentleman for his answers. I know the Bill is offered in good faith. I -- I continue to have concerns primarily based on significant number of emails from constituents who are concerned about the vague wording of the Bill that left so much discretion to the Department of Public Health, number one. There were also concerns that a lot of this hunting would go on in remote areas where in fact bears are living in their habitat in Connecticut and should be allowed to continue to do so.

As Senator Miner knows, I've always voted for Sunday hunting. I'm not somebody who says no hunting and one of my most famous Capitol Report captions was Senator Bye, Kill 'Em with a picture of a bear because there was a bear who was behaving badly in my district in Burlington and DEEP determined by that bear's behavior that it was not safe to be around people and in fact DEEP ultimately did have to get rid of those bears in Sessions Woods.

So I do think there are cases and DEEP seems extremely well versed in when bears become a menace and what needs to happen in those cases but I -- I cannot support it at this time because of the lack of specificity and also really because of a incredible outpouring of opposition from

jm
Senate

183
May 17, 2017

constituents in my district, many of whom live with bears in their neighborhood. I happen to have Burlington and Farmington where there are a whole lot of bears and when you talk to constituents there they talk about the damage that bears are causing and it's primarily garbage cans and birdfeeders and they have come to learn to live understanding the bears in their culture. So I appreciate the gentleman's answers and I will be opposing this Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Are there any further comments? Senator Winfield.

SENATOR WINFIELD (10TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. And just -- I think very briefly one or two questions depending on the answer to the first question. So a lot of the Bills we do have a story that grows up around the Bill. As I've listened to the story that's around this Bill I'm just trying to find out if it's true or not. So there was -- there's a lot of talk about tranquilizing and moving bears to a -- a different area and that could be of concern, so through you, Madam President, if the good Senator could talk about the issue of tranquilizing and transportation of bears as it relates to this Bill.

THE CHAIR:

We will be PT-ing this Bill right now.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

jm
Senate

184
May 17, 2017

Madam President. Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Yes. Yes, Senator.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I may today.

THE CHAIR:

Okay, Senator Duff, why do you rise [laughing]? I'm sorry.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move that we PT this item and move on to the next calendar item that I have marked as Go, please.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 15, calendar 208, Senate Bill No. 506, AN ACT CONCERNING WATER USAGE AND CONSERVATION DURING DROUGHT CONDITIONS. There are Amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

jm
Senate

185
May 17, 2017

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

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of a Strike All Amendment, LCO No. 7145. Will the Clerk please call the Amendment?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7145, Senate A, offered by Senators Kennedy, Leone, and Gerratana.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

I'll just make a couple brief remarks before yielding the floor to my friend and colleague, Senator Leone, who's worked very hard to bring this Bill before the Environment Committee, but I think all of us in this room know that from an environment and public health perspective there are very few issues that are as important as ensuring a fresh water supply for our citizens and businesses.

jm
Senate

186
May 17, 2017

Again, this is a Strike All Amendment from the Bill that we heard at the committee level which was very prescriptive in terms of when a drought could be declared and specifically what provisions citizens and business needed to do under those various circumstances, but this Bill is a good Bill because it simply asks the Water Planning Council which already exists to make recommendations to the General Assembly, review state and local authorizations concerning drought.

There are four levels of drought, advisory watch, warning, and emergency, and I think most people in the state have no idea what is the difference between a drought watch, between a drought advisory, and an emergency. In fact another agency has another level called heightened awareness. So what we have basically and what this Bill tries to do is there are literally dozens of agencies in our state. There are state agencies, there are water utilities, there are localities, all with jurisdiction, overlapping jurisdiction, about what a drought is and what people need to do.

So I think this is a very common sense measure to help us standardize what these triggers are, account for the variation within the state. We just got through a drought. I know most people -- we've had a lot of rain in the last month so people have forgotten the fact that the last two years our state has been in a drought. So we -- we are trying to get better information on what is voluntary and what is mandatory use restriction. What does that mean that people should voluntarily reduce their water intake? No one knows what that means. So we want to turn to the experts who can tell us and create some uniformity and I turn the -- the -- yield the

jm
Senate

187
May 17, 2017

floor over to my friend and colleague, Senator Leone, who can just explain the -- what prompted him to bring this issue before the Environment Committee. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Leone, will you accept the yield?

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):

Thank you, Madam President, I do, and I want to thank the good Senator from the Environment Committee and all his members on the Environment Committee for bringing this Bill to light and for working with all the members who have worked on this issue.

And one of the main reasons why I submitted the Bill was more -- was first a local issue but then the more I thought about it and the more I realized the reality of the situation it became more of the right thing to be doing for the State of Connecticut because it's not only affected my community in a very severe manner, it's affected other parts of the state, some as severe and others maybe not as severe, but nonetheless it has affected almost everyone statewide.

And that's the fact that, as mentioned, that we've gone through a serious drought here in Connecticut for the past two, two-and-a-half years and it's really simple that it's easy to overlook because we're all used to going to our homes, turning on the water faucet and the water's there. Taking a shower and the shower water is there. Flushing our toilets and the flushing continues. When that doesn't

jm
Senate

188
May 17, 2017

happen then it becomes a major issue because it's very disruptive and I would not want anyone to have to go through that disruption.

Now in my community in Stanford we have a reservoir that got down to the lowest levels in recent times, most likely even historic times. It was down to the point where you could walk throughout large sections of the reservoir where normally the water would be over your head. So much so that the water utility company had to put in an above-ground pipeline from a neighboring reservoir miles away along the Merritt Parkway through the North Stanford area into our reservoir and pump water from another reservoir north of my community to make sure that there was enough water usage for the people in our area in that reservoir's watershed. And because that was done people didn't really realize the severity of the issue unless they happened to drive by that reservoir and not everyone does that for many reasons.

Now I will say this, the water utility company did make efforts to contact residents through a reverse 911 to do voluntary reductions but aside from maybe one or maybe if you caught a local newscast, maybe was reported in the newspaper, and with the declining subscriptions even that is not as good as one would think, not a lot of people realized we were in the severity that we were in and even that communication wasn't good enough. So there were people uselessly using the water when they really shouldn't have so what is voluntary, what is mandatory, when should our citizens know that they need to act before it's too late or before it's a problem?

jm
Senate

189
May 17, 2017

That was the genesis of this Bill, to get information out to our constituents, to our residents, that as water is declining in our reservoirs they should be notified and they should be notified before it becomes a problem. They should be notified before you have to do this voluntary or even mandatory reduction. They should be notified before you have to put in an above-ground pipeline across multiple communities to divert water from a different reservoir to another reservoir.

Now as a result of this the local communities started to talk to each other and it was mentioned how we wanted a standardization and in some communities they do that better than others, but as a result of the severity it forced the communities to start talking together and I think that's a good thing. But I don't think it should happen on an as needed basis. There should be a plan that we have throughout the State of Connecticut that should have some kind of communication standards that come out to our community to tell our residents what's going on with their water supplies.

And it's really simple. Water is the lifeblood of our community. You don't think about it because it's always there. And it's been said before a few years ago, even in this Chamber -- maybe not in the Chamber but in this building that, you know, Connecticut is water rich. We don't have droughts.

Well the past two years proved that wrong. And different reservoirs have different capacities. Some of have underground pipelines where water is being diverted and we don't know about it. You could say that's good management of getting the

jm
Senate

190
May 17, 2017

water where it's -- where it's at to moving to water where it's needed, but I think we should know what's going on with our water even when that's being done. I think we all deserve to know how our water usage is being used and by whom is using it and by when they're using it, and if they're not using it in the right way we should be -- we should have a plan on knowing what to do, how to act, and it should be communicated to our municipalities and to our residents.

Now as little as April 25 in 2017, the State of Connecticut was either in a normal, abnormal dry, or moderate drought throughout the state and roughly about eight-tenths of that was either in a abnormally dry or moderate drought. Only a small section was normal. So this happens more than people think, more than people realize, and I think they should know. They should know before it becomes critical.

What I don't want to see is the State of Connecticut have to go through the severity as to what's happened in other states, specifically in California. California went through multiple years of drought and it is only because of sheer luck that this past year they've had record amounts of snowfall that will provide the snowpack runoff for the new year so that they will have adequate water supplies, and even then it's not -- the drought that could still potentially come out there still might make things worse than better.

I would say that we have been lucky because we've also been fortunate with enough water supply, enough water and rain, through this past season that has brought up a lot of our water levels and even -- I

jm
Senate

191
May 17, 2017

will say even in my area our -- our water drought has been lifted because the reservoirs have been filled with the water runoff and the diversion of the water and as a result now they're starting to dismantle that pipeline that I talked about so that's kind of a good thing.

But at the same time that pipeline that was installed was -- is not installed for free, or even the dismantling of it is not being dismantled for free. At some point the utility company that acted is gonna want to get reimbursed and they're gonna get reimbursed by the rate payers by the request for increased rates down the road so I want to make sure that when we do something like that if we have to authorize that or if the agency authorizes a rate increase because of that we should know how to prevent those things from happening in the future and good water policy is the way to make sure that we don't go through that kind of severity. We should be managing our water supply going forward.

Now I know the state is gonna -- is in the process of creating a state water plan. It's gonna be pretty much a large scale big picture. This Bill here is a little bit more narrowly focused on the standardization on how to communicate, making sure that there's information on local websites, at your municipality, and also your utility company so that you could get a link on either website telling you and informing you what to do.

So that's just a small measure and even though their plan is gonna be in January of next year, this report that we're asking the agency to give us in February 2018 is right after that. Even though it's a very close timeframe it's simply asking for

jm
Senate

192
May 17, 2017

recommendations and even though the recommendations might not be 100 percent fully vetted I think that's still a target date that we should shoot for so that this body can act so that we have a starting point of information on how to make sure that we're managing our water supply for the State of Connecticut and for our regions in the proper manner.

So I'm hopeful that we have support in this Bill for making sure that we prepare for our future so that we conduct our water usage in the proper way and that if we have to put in controls, if we have to issue drought warnings or drought severity notices, that we know how it's being done, it's being done properly, it's being done ahead of time. No one should be blindsided or questioning why their water doesn't come one when they feel that it should. So I would urge support of this Amendment. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I want to speak in favor of this Amendment. It was during one of our caucuses that I discussed with Senator Leone and Senator Kennedy the situation that went on in my local community of New Britain, my hometown, and a number of my constituents had come to me and said, you know, aren't we in a drought? Aren't you concerned about some of the policies of our hometown and also the lack of information? At that time the City of New Britain was contemplating actually

jm
Senate

193
May 17, 2017

selling a well, a well that was a source of water for the city, and there was a lot of discussion and it wasn't until I started reading the Board of Water Commissioner's minutes that I found out that our city was experiencing a drought and I thought that that was pretty alarming. So subsequently in doing a little investigation, I found out that our city's capacity and our major reservoir was down to something like 22 percent. It was so low that the city had to end up buying and purchasing money from the MDC, which of course my colleague, Senator Beth, knows very well, a major source of water in our Central Connecticut area.

And there was much discussion and much confusion because it would seem that there would be some sort of notification and here I am surrounded by my wonderful neighbors who have their sprinkler systems, their automatic lawn sprinkler systems, going on and watering their lawn, and I'm thinking but we're in a drought and shouldn't there be some sort of notification, some sort of precaution? So with that I'm very glad that we're coming forth with this Amendment. I did have a little bit of input. I think -- and I know that the reverse 911 system is used for notification for -- and to all of our people in our communities about things that may be going on that they should be aware of and I'm glad that this is included in the Bill because I think it's a system that could be utilized and prevent certainly the gross overuse of water when we don't have it and that was my overwhelming concern. So I do ask that the Chamber support this legislation. I think it's well crafted and we should develop a policy. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

194
May 17, 2017

Are there any further comments on the Bill? Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Excuse me, this is on the Amendment.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President, and if I might, just a few questions about the amendment, through you, to the good Chairman of the Environment Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Please prepare yourself, Senator Kennedy. Please continue, Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. As I recall during the Committee meeting and the public hearing, there was a lot of discussion about the impact of making a determination of whether or not the state was actually in a drought condition as it pertained to mandatory cutbacks in usage and as I recall under the original -- the language of the original Bill, there was a requirement that one certain threshold had been reached. In fact that that zone would be required to curb water usage by 20 percent, 35 percent, and then up to 50 percent, and if the gentleman could tell me in the Amendment, is it

jm
Senate

195
May 17, 2017

anticipated that that type of a recommendation or whatever the recommendation would be would come through the process of this, what appears to me in the Amendment, to be a more in depth evaluation of how we can communicate that and what the impact might be regionally as opposed to statewide? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you to Senator Miner for that question. The original Bill really called for our General Assembly to really update and accelerate our current law on water supply plan regulations under 25-32d-3. This is a list of actions that need to be taken in case of a drought advisory which prescribes certain types of reductions, a drought watch, mandatory emergency, and we felt that we needed to accelerate this because it was -- people were waiting too long before their reservoir -- in fact many communica -- communities around the country wait until their reservoir is 10 percent full or 20 percent full before they issue the red alert that we're running out of water.

We thought that didn't make sense. It made much more sense to advise the community when we're maybe half full or we're heading towards a drought. Shouldn't we take protective measures before we're in a full-blown crisis? So to respond to my friends' and colleagues' questions, we have these regulations in place but we are not trying to

jm
Senate

196
May 17, 2017

presuppose what this Water Advisory Council is going to recommend, this Water Planning Council. The Water Planning Council already exists under Section 25-33-0. The Council may establish an advisory group of professionals so what -- what we envision is that this advisory group of professionals are gonna come back to the General Assembly with their recommendations about what they would do to try to make sense of these dozens, as I said, overlapping jurisdictions leading to confusion and conflict. There are literally -- there's over 40 water companies in Connecticut that have their own drought reg -- you know, rules and regulations.

It's just a hodgepodge and it makes no sense and so to respond to your question, I don't know what -- honestly, what the Water Planning Council is going to recommend. I respect that there is tremendous variation in our state as my friend and colleague knows from our work together in -- on the Environment Committee. We know that in some parts of the state experienced a very severe drought recently while other parts of the state had plenty of water so we know it's not a one size fits all strategy throughout the entire State of Connecticut 'cause we're very different geologically and environmentally even though we live in a very small state. We do have different water pressures in different parts of our state.

So I'm interested in knowing honestly what this group of people comes back to recommend how we can improve this -- the levels and what they specifically want the general population to do when they come up with an advisory or mandatory reduction. Through you, Madam President.

jm
Senate

197
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. So as -- as the Amendment is currently drafted there's no specific recommendation yet. It's anticipated that there will be a series of recommendations that in fact could be regional, could be statewide, we're not -- we're not making a predetermination. And my last question is I believe under the original Bill there was a report to the Committee of cognizance and under this Amendment it says, I believe, Committees, and so I heard Senator Gerratana, the Chair of the Public Health Committee, speak already -- it would be expected that there would be a series of recommendations for both the Environment Committee and the Public Health Committee. Am I correct? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Through you, Madam President. My colleague is correct. Earlier versions of the Bill simply had a report back to the Environment Committee. We felt, through many discussions with our friends and colleagues in the General Assembly, that in fact this is a joint concern between the Public Health Committee and the Environment Committee, which is rea -- the reason why we are asking that the report be submitted to both the Environment Committee and

jm
Senate

198
May 17, 2017

the Public Health Committee of the General Assembly.
Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Miner.

SENATOR MINER (30TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I don't have any further questions. I also rise in support of this Amendment. I think the February 1st date is sufficiently long enough to get some kind of an answer. I think most of us heard from constituents pretty much all summer and all fall last year how concerned they were about whether or not we had reacted soon enough or water company to have reacted soon enough. It may very well be that after this body meets and the recommendations are made that we are perhaps better prepared or at least more aware of where we are in this process and so I would urge my colleagues to support the Amendment. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Are there any further comments? Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I am speaking in opposition of this Amendment, main reason being is that I think the discussion is partly missing the mark. Our good Senators have all made some very good points but the fact of the matter is is that the Water Planning Council is already looking into this issue. As a matter of fact my main opposition

jm
Senate

199
May 17, 2017

to the Amendment -- the original version of the Bill was overreaching and I think that's why the Amendment came through.

The Amendment kind of waters it down a bit to a report that would be submitted to the Water Planning Council; however, however, the Water Planning Council currently and, again, this speaks to the redundancy of the Amendment, the Water Planning Council right now is working on a state drought plan. There was an original drought plan that was created back in 2003. That plan is now currently being updated. The state drought plan through a work group, again, some of the same language that you're hearing in terms of this report and how it's gonna go about, is already happening now.

This state drought plan work group was formed by the Water Planning Council advisory group as the result of a directive from the Water Planning Council to improve the Connecticut drought preparedness and response plan, the state drought plan. The current state drought plan, again, was last adopted in 2003.

As a volunteer body representing several water interest groups inside and out of state government, the state drought plan work group currently, right now, has the responsibility of updating the state drought plan so that, and listen carefully, that it may be reliably and consistently implemented during future periods of drought. This involves identifying and analyzing alternatives to address the shortcomings of the existing plan. For example, the work group is reconsidering the plan's reliance on several statewide drought indicators since it is known that drought conditions can be localized and not necessarily felt across the entire state. The

jm
Senate

200
May 17, 2017

drought response actions such as coordination, public outreach, conservation, and preparedness are also being updated to be more realistic and achievable based upon the abilities of the state, municipalities, and water utilities to manage a drought situation, current status of this drought plan.

Now I've seen this drought plan because I actually participated in some of these discussions and -- and meetings. The drought plan is about three quarters to an inch thick. It is a complicated issue that is currently being studied now and as a matter of fact the drought plan work group is being jointly chaired by one individual who actually works for the town of Greenwich and someone who's retired from the USGS.

Please also note that the state drought work group is separate from -- there's another agency called the interagency drought work group which is the group responsible for implementing the state drought plan. Now this group meets on a regular basis. I know that they are looking at finalizing their drought plan sometime this year and they actually suggest and encourage for folks that want further information on the drought or water conditions to visit the Connecticut water status website, so there is a water status website. They also suggest that if anyone has ideas for improving the state drought plan that they want to hear about it and they have contact information that's available.

So my issue is is that why are we talking about adding another study to cover something that is already being addressed now? Going through the same Committee, the Water Planning Council here in the State of Connecticut, it's my feeling that we must

jm
Senate

201
May 17, 2017

stop this very type of activity where we are asking an agency to do something or asking folks to fill out information or forms to do a study and with the left hand and then at the right hand we're asking 'em to provide a report to the same organization for the same information that they're already charged with doing and that they're in the middle of doing.

So my issue is this seems to be redundant. I understand that it's an effort to salvage an overreaching language of the original Bill, but unfortunately this study is redundant, it misses the mark, it's gonna cause the state, particularly the Water Planning Council, to do a lot of extra work in putting this extra report together that is already included in the drought plan that's being revised, not to mention that the Water Planning Council provides an annual report to the legislature every year as it stands now.

When I look at the -- the Amendment, it has a number of different aspects of it. A lot of it includes recommendations in terms of trigger -- recommending trigger levels for reservoir depths and those sorts of things, actions that are already included in terms of water supply planning from the water industry and for the water utility which is held and controlled by the Department of Health. So my issue is that, again, redundant Amendment. Most of -- most of the actions that are requested as far as for the report are already underway in being done now and it would be a matter of collecting information and putting it in a different format and a different report to address or satisfy this Amendment.

So I will be voting in opposition of this Amendment and of this Bill. Through you, Madam President.

jm
Senate

202
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Are there any further comments? Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Yes, I - I just wanna make a couple of comments. First of all, I thank my -- my colleague, Senator Logan. I know you know a lot about these issues obviously so I'm very respectful of your thoughts and opinions on this, but I think -- I think that in fact Senator Logan makes my point.

My point is that we are overwhelmed with reams and reams of information, okay, and no cohesive plan. There are dozens of agencies, as Senator Logan mentioned, the Connecticut interagency drought advisory group. There are individual water utilities. Over 40 of them have their own drought plan. There are conservation directors who can order a -- and trigger a drought alert. Upper Selectmen of any given town can order a drought alert. So can the Director of Health in any town. The Fire Chief in every town can order a drought alert. There's the Water Planning Council advisory group. There's the state drought preparedness and response plan. There's the local water supply Ordinances. Many of our towns have their own Ordinances relating to drought. The Department of Public Health may implement a mandatory water restriction. The Governor can declare a statewide water supply emergency when the water levels fall below a 25 percent cap. I can go on and on. You get my point.

jm
Senate

203
May 17, 2017

There are so many agencies and local water utilities and individual towns who are all trying to tell the public what to do and the public's confused. I'm confused. And I spend a lot of time thinking about these issues so I think that all we're asking for, again -- I want to be very respectful to my colleague who knows a lot about water, I understand -- but what we're -- all we're simply asking for is a series of recommendations about how we can simplify what I think is a very byzantine and very confusing set of -- of regulations and rules pertaining to how we manage water in our state.

So I -- I think we do need recommendations and I urge my colleagues to support this important piece of legislation. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you and, Senator Kennedy, are you asking for a roll call on this Amendment?

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Thank you, yes I would, thank you, please, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Is there any further comments on the Amendment? Any further comments on the Amendment? If not, Mr. Clerk, call for a roll call vote.

CLERK:

jm
Senate

204
May 17, 2017

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate
on Senate A. Immediate roll call has been ordered
in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted?
Please make sure your members -- your votes have
been properly recorded. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On Senate Amendment Schedule A.

Total number voting	36
Those voting Yea	27
Those voting Nay	9
Absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Amendment passes. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If the Clerk can now
please call calendar page 16.

THE CHAIR:

I'm sorry. Senator Duff, we have to vote on the
Bill as amended.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Oh, I apologize.

jm
Senate

205
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

I'm sorry. Senator Kennedy, do you have any further comments on the Bill as amended?

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

No, I have no further comments of the Bill as amended.

THE CHAIR:

Does anybody else have any further comments on the Bill as amended? Any further comments on the Bill as amended? Seeing none, Mr. Clerk, if you can call for a roll call on the Bill as amended.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kenne -- Kelly. Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Please check your votes to make sure they've been properly recorded. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On Senate Bill No. 506.

Total number voting	36
Those voting Yea	28
Those voting Nay	8
Absent and not voting	0

jm
Senate

206
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

The Bill as amended passes. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Sorry about jumping the gun a little bit earlier. Will the Clerk please call calendar page 16, calendar 216, Senate Bill 871.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On page 16, calendar 216, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 871, AN ACT CONCERNING THE ENDOWED CHAIR INVESTMENT FUND.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Good evening, Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and move passage of the Bill, waive its reading, and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

jm
Senate

207
May 17, 2017

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I believe the Clerk is in possession of an Amendment, LCO 7339. Mr. Clerk?

CLERK:

LCO No. 7339, Senate A, offered by Senators Bye and Flexer.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. I have different co-sponsors to LCO 7339, so if you can please hold so we can make sure I have the right one before me.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I was just confused because Representative Staneski and Haddad were not read so I was afraid we had the wrong Amendment, but we have the right Amendment.

What this Bill does is that this Bill has the Office of Higher Education establish an endowed chair's investment fund that will allow the foundations at UConn and the state university system to request funds that are being held by the Treasurer and invest it with the short-term investment fund over

jm
Senate

208
May 17, 2017

into their foundation to be able to maximize interest rates and enhance the funds for things like scholarship and activities.

With that, the Committee has some very important safeguards. One is that they would need to maintain those funds, the state funds, separately from the non-matching contributions and by that I mean maintain separate accounting for those funds. They have to hold those funds as a permanently restricted asset and they need to manage those funds in accordance with the Connecticut uniform prudent management of institutional funds that is a statutory reference that follows.

This Amendment makes those things clear and also enhances the reporting requirements so that the investment and return on these funds will be reported both to the Office of Higher Ed and to the General Assembly Higher Education Committee. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

And just for clarity, Senator Bye, is this a Strike All Amendment?

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Very close to a Strike All Amendment. Yes, it is a Strike All, Madam President. Thank you for that question.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Are there any comments on the Amendment? Senator Linares.

jm
Senate

209
May 17, 2017

SENATOR LINARES (33RD):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of the Bill. I do have one -- or rise in support of the Amendment. I do have one question for legislative intent I would like to ask the proponent of the Amend -- Amendment. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye, prepare yourself. Please proceed, Senator Linares.

SENATOR LINARES (33RD):

One concern I do have, especially now during these times of fiscal crisis that -- especially with our universities running into financial issues themselves, that there might be temptation for the Board of Regents or UConn in -- while they are in dire straits and need for more revenue for their own university, to use the principal that will be transferred from the Treasurer's fund to the endowed chair's investment fund to cover some of their own operation -- operations and expenditures and overhead and so, Senator Bye, as a proponent of this Bill, I would just like clarification to know that this money is not going to be used for that, cannot be used for that, and that the dividends and interest from this principal will be used to invest in scholarships for students and for the wellbeing of our young students in Connecticut. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

210
May 17, 2017

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. I really appreciate that question from Senator Linares and his work on this Bill as well as other Committee members. We had a long meeting with the foundations because of concerns around safeguards and we've worked with LCO and we've structured the language and also the investment rules and the rules that they need to follow and the standards of practice would assure that the dollars would stay in the foundations. The foundations are a totally separate entity so the Board of Regents would not be allowed to sweep those funds or use those funds except for the intended practices which is part of the uniform prudent management of institutional funds standards. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Linares.

SENATOR LINARES (33RD):

Thank you, Madam President. I have no further questions for the proponent of the Bill and I do, as I had mentioned before, I do support the underlying Amendment and the Bill. I -- I understand that the Treasurer's office under the current investment formula, the term investment fund, or short-term investment fund, does not yield the kind of return and interest that the endowed chair's fund is currently getting under their management and so if we can shift this principal it will ultimately

jm
Senate

211
May 17, 2017

result in more investment into our students, more investment into our schools, and so after -- after a lot of thought and discussion I -- I do support this Bill and I would like to thank Senator Bye for her work to make this -- to add safeguards to make sure that the principal is not used for any other purpose than for investing in our students. So I urge my colleagues to support this Bill. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Will you remark? Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I rise to support the Amendment and commend the Chairs of the Higher Education Committee for this movement. I think it's really critically important that we shore up the financial circumstances of our state universities and at community colleges and one of the small ways we can do that is by changing the dynamic of where these funds lie so that it gives them some more support given the kind of financial situation the state finds itself in and many of our universities find that they're in situations where they could have shortfalls.

So this is, I think, a very positive step. I think it's a very responsible step, particularly the way in which this Amendment was crafted and, as I said, I commend the Chairs of this Committee and support the Amendment. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

212
May 17, 2017

Will you remark? Will you remark further? Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN (24TH):

Thank you, Madam Chair. I stand for the purpose of a question to the proponent of the Bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye, please prepare yourself. Please continue, Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN (24TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Senator Bye, I wonder if you could share with us, is there any other agency or organization of Connecticut state government that currently manages investment funds that were previously managed by the Office of the State Treasurer? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Through you, Madam President. No, I am not aware. I'm only aware of this particular fund.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN (24TH):

jm
Senate

213
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Madam President, and thank you, Senator Bye, for your answer. I think that this is a major policy shift for state government to allow taxpayer invested funds to be shifted from the primary financial officer of the State of Connecticut to another agency and I believe that this should be looked at in more -- great detail before this decision is made and for that reason I'm opposed. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Will you remark? Will you remark further on the Amendment? Senator Bye, I believe you're asking for a roll call vote?

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Yes.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. A roll call vote has been asked for. Mr. Clerk, would you please indicate that we need a roll call vote?

CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate Amendment Schedule A. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

214
May 17, 2017

Have all members voted? Have all members voted?
Please check your votes and make sure they have been
properly recorded. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On Senate Amendment Schedule A.

Total number voting	36
Those voting Yea	33
Those voting Nay	3
Absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Amendment passes. Senator
Bye.

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Thank you, Madam President. As we have debated the
Amendment, the Amendment becomes the Bill so I urge
adoption and move the Bill --

THE CHAIR:

Are you asking for a roll call vote?

SENATOR BYE (5TH):

Yes, with a roll call vote. Thank you, Madam
President.

THE CHAIR:

Oh wait. I'm sorry. Senator Fasano.

jm
Senate

215
May 17, 2017

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I just wanted to make a few comments on this Bill before we vote on it. When we look at a fiscal note you look at the interest rate that the Office of State Treasurer has received an average of 1.2 with a spread between 0.13 and 4.78 where UConn Foundation had a loss between roughly 20 percent but a high of 15.9, which means an average of 3.9. When you add that all together one has to question how the Secretary State -- Secretary -- should say the Treasurer's Office, ends up with such a low return rate on investments and when you look at our other investments around this state relative to the budgets that we're facing it seems to be apparent that we need to look at the Office of State Treasurer to determine how these funds are -- are being invested and what the return is.

So I recognize why UConn would want to say the returns are extraordinarily low and we're suffering those consequences so what we're asking for is our ability to make more prudent investments so we can yield a better return and that's exactly what the Office of Fiscal Analysis report says, is that if you allow UConn Foundation to do it you're gonna get more money back. Well somewhere along the line this body's gonna start to wonder what is happening with all the other funds if it is true that this fund is underreporting and I think that this has to be a flare in the night to say we should start to take a look at these funds, see what's happening, because we all in this Chamber and the Chamber downstairs have to answer when those funds don't meet the expectations of the pensions and other items because we have to find that shortfall.

jm
Senate

216
May 17, 2017

And maybe they're doing it prudently but I would suggest us not reviewing that would be a fiduciary lapse of obligation on our behalf. So I support this Bill. I thank the Chairs for this Bill and there's a sound reasoning for this Bill but we need to look further. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark? Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Thank you, Madam President. As you know, I support this Bill but the comments made by our leadership just a minute ago just prompted my getting up and making a comment that the good Senator is absolutely right that one of the compelling reasons to make this change is because currently the funds for this account for a community college and state university systems is in a stable value fund which has very, very, very low return and as a result by shifting the funds they can do much better when the various foundations now will govern this.

What's particularly important of the comments recently made was, as members of the Finance Committee, we have empowered the -- the Treasurer's Office in the last few years to make changes to their asset allocation that was not quite as a staff conservative as the stable value fund. We've given them an opportunity to -- to be more diversified so that they can get a higher return as our various colleges have done, whether it's UConn Foundation or others, that have done much better.

jm
Senate

217
May 17, 2017

In addition, we also passed a Bill last year we worked hard on to allow them also to have a different salary structure for the individuals in the investment office at the State Treasurer's Office hoping, therefore, to get more expertise to help them gain a better return. However, unfortunately we haven't seen that kind of return produced. Given the kind of situation we now have on Wall Street where the equities have gone through the roof and a lot of people's 401(k)s and pension funds have done enormously well, we would expect the same thing for our pension fund as well.

So I -- I believe that the good Senator's comments were very well taken and should certainly cause us to review the situation with regards to the returns in our pension funds. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark? Will you remark further? Seeing no further remarks, Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? If so, please check your vote and make sure it's been properly recorded. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On Senate Bill 871.

jm
Senate

218
May 17, 2017

Total number voting	36
Those voting Yea	34
Those voting Nay	2
Absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Bill passes. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Will the Clerk now please call calendar page 17, calendar 223, Senate Bill 345, with Bill to be taken out by the Republican Co-Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Good evening, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance of the Committee's Joint Favorable Report and passage of Senate Bill 345.

THE CHAIR:

Excuse me, Senator Boucher. Please give me one minute. Mr. Clerk, would you please call the Bill?

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 345, AN ACT CONCERNING LIVERY SERVICE FOR PERSONS WITH DISABILITIES AND ELDERLY PERSONS. There are Amendments.

jm
Senate

219
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

I'm sorry, Senator Boucher. Please continue.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Not at all, Madam President. Madam President, I ask your indulgence and permission to yield to Senator Terry Gerratana for the purpose of an Amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I accept the yield and I have for the Chamber an Amendment and if the Clerk would please call LCO No. 7238 and I be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7238, Senate A, offered by Senator Gerratana.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue, Senator.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

jm
Senate

220
May 17, 2017

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

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Thank you. This Bill came to my attention when we were caucusing it a week or two ago and I had some concerns about the underlying Bill and those concerns were, of course, from a public health perspective, you know, Public Health Committee which I co-chair, oversees and works with EMS and our ambulance services through the Department of Public Health and my question was this is a livery service for persons with disabilities so I was very concerned because I felt, well, if this is a person with disabilities what are those disabilities and what kind of precautions would we be taking? This is not emergency transport, I fully understand that, nor are we trying to attempt this here, but I really felt that there should be some safeguards put into the legislation so the Amendment, I hope, will take care of those concerns.

The first part, lines 3 through 12, talk about getting consent from a -- written consent from a practitioner to -- for a patient or a person who may be transported in this way. I felt that that was an appropriate safeguard because, after all, the practitioner would know his or her patient and any limitations or even any dangers. For instance, somebody who is lying prone in a stretcher may have respiratory problems so I thought it would be very

jm
Senate

221
May 17, 2017

appropriate to get a primary care provider to give consent.

And also I felt that there should be some training on lifting and moving and transport of the person in the stretcher. Again, I was trying to envision, well, what kind of scenario or situation would be -- would we be talking about here? So training, I thought, was quite appropriate.

I added a new section in here that any person who transports an individual would have to make sure that the stretcher would be secured in the van, and this means the person who would be using the stretcher would be appropriately secured onto the stretcher as stretcher transport is appropriate in this way.

In lines 36 to 44, in this I worked on with the person who is the proponent of the legislation and came to us in the legislature. He felt, and I was in agreement, that there should be some sort of an attendant who would be present when this person is being transported.

And finally, in the last section I think that's just for consistencies regarding motor vehicles registered in the state.

So with that I certainly hope the Chamber will take in consideration this Amendment as it does provide some safeguards and I would urge the Chamber to approve the adoption. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Berthel.

jm
Senate

222
May 17, 2017

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Good evening, Madam President. I have a couple of questions for the introducer of the Amendment, please.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana, prepare yourself. Please continue, Senator.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Thank you, Madam President. Through you. Senator, I appreciate your introducing this Amendment. It does address some of the concerns that I had with the legislation when I initially saw it. I'm just wondering if you could provide a little more clarification with respect to lines 7 through 9 with regard to the written consent. Do you -- do you have a idea as to what that written consent would look like? Is that gonna be something similar to perhaps like a prescription or is it just a -- do you envision something like just a note that says it's okay to -- to go on this van? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Thank you, Madam President. It is appropriate for a practitioner to evaluate and consider, of course, his or her patient and just as we do with children and with others that a practitioner would then come

jm
Senate

223
May 17, 2017

up with a consent and say that it would be appropriate for this person to be transported in this manner. Sometimes a physician will use a prescription pad or form to do this. Sometimes it would be appropriate. There might be other forms that the practitioner has available that may be already tailored to this kind of condition but certainly it would be so that the practitioner would sign and affirm that this would be appropriate. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Again, through you, Madam President. I thank the Senator for that answer. So we would envision that the consent would include a statement from the primary care provider that says it is safe for this patient to be transported in this manner? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Through you, Madam President. Yes.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

jm
Senate

224
May 17, 2017

Thank you. Again, through you, Madam President. I thank the Senator for her answer. Moving on to the second page of the Amendment, am I correct in -- when I look at lines specifically 38 through 40 that state -- I know you stated that the training would include similar training that is provided to personnel that are involved in lifting, moving, and transport of a person on a stretcher. Is it -- is it appropriate to say that the training would not include any emergency services personnel training as described in the Statute that's stated and offered through the Department of Public Health? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Gerratana.

SENATOR GERRATANA (6TH):

Through you, Madam President. This would not be, for instance, an EMS personnel or a paramedic or there are many designations that are utilized but one pers -- a person who would be trained in accordance with those kinds of protocols and be aware. Now I didn't look at Statute 19a-180b that we reference there. I mean I'm happy to take a look at it but that's my interpretation. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

jm
Senate

225
May 17, 2017

Thank you, Madam President, and, again, I thank the Senator for the answer and through you, Madam President. I'll support the Amendment tonight only because it does -- it minimally addresses my serious concerns about having a -- having an attendant on board which I think is a -- an important component of this and having the permission and, you know, the -- the analysis by a primary care provider to say that -- that this person is safe to travel in this manner. So, again, I thank the Senator for her answers. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Are there any further comments? Senator Boucher, on the Amendment.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. On the Amendment, I do appreciate the various safeguards that were put in place. It -- it goes a long way to hopefully allaying a lot of people's concerns about the Bill including yourself, Madam President, has numbers of -- of cases and examples as I do and others we are -- this Bill is very much needed and necessary right now.

I think that we are talking about the Amendment but at some point we will also want to talk about the underlying Bill and the reason for this even coming before us and that is the very high cost right now and the non-differentiation between those that can be safely transported and those that need full medical attention, full EMT and ambulance services versus those that have to make necessary and not be isolated, whether it's a case of -- of a funeral of

jm
Senate

226
May 17, 2017

a spouse or hospitalization of someone in their family, or other events in their lives where it -- it has become cost prohibitive, up over \$700 to \$800 for one trip and in my case meeting with a constituent it cost them nearly \$200 to make a short visit so that we could talk.

And so I think this does address those kinds of concerns and is very necessary and this Amendment goes a long way, as I said, to taking care of a lot of the concerns that others have had about safely transporting those vulnerable citizens that we would like to help. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Are there any further comments or remarks on the Amendment? Seeing none, I'll try your minds. All those in favor of the Amendment please indicate it by saying Aye [Ayes voiced]. Any opposed? Amendment passes.

Senator Boucher, on the bill as amended.

SENATOR BOUCHER (26TH):

Yes, Madam President. On the Bill as amendment, I would move if there's no objection to putting this on the Consent Calendar. Oh, I'm sorry. Before so, may I please yield to our Co-Chair of the Transportation Committee, Senator Carlo Leone?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Leone, will you accept the yield?

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):

jm
Senate

227
May 17, 2017

Yes, I would. Thank you, Madam President. I just wanted to rise and give my support for the Bill as amended and I want to thank my Senate Co-Chair for her great assistance and leadership in helping craft the Bill, along with Senator Gerratana with her expertise from Public Health to address some of the concerns that were just previously mentioned by making the Bill even better with the safeguards and the training of personnel to provide this type of service for the people that do request it and need it.

And it's one of those kind of services that you would not normally think is required for out there if you're a healthy person but if you don't have 100 percent of your health and you find yourself in the position where you can only be transported in the prone or supine position and it's not a medical issue, prior to this Bill the only options you had were to go through the high cost either through the ambulance or something covered under insurance or Medicaid and if you didn't have those available to you were out of pocket a significant cost potentially, or you would not be able to undertake what you would be desired to do, whether it's to visit a loved one, to go shopping, to go visit family, just to do some simple tasks, not that some of those tasks would be overly simple being in that position but, nonetheless, you want to be able to have as normal a life as possible given anyone's circumstances and this Bill goes in that direction to allow people flexibility when there is a nonmedical issue, a non-emergency issue. There is something -- they need to get from point A to point B with -- in a safe manner that is not an exorbitant

jm
Senate

228
May 17, 2017

cost and I think this Bill goes a long way towards doing that.

So I'm happy to support this Bill and I would urge my colleagues to support it as well. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Berthel.

SENATOR BERTHEL (32ND):

Madam President, I would ask for a roll call vote on this. The -- I fully respect and appreciate the intent here and that is to lower the cost of access to certain types of transportation for patients that we may believe are not medically complex or that might not medically require this type of transportation, but I think inherently and from my own personal experience many years ago working in the EMS industry, that a patient who is confined to a stretcher is by definition medically complex. There's a reason why someone needs to be on a stretcher to be transported. They don't have the ability to sit or stand on their own. They have to be lying down and moved on a stretcher.

The current regulations do require, as we -- we've talked about briefly, that a person with disabilities who are confined to a stretcher be transported in an ambulance vehicle and there are very specific guidelines and laws and regulations that -- that apply to what is an ambulance vehicle in Connecticut and that, of course, is part of the -- the cost in using that vehicle. Those vehicles are subject to regular and ongoing inspections by

jm
Senate

229
May 17, 2017

DPH. They're full of hundreds of thousands of dollars' worth of lifesaving medical equipment.

So, you know, I think that we're -- we're trying to do the right thing in terms of offering a -- an option that is more cost effective but I'm not sure that we are necessarily doing the right think with our obligation to protect the people that we are obligated to protect. And I'm not sure that this is a -- I'm not comfortable that this is a safe way to move a patient that is, as we defined in the Bill, disabled or elderly that needs to be on a stretcher and it's not a risk that -- that I'm willing to take.

So I am voting no on the Bill and thank you, Madam President, for a few minutes to explain myself.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Somers.

SENATOR SOMERS (18TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President. I, too, have reservations about the underlying Bill in effect and I will echo what Senator Berthel said. If you are on a stretcher you are, by nature, medically compromised and a patient that requires more than just -- below the standard of care, I should say, to be transported.

I also would like to point out that the DOT -- this Bill requires the Department of Transportation to issue these permits and currently, as Senator Berthel says, the DPH is required to inspect medical transportation, ambulances, and this would fall

jm
Senate

230
May 17, 2017

under the DOT. According to the DOT's original testimony, they would have to create specifications, regulations, do new inspections, and perhaps even hire new inspectors to look at these new stretcher vans that will be under their cognizance to transport these possibly medically compromised patients.

I believe that this is a safety risk for people that are being transported and at this time I understand the idea of trying to save money and the cost associated with it; however, again, if you are on a stretcher and need to be removed or helped from one facility to be transported to another place you are medically compromised and I think that you should have the required medical care that's necessary to make sure that you are transported properly so I will be opposing this Bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Are there any further comments? Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

I rise just to comment on the Bill and lend me support to this Bill as amended for and certainly understand the good Senators' conversation and concerns with regarding safety but I don't believe that the intent on this Bill is to compromise safety, but just to move and transport people who have been, one, cleared by their primary care physician to travel in this manner, to be attended by a person alongside them during the trip who has been trained, and it does, as the good Senator talked about, save considerable money on trips that

jm
Senate

231
May 17, 2017

just simply are to move to and from and not in any an emergency opportunity. So while I appreciate the safety concerns I think that they've been adequately addressed in this Bill and I urge my colleagues to support. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Are there any further comments? Seeing none, Mr. Clerk, if you'd call for a roll call vote?

CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted?
Mr. Clerk if you could call the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Bill No. 345

Total number Voting	36
Necessary for Passage	19
Those voting Yea	28
Those voting Nay	8
Those absent and not Voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The bill as amended passes. [Gavel] Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

jm
Senate

232
May 17, 2017

Thank you Madam President. Madam President, would the clerk please call Calendar Page 52, Calendar 128, Senate Bill 821 taken out by the Republican co-chair of the committee, please?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On Page 52, Calendar 128, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 821, an ACT CONCERNING ROOFING, WINDOW AND SIDING CONSUMER WARRANTIES AND POST-SALE WARRANTY WORK REIMBURSEMENT FOR POWER EQUIPMENT DEALERS.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you Madam President. I move acceptance of the joint favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you Madam President. There is a strike-all amendment so at this time I would ask the clerk to please call LCO No. 6833 and I'd be given leave to summarize?

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

233
May 17, 2017

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 6833, Senate A offered by Senator Witkos, et al.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Witkos, please continue.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

Thank you Madam President. First, I want to thank my co-chairs Senator Leone and the other members, Representative Baram down in the House along with Representative Smith to move this bill out of the General Law Committee and then the folks on the Appropriations Committee, which it went to and passed out by both committees unanimously. This is a consumer protection bill wherein if a manufacturer on the first section offers a warranty for replacement of roofing, windows or siding supplies and there's a recall then the individual that once those items have been -- if it falls within the warranty period and it's recalled, then the manufacturer will fully refund the total amount of the product including re-installation of that product not more than what the person originally spent. Many homeowners if you had placed a roof on your house and there was a recall or warranty defect, it's a small amount to replace the cost of the actual product but what happens is folks are required to go get an additional permit sometimes at their town hall. They have to pay to have their roof stripped again. They have to pay to have a

jm
Senate

234
May 17, 2017

dumpster brought in again and they have to pay to have somebody else reinstall the shingles at no fault of their own only because if it's a faulty product. So if the manufacturer puts a warranty on their own product then this bill would require them to offset the cost of the replacement back to its original condition. That's Section One of the bill.

Section Two of the bill has to do with automated equipment that's sold at a dealer's repair shop. We heard in the General Law Committee during the public hearing that there are some dealer repairs that require the -- to sell a certain product and that the big box stores they sell them but they don't repair them. So when somebody goes to return the product to the big box store because of a warranty defect, they are directed to the local dealership store to have those products repaired and currently under the current law, the dealerships are only given X amount of dollars to pay for the cost of the repair which does not meet their non-warranty repair costs of their hourly rate. So this language requires those again, those suppliers that supply these types of product to pay the cost of the dealer's actual labor cost if it falls within the warranty period.

We mirrored this law after those in neighboring states of Vermont and New Hampshire, so it's not anything new and I ask the Chamber's adoption. Thank you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any comments on the amendment? Senator Leone.

jm
Senate

235
May 17, 2017

SENATOR LEONE (27TH):

Thank you Madam President. I rise also in support of this bill and this language, specifically for the reasons mentioned by my co-chair Senator Witkos and I want to thank him for his leadership, as well as the leadership of our House co-chairman Representative Baram, and all members of our General Law Committee. This was an overwhelmingly supported effort on both issues. The testimony was clear. It was supportive and we feel it's a good consumer protection bill in the sense that A, for the roofing or the windows as approved in Section One and for those dealers that do tackle the extra work that needs to be done on a product that should be covered under warranty. They should be fully reimbursed and that's just a fairness issue. So this was a good bill supported by the committee at large, and I would urge my colleagues to support as well. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Senator. Are there any further comments on the amendment? Any further comments on the amendment? Seeing none. I'll try your minds. All those voting in favor please indicate by saying "Aye".

SENATORS: Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Any opposed? Amendment passes. [Gavel] Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS (8TH):

jm
Senate

236
May 17, 2017

Thank you Madam President, if there's no other questions I ask this to move to consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objections, Mr. Clerk. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you Madam President, would the clerk please now call Calendar Page 14, Calendar 203, Senate Bill 944 and that will be taken out by the Republican co-chair --

THE CHAIR:

--Hold on one minute. Okay. The bill is moved to consent calendar. Senator Duff, I'm sorry. Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you Madam President, will the clerk now please call Calendar Page 14, Calendar 203, Senate Bill 944?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On Page 14, Calendar 203, Substitute for Senate Bill 944, an ACT CLARIFYING THE CONTINUATION OF NONCONFORMING USES, BUILDINGS OR STRUCTURES. There's an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

237
May 17, 2017

Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Good evening Madam President. I move acceptance of the committee's joint favorable report and passage of Senate Bill 944.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you Madam President. This bill allows for the continuance of nonconforming use for repairs, improvements and where reconstruction is required. Madam President, the clerk is in possession of LCO No. 7276. I ask the clerk to please call the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7276, Senate A offered by Senators Cassano and Logan.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you Madam President, I move adoption of the amendment, waive the reading and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

jm
Senate

238
May 17, 2017

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you Madam President. The amendment allows for the demolition or deconstruction of a nonconforming use building or structure and that by itself will not be evidence of such property owner's intent to not reestablish such use building or structure. There's no limit to when this work must be completed. The nonconforming use building or structure can be discontinued voluntarily by an intent to not reestablish such use. I urge adoption of the amendment and ask for a roll call vote.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Are there any comments on the amendment? Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN (24TH):

Thank you Madam Chair. I stand for the purpose of a question to the proponent of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Logan, prepare yourself. Please continue Senator.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN (24TH):

Thank you Madam President. Thank you Senator Logan for your work on this topic. It certainly is a challenge to property owners across the state. I'd like to just share a scenario and if you could clarify what the outcome would be post-passage of this bill.

If a property owner's building is damaged either by fire or storm and is irreparable and has to be demolished. It's in a nonconforming lot meaning in many downtown communities for instance pre-dating

jm
Senate

239
May 17, 2017

zoning they shoehorned buildings in that no longer would be acceptable with front edge and square footage of the lot, and so this nonconforming lot is home to a multi-family building. The multi-family building is going to be torn down but the property owner is not prepared to rebuild for several years, three, four or five years, it's unknown exactly when. What would happen to that property that would not be subject, would not be able to get a building permit under current zoning regulations. What would happen to that property once this bill is passed? Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Right, so in that scenario given that the building or structure was damaged. It was demolished because it was perhaps unsafe, it had to be raised, unless the property owner voluntarily decided to give up the, described as intent, not to re-build that facility or structure to non-conforming use would remain indefinitely.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN (24TH):

Thank you. Thank you Madam President. So just for clarification, the property owner intends someday to rebuild. They're not abandoning. They don't want to abandon because it dramatically reduces the value of the property if they did abandon, the grandfathered use. So I'm correct in assuming then that they have an unlimited period of time to take

jm
Senate

240
May 17, 2017

advantage of the grandfather zone on that property?
Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

The way the amendment is written, that is correct.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN (24TH):

Thank you Madam President, and I appreciate your answers Senator Logan, and I encourage support of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any further comments or questions on the amendment? Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Thank you Madam President. A question to the proponent of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Logan, prepare yourself. Please continue Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

So with the scenario that a building is now nonconforming because of a zone change and the structure is taken down, the property sold, is the next owner allowed to build under the old

jm
Senate

241
May 17, 2017

regulations?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you Madam President. Yes, that is correct, as long as they plan on building the same or similar structure that existed prior to the raise.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Martin.

SENATOR MARTIN (31ST):

Okay, thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Thank you Madam President. Good evening, or good morning. Question to the proponent, Madam President?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Logan prepare yourself. Please continue Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Senator Logan, Connecticut has what I believe to be the strongest laws in the country regarding protecting nonconforming uses. Unlike many states a use is protected in its current form. As an example, a cottage along the shoreline as long as

jm
Senate

242
May 17, 2017

its continuing in its present form, it's protected. In many states if that property were to be destroyed by an act of God or something it could not be reconstructed, but Connecticut has an extraordinarily strong law protecting that provision in that it can be reconstructed. How does this bill differ than what Connecticut law currently provides for, or the amendment that is before us I should say? Through you Madam President--

THE CHAIR:

--Oops I'm sorry. Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Yes, I mean that's specifically the purpose of this amendment. It's to tighten that because there is some confusion. There is some wiggle room in terms of interpretation and this would tighten that and make it more clear, what the intent of current laws are.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Through you Madam President, but what is unclear about our law currently?

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

That if the structure is raised or destroyed or it's left abandoned for a period of time, and particularly if the zoning regulations change in that area that they would not be able to build or rebuild that nonconforming use.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

243
May 17, 2017

Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Through you Madam President, but current law does protect, that's why it's conforming because some aspect of zoning policy has changed that would bring that property or the use of that property into nonconformity. My question is what is it that this amendment is attempting to correct?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

So as a clarification if a building is raised and left abandoned for a certain period of time, the town may be able to assume that the property owner has abandoned the structure in terms of wanting to rebuild. This would just clarify, particularly in a situation where the property is sold to another entity.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Thank you Madam President. Through you, so hypothetical but it could be one that becomes an actual condition if a property owner were to leave the property or the use unreconstructed for 50 years, is there a step that the property owner has to take? Is there an action that the property owner has to take or they have to notice the town or the municipality that they intend to -- or do they have to notice that they do not intend to maintain the use?

jm
Senate

244
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you Madam President. They would have to notice that they intend not to continue the nonconforming use.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

SO if they do not then it is, for legislative intent Madam President, that is to be construed to be continuing the use even if for many years that property were to remain unreconstructed or the use were not maintained?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Logan.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

Thank you Madam President. Yes, this clarifies that it does not lapse due to time.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fonfara.

SENATOR FONFARA (1ST):

Thank you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you Madam President. I don't have any questions for Senator Logan today. Sit down. I had the pleasure of serving, I think my first year, in

jm
Senate

245
May 17, 2017

the General Assembly as Senator Fonfara as my chair of planning and development and so let's take a run at this. This is a pre-existing nonconforming right. It's a constitutionally protected right in the state of Connecticut, which is what Senator Fonfara was eluding to and clearly when you have a pre-existing nonconforming right that's a constitutionally-protected right, it is a property right to which the state cannot or any public entity, municipality or state, cannot take away from you without compensation. That's what that right is and Senator Fonfara is correct in that we held that very high esteem here in Connecticut and protect that.

Unfortunately I think the reason for this bill is the fact that there are certain zoning officers who require more. Their indicating that you have to show a clear intention that you reserve that constitutional right. So if you remove a deck because it is decaying and it is a pre-existing nonconforming encroachment, we'll say in the front yard, and then you try to get your funds together to rebuild that a year or two later, there are zoning officers who are taken opinion that that lapse of time is equivalent to your intent to not keep that pre-existing nonconformity right in place, and what I think this bill is trying to say which is what the case law has said is you have to have a clear intent to abandon that constitutional right. Zoning officers have argued your non-building on that house that gets torn down because of a storm, that deck that you take down. If you don't act quickly enough, that is enough to infer your intention to abandon, and what this clarifies law to say you cannot, there has to be a clear intention. So because of the aggressiveness of zoning officers to challenge, resulting in constituents having to spend

jm
Senate

246
May 17, 2017

money to go to court to attack that challenge, this bill takes the existing case law which is crystal clear and codifies it. And I think that's the reason why this amendment has been brought up. Thank you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Are there are any further comments on the amendment? Seeing none. Mr. Clerk if you could a roll call vote?

CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on Senate A. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Mr. Clerk if you could call the tally.

CLERK:

Senate Amendment Schedule A	
Total number Voting	36
Necessary for Passage	19
Those voting Yea	36
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not Voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The amendment passes. [Gavel] Senator Logan. We are now talking about the bill as amended.

SENATOR LOGAN (17TH):

jm
Senate

247
May 17, 2017

Got it. Without objection, I move to consent.

THE CHAIR:

Is there any objection moving this to the consent calendar? Seeing none. Mr. Clerk, if you could move this to the consent calendar? So ordered.
Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you Madam President. Madam President, would the clerk now please call Calendar Page 5, Calendar 108, Senate Bill 894, which will be taken out by the Republican co-chair of the Children's Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On Page 5, Calendar 108, Substitute for Senate Bill No. 894, an ACT ESTABLISHING THE STATE OVERSIGHT COUNCIL ON CHILDREN AND FAMILIES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you and good morning Madam President. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's joint favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

248
May 17, 2017

Please continue.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you Madam President. This bill would establish an independent oversight council to replace the current advisory council with respect to the Department of Children and Families. This is particularly appropriate in light of the ongoing questions regarding the efficacy of DCF programs and the safety of the children for whom DCF is responsible. It's also I think particularly appropriate in light of the fact that the department itself has been subject to ongoing court supervision for nearly 25 years and this act will demonstrate to the court that the legislature is exercising its oversight responsibility and authority with respect to the services provided by the Department of Children and Families.

Madam President, the clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 7343. I ask the clerk to please call the amendment?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

LCO No. 7343 Senate A, offered by Senators Moore and Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you Madam President --

jm
Senate

249
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

--Please continue.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Madam President, I move adoption of the amendment, waive the reading and seek leave to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you Madam President. The amendment is a strike-all amendment and it establishes the committee and to whom the committee reports. The committee would report to the legislature via the committees of cognoscente which would be the Children's Committee and the Appropriations Committee. The bill itself identifies the membership of the committee and it would establish the meetings to occur bi-monthly, that is every other month. And the committee would render, among other things, a report an annual report to the legislature both to the Appropriations Committee and the Children's Committee. It would monitor and track and evaluate the policies and practices of the Department of Children and Families. It would submit policy recommendations regarding DCF to the Children's Committee. It would annually review the proposed DCF budget. It would receive quarterly reports from DCF regarding its strategic plan including safety, permanency, outcome data categorized by race, ethnicity, age, departmental region. It would receive the annual children's

jm
Senate

250
May 17, 2017

report card from the Children's Committee, and it would monitor DCF progress in achieving its strategic plan. And finally it would help DCF implement recommendations of the council itself. I move acceptance and passage of the amendment Madam.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, are there any comments on the amendment? Any comments on the amendment? Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN (24TH):

Thank you Madam President. I stand for the purpose of a question to the proponent of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio, please prepare yourself. Please continue Senator.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN (24TH):

Thank you Madam President. Senator Suzio, thank you for your work on this amendment. I just have a simple question. On Line 58 of the amendment LCO 7343, it references the minority leader of the Senate, that position no longer exists and I wonder if the balance is correct in the appointments to this new organization. Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

jm
Senate

251
May 17, 2017

Thank you Madam President. The Senator is correct in pointing out that under the current conditions there is no minority leader in the Senate because of the 18:18 split in the Senate. Nevertheless, I would suggest that the two appointees that would subject to the minority leader would be split. There's in fact two majority leaders right now in the Senate and clearly between the two of them there are four appointments. So whether one is done in the capacity as majority leader or minority leader, the outcome is the same. It would still be four appointments split between the two positions. Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN (24TH):

Thank you Madam President. Thank you Senator Suzio.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any other comments on the amendment?
Senator Moore.

SENATOR MOORE (22ND):

Thank you Madam President. I want to thank my co-chair for the work that was done on this bill and I think it's a very necessary issue that we need to be taking care of at this time with all things that are going on within DCF and our children's protection. This bill has a lot of inclusion and transparency and I think that's what we're looking for. I urge that you support the bill. Thank you.

jm
Senate

252
May 17, 2017

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Are there any other comments on the amendment? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you Madam President. Madam President, I rise to support the amendment. I would like to thank Senator Suzio and Senator Moore for their leadership on this bill. The oversight just to talk a little bit more about what Senator Suzio said is we get out of the echo chamber. We get out of a chamber which was controlled by the Commissioner, the appointees controlled by commissioners, the outcome controlled by Commissioner. I don't think there's anybody in circle that believes that has been a good result for DCF over the number of years. And what this does is bring people who have stake in the game and understand the issues that kids face in this system and let their voices be heard, and that is what has been missing. That autonomy, that autonomous body that look at this without being afraid of a Commissioner who controlled the conversation in and the conversation out. I applaud this amendment and I look forward to its passage.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Senator. Are there any further comments on the amendment? Seeing none, I'll try your minds. All those in favor of the amendment please indicate by saying "Aye".

SENATORS:

jm
Senate

253
May 17, 2017

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Any opposed? [Gavel] The amendment passes.
Senator Suzio, the bill is now amended.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

Thank you Madam President. If there's no objection, I would move that the bill as amended be put on the consent calendar?

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objections, so ordered.

SENATOR SUZIO (13TH):

And by the way I do want to thank Senator Moore, my co-chair. She was a pleasure to work with and I look forward to many more years serving with you Senator. Thank you very much Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Mr. Clerk. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you Madam President. Madam President, will the clerk now please call Calendar Page 30, Calendar 340, Senate Bill 1020 brought out by the republican co-chair of Judiciary Committee?

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

254
May 17, 2017

Senator Duff, could you please give the Calendar number and page number again?

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you Madam President. Calendar Page 30, Calendar 340, Senate Bill 1020. Correct?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On Page 30, Calendar 340, Senate Bill No. 1020, an ACT CONCERNING THE ENFORCEMENT OF A DEFAMATION JUDGMENT ENTERED BY A COURT OUTSIDE OF THE UNITED STATES.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Good morning Madam President and Happy Thursday. I move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much Madam President. What this bill does is it shuts out the requirements for a

jm
Senate

255
May 17, 2017

Connecticut court to recognize a foreign defamation judgement. Unfortunately what has been happening in the world is if someone outside the United States feels that their reputation has been harmed they go to basically forum shopping and they go to jurisdictions where that is very easily asserted and difficult to defend. Two of the areas that were particularly noted in our public hearing are London and Singapore and this has been happening with greater frequency. So many of our sister states in the United States of America have adopted similar bills. What this bill does is set up the requirement that if you're a defendant for the foreign defamation judgement to be looked at here in Connecticut, then the rights that you have here in Connecticut regarding freedom of speech and freedom of the press have to be equaled or better than in that foreign jurisdiction. So what that ultimately will do will stop these individuals from getting these judgements and then trying to come to America to enforce them to basically silence folks that are writing books or speaking out about things that are going on in the world, and so we owe it to folks in Connecticut to protect them from these actions by others trying to enforce these foreign defamation judgements and I would urge my colleagues to support this bill. Thank you very much Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE (9TH):

I want to echo the fine remarks by my co-chairman of the Judiciary Committee. This bill, again, will just protect individuals in Connecticut that may in other country, a foreign country, where their free speech or freedom to press or rights are abrogated

jm
Senate

256
May 17, 2017

by a foreign judgement against them where their livelihood could be jeopardized and the key to this bill is a Connecticut judge has to assure on the record that in fact a defendant of a Connecticut resident in the court has the rights of the country that were brought over here conform to the standards of America and the standards of our U.S. Constitution. SO it's really an important piece of legislation to protect the residents of Connecticut, and I urge the chamber to support this piece of legislation. Thank you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you Madam President, and I certainly commend the Judiciary Committee and the co-chairs Senator Doyle and Senator Kissel for bringing this forward because I think it is, it meets a legitimate need where Americans may be victimized by foreign courts, but if I might a question, through you, to the proponent Senator Kissel?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel prepare yourself. Please continue Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Thank you Madam President. Through you to Senator Kissel, Senator Kissel Senator Doyle in his comments in support of the bill, which I wholeheartedly agree, pointed out that the safeguard in this is that it would require a finding by an American court judge to make the finding that the rights in the other jurisdiction where the judgement was sought to

jm
Senate

257
May 17, 2017

be -- where it was issued and now sought to be enforced in the U.S. are comparable right? Would that mean comparable in terms of due process protections and things of that nature?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much Madam President. Through you to the good president of the Senate. Yes, I would say that basically all the safeguards in totality would have to be there because if I am a defendant here in Connecticut, I can rely both on Connecticut constitution, United States Constitution, any statutory protections and the common law, and so I would think that the totality of all those protections that I have, that if I was the defendant in a defamation suit would have to be there in the foreign jurisdiction for that foreign defamation judgement to be looked at here and respected and enforced by Connecticut court. Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

So through you Madam President, thank you Senator Kissel, I think that is exactly the answer that we were hoping for here. My one additional further question Madam President to Senator Kissel is if the American judge makes a finding that the foreign jurisdiction does not have comparable rights of protection of the individual rights/liberties comparable to our American both constitutional and

jm
Senate

258
May 17, 2017

common law or statutory rights. Is that an appealable judgement? Now can the person seeking to enforce the foreign judgement go up a chain of appeals to contest that, I assume it would be a superior court finding?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Thank you very much Madam President. There's nothing in the bill before us that speaks to the appealability of that determination. I would suspect that that decision could be appealed because any litigant has the ability to file an appeal, but hopefully the appellate court would make swift judgement on that and minimize whatever damages would occur to the unfortunate victim of that lawsuit. Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Yes, Madam President through you, thank you Senator Kissel. And I assume also, if I might ask an additional question through you Madam President, that the converse would also apply that the American party who was a defendant in that action, if the Superior Court judge made a finding in favor of the foreign claim that that also would be appealable?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

jm
Senate

259
May 17, 2017

Thank you very much Madam President. What's good for the goose is good for the gander, and absolutely the defendant would have a right to appeal that. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Through you Madam President, thank you Senator Kissel, thank you Senator Doyle, and I think this is a very good bill in protection of important rights that might otherwise be exploited.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, are there further remarks on the -- Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL (7TH):

Seeing no other questions, I would ask without objection if this could be moved for the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objections, so ordered. Mr. Clerk. That's ordered. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you Madam President. Madam President, before I move to the second consent calendar, I'd like to have additional marking?

THE CHAIR:

Please continue.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

jm
Senate

260
May 17, 2017

Thank you Madam President. On Calendar Page 60, Calendar 271, Senate Bill 1001. I'd like to take that item off the foot of the calendar and mark that PR?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you Madam President. If the clerk could now call the bills that are on the second consent calendar followed by a vote please?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On Page 2, Calendar 76, Senate Bill 766. On Page 5, Calendar 108, Senate Bill 894. On Page 7, Calendar 126, Senate Bill 906. On Page 14, Calendar 205, Senate Bill 820. Also on Page 14, Calendar 203, Senate Bill 944. On Page 30, Calendar 340, Senate Bill 1020. And on Page 52, Calendar 128, Senate Bill 821.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you Mr. Clerk. If you could call for a roll call vote.

CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the second consent calendar for the day. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

jm
Senate

261
May 17, 2017

Senator Kissel. Have all members voted? Have all members voted? Please ensure your vote has been properly recorded. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

On the second consent calendar for the day

Total number Voting	36
Necessary for Passage	19
<u>Those voting Yea</u>	36
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not Voting	0

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you Madam President. Madam President, I think we've had a very successful and productive day today even though it is now tomorrow, but it is today actually. So I will yield to any points of personal privilege before we make our announcement for later today.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any points of personal privilege? Seeing none, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you Madam President. Madam President, it is our intent to gavel in tomorrow at 10:30 sharp tomorrow morning and we will be taking up the bills that were marked PT earlier yesterday or today in

jm
Senate

May 17, 2017

our legislative day, but those will be the bills that will be going first will be the ones that we marked PT so hope to see everybody later today at 10:30 am. With that Madam President, I move that we adjourn subject to the call of the chair.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

(On motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 12:45 a.m. adjourned subject to the call of the chair.)