

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

HB 7579	PA 124	1989
House	4178-4231	(54)
Senate	1647, 1663-1665	(4)
Education	1601, 1686	(2)

**CONNECTICUT STATE LIBRARY
LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE SECTION**

Total-60p.

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate
and House of Representatives Proceedings

Connecticut State Library

Compiled 2016

H-524

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
1989

VOL. 32
PART 12
3879-4247

abs

348

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

Thank you. Are there any other announcements?
Representative Palermino of the 5th.

REP. PALERMINO: (5th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. For a Journal notation?
Representative John Fonfara will miss a few votes this
evening. He is out of the Chamber on legislative
business. Thank you.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The transcript will note. Any other announcements
or points? Please return to the Call of the Calendar.

CLERK:

Page 4, Calendar 320, Substitute HB7579. AN ACT
CONCERNING MINOR REVISIONS TO THE STATUTES CONCERNING
EDUCATION EQUALIZATION AID.

Favorable Report of the Committee on EDUCATION.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Millerick of the 22nd.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the Joint
Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question is on passage. Will you remark, sir?

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

abs

349

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

Yes. Mr. Speaker, the reason for this bill, this bill makes technical corrections to the ECS Program. It clears up some definitions, provides for towns that are not on the Uniform Fiscal Year, fixes the minimum expenditure requirement for each town, based on the data of record as of December 1st of the previous year, and eliminates obsolete sections concerning general state aid.

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO6353. Would he please read?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Clerk, please call LCO6353, designated House "A".

CLERK:

LCO6353, designated House "A", offered by Representative Cohen.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Excuse me, Representative Millerick, did you say to read, or did you wish to summarize?

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

I asked him to read.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

That can be done, sir. Would you please read the amendment?

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

It is a very short amendment, and it explains

abs

350

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

itself. It is a technical amendment.

CLERK:

In line 34, bracket "a" and insert "SUCH" before "regional"

In line 53, bracket "buildings", insert "CAPITAL BUILDING EXPENDITURES" after the closing bracket and delete "WHICH ARE"

In line 54, delete "CAPITAL EXPENDITURES"

In line 72, delete ", " and the brackets before and after "and"

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Thank you.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Millerick, would you care to move adoption of the amendment?

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Yes, Mr. Speaker, as you can see, it is a technical amendment. I move adoption.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark on the amendment, Representative Millerick?

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

The amendment simply gives new language to some of the original language that was in the bill and makes it a little more germane to the subject.

abs

351

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment? If not--
Representative Young of the 143rd.

REP. YOUNG: (143rd)

Mr. Speaker, through you, a question to the proponent of the bill?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. YOUNG: (143rd)

Mr. Speaker, through you, in the summary, it talks about roof repairs, for example, being considered as a part of program expenditures and thus count towards its MER. Would that account, would that include roof repairs that were subsidized by the state? Through you, sir?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Millerick.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

The bill talks about roof repair and such items. The amendment does not. The amendment simply adds language.

REP. YOUNG: (143rd)

Okay. I will withdraw my question. We are not really on the bill, but on the amendment. Thank you,

abs

352

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

sir.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Right. Thank you.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Ward.

REP. WARD: (86th)

Mr. Speaker, on the amendment. Just to be clear, through you, to Representative Millerick, by changing the reference to capital expenditure and making a capital building expenditure, is it changing any of the intent? Was it originally to apply to only structures to buildings, or are we actually changing the intent so that less is eligible as a regular education expense?

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Millerick.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, there is nothing in this amendment at all that changes the intent. The intent is the same. It just-- We are moving the wording around, as you can see by the file copy and the amendment. They amount to the same thing, but they zero in a little more on the intent. There is no change.

abs

353

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark? If not, all those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted, ruled technical. Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Representative Young.

REP. YOUNG: (143rd)

Mr. Speaker, back to where I was before I was out of order. When we talk about non-capital construction costs such as roof repairs, it is my impression that some of those costs are reimbursed by the state. Would costs reimbursed by the state or paid for by the state count as an expenditure to MER? Through you, Mr. Speaker?

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Millerick.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

That's an excellent question. When we changed from the GTB formula, to the ECS formula, we also changed

abs

354

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

the MER. And so, under the new MER for each town, we have included roof repairs and some other improvements to be included in the new MER program.

REP. YOUNG: (143rd)

Well--

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

I am sorry if I have gone too fast.

REP. YOUNG: (143rd)

But my question is, if those expenditures were reimbursed by the state, so they were in fact not really expenditures of the local board of education or the local community, would they count toward the MER? Through you, sir?

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Millerick.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

The answer is yes. Under the new formula, they count.

REP. YOUNG: (143rd)

So then again, through you, I have got a situation where a town is required by the formula to spend so many dollars in order to qualify for its MER. It spends so many of its own dollars, and it spends so

abs

355

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

many dollars that it is reimbursed for by the state, which are in fact not its own dollars. And, then, we by this formula deem it to have spent enough to qualify by MER? Am I correct? Through you, sir.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Millerick.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

If I am-- Through you, Mr. Speaker, if I understand your question right, yes, you are correct.

REP. YOUNG: (143rd)

So then, towns which by this formula appear to have qualified for aid by spending sufficient on the MER have not in fact spent sufficient of their own money through the MER, because a portion of what they have spent is state reimbursed. So, they have not spent what they are supposed to have spent to qualify, if I read you correctly. Through you, sir.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Yes, to clarify it. Money spent for capital improvements on buildings do count in the MER. But, in your question, if the state supplied the money under the program, then it does not count.

REP. YOUNG: (143rd)

No, I think you misunderstood me. I think before you answered me that money reimbursed by the state

abs

356

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

would count as an expenditure toward the MER. That's the question I asked originally.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I understand your question, and I was corrected. I know that, I know that roof repairs and such can count in MER. I was under the impression that state money, even though it was reimbursed by the state would count. But, my Chairman just corrected me. It counts, but as long as the state didn't supply the money.

REP. YOUNG: (143rd)

Okay. So then, actually, to qualify for the MER, whether it's a direct expenditure for education or a semi-capital cost on an educational building, the moneys must be spent by the town. They cannot be money spent by the town and then reimbursed by the state. Through you, sir?

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

REP. YOUNG: (143rd)

Thank you. That is the question I wanted to get qualified, because it looked, for the moment, as if we were kind of going to get state aid because the state spent the money to qualify us for the state aid, which is Catch-23 1/2 or something. Thank you, sir.

abs

357

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

REP. FARR: (19th)

Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further? Representative Farr of the 19th.

REP. FARR: (19th)

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment. Will the Clerk please call LCO5593, and I be allowed to summarize?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Clerk, please call LCO--

REP. FARR: (19th)

5593.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

LCO5593.

CLERK:

LCO5593, designated House Amendment "B", offered by Representative Farr.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question is on summarization. Is there objection? Seeing none, Representative Farr.

REP. FARR: (19th)

Mr. Speaker, what this amendment does, it changes the reimbursement formula for those communities participating in Project Concern. Essentially, under

abs

358

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

the present law, the state is actually saving money by youngsters' participating in Project Concern. This changes that reimbursement formula so that the state does not, no longer has a savings, and the communities that are receiving the youngsters will get an additional reimbursement.

Mr. Speaker, I move adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question is on adoption of the amendment. Will you remark?

REP. FARR: (19th)

Yes. Mr. Speaker, members of the Chamber, Project Concern is a program that is active in the state, affecting 13 suburban communities and 2 cities. Both Bridgeport, both Bridgeport and the City of Hartford sent youngsters to suburban communities. At the present time, approximately 700 youngsters are sent to those communities.

Under the formula for reimbursement to those communities, the two cities, Bridgeport and the City of Hartford, receive a reimbursement equal to one-half of the GTB grant that they would have received had the youngsters stayed within the cities. In the case of Hartford, if the youngster stays within the city, the city receives \$4,000 on a GTB grant. Under the present

abs

359

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

formula, and under the amendment, the city would continue to receive one-half of that, or \$2,000. So, for every youngster participating in Project Concern, Hartford would get \$2,000 and wouldn't have to educate that youngster.

The City of Bridgeport would have basically, would face basically the same result. Under the formula as now constructed, each of the suburban communities receives one-half of its GTB grant for every youngster it receives. So, for a suburban community that is entitled to an \$800 grant, it receives \$400 for each youngster and then has to pay for the cost of educating that youngster.

The net effect is that the state spends \$2,400 in average for every youngster participating in Project Concern, and saves \$1,600 per youngster, by not having the youngster stay within the inner city, \$1,600 per youngster. What this amendment says is that we eliminate that savings and instead provide each of the suburban communities that are receiving the youngsters one-half of the grant that the inner city would have received. The inner city continues to receive the \$2,000. The suburban community receiving the youngster would receive the \$2,000, but it now has to educate that youngster.

abs

360

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

Obviously, when you are dealing with communities that are receiving, spending \$5,000-6,000 per student to educate youngsters, receiving \$2,000 does not pay for the cost of that education. But, it clearly contributes a lot more than the present formula does, which is approximately \$400 on the average. This would affect some 13 towns. Among those towns are the town of Manchester, which would receive \$132,000 extra, the town of Plainville, which receives \$52,900, and I guess most importantly, the town of Newington, which would receive an additional \$54,400.

For no other reason, this is indeed a good amendment.

LAUGHTER

But, what happens, under this amendment is, it will have no fiscal impact this coming year. It doesn't go into effect until the following year. The impact of the amendment is that it eliminates the 1.2 million dollar savings that the state now has by youngsters participating in Project Concern. It means that the state will continue, will have to give grants equal to the grant that it would have to give if the youngster stayed within the inner cities.

This means that in two years time, the state will be spending 1.2 million dollars more than they do right

abs

361

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

now, but that is because they will no longer have the savings they do right now. I think this bill is important for a number of reasons.

Keep in mind this program is an entirely volunteer program. These communities volunteer to take these youngsters. But, the fact of the matter is that the enrollment in Project Concern has declined, because the suburban communities have found that it costs them a considerable amount to subsidize the education of those youngsters that are being shipped in. This will help reduce the subsidy.

I point out that the-- It is my understanding that there will be a suit brought on the whole question of desegregation. This is a voluntary program that helps desegregate our schools, and it is one that is already working. Passage of this amendment would just assure that it continues to work and may indeed encourage communities to expand their involvement and other communities to participate in the program.

I urge passage of this, and Mr. Speaker, I'd ask when the vote be taken, it be taken by roll.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question is on a roll call vote. All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

abs

362

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

Aye.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

In the opinion of the Chair, 20% has been met. When the roll is taken, when the vote is taken, it will be taken by roll. Will you remark further on the amendment?

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Millerick.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Mr. Speaker, a question to the proponent of the amendment?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I appreciate the fact that Plainville would be gaining some money, not to mention Newington. But, I think we have to look a little beyond Plainville and Newington and look at the picture that we have in this state. I realize what you are talking about is 1.2 million is the fiscal impact, not this year, but next year. We have no budget at this point. We can't, in my opinion, commit 1.2 million, when we don't know what our fiscal picture

abs

363

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

will be.

In addition to that, I think we have to look at the whole desegregation question and look at it from the viewpoint of what is the Commissioner attempting to do? What is our Blue Ribbon Committee attempting to do? And, when they come to their conclusions, I think we may have something here that would work very well.

But, in addition to that, I think we have to look at the contract that the town of West Hartford has and the towns that are involved in this program other than West Hartford. Their contracts are not all the same. They run different percentages and different moneys. So, all in all, I think you may have something for the future, but I have to oppose it at this point.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark? Representative Fleming of the 16th.

REP. FLEMING: (16th)

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, rising to speak in favor of the amendment, not just because it means additional money to my town and to some of the towns in the Farmington Valley and other areas around the state. I think the issue here is not the money. It is the principle of the thing, and that is that there are towns in this state for a number of years who have

abs

364

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

tried by voluntary measures to help work with our inner city, our inner city schools.

And, this will send a message. I think the same message that Commissioner Tirozzi keeps talking about, and that is that he is going to support voluntary efforts. That's what this is. The towns have volunteered to do this on their own. This is going to provide the proper funding and send a message out that that is the direction that the state wants us to pursue.

So, I hope that the members will support this, in as much as it will not impact upon our budget this year. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Cohen.

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, let me say, in rising to oppose this amendment, that I agree with Representative Fleming. It is the principle of the thing. And, let me tell you what I think we are doing by this amendment. We are doing two things. We are

abs

365

House of Representatives Wednesday, April 26, 1989

saying we think it is a good idea, as a matter of public policy, for the 1989 General Assembly to identify one line in the 1990-1991 budget. This is not taking place in this year's budget. It's next year's budget, and if you think that's a good way to budget for the state, then vote for it. But, I don't think that is a good way to vote for it.

The other thing is, Mr. Speaker, that we have an on-going bi-partisan committee of this General Assembly that is committed in the interim to looking at all issues of voluntary racial balance plans, and is committed to bringing forth to next year's General Assembly recommendations for what kinds of programs the state should support. I agree with Representative Farr. There is a lot of merit to his concept, but I don't think we do it in a vacuum, and I don't think we do it for next budget year. I don't think we do it now. I'm voting no. I hope you will, too.

REP. FARR: (19th)

Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark on the amendment? Will you remark?
Representative Farr.

REP. FARR: (19th)

Mr. Speaker, I'd like to make two points. First of

abs

366

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

all, last year, when I brought out a similar amendment, it wasn't for, it wasn't exactly this one. In fact, what it did say was that every suburban community ought to get paid for the total cost of that education, which would be about 3 million dollars. This is a much more modest proposal. We are not proposing that the suburban, the receiving community get paid the total cost. We simply say that the state ought not to be saving money for every youngster that participates.

But, I am frankly rather surprised that Representative Cohen would stand up before this body and say we ought not to pass a bill that is going to affect cost another year, another Legislature. We just got through passing the ECS formula for educational, for educational funding that is going to affect us for years to come. And, before that, we passed a GTB. That's what we have been doing in education. We've been passing legislation that affects us for years to come.

All this bill does is it simply makes a correction, and that is what this, what the underlying bill is. It makes a correction in the way in which we are giving out that money. If we decide we don't have enough money next year to fully fund ECS, we reduce the funding. And, it reduces the cost of this, because

abs

367

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

this is a bill that is affected by the amount that we put into ECS. It simply will, in effect, redistribute money under that educational formula.

If you don't think this is a priority, if you think that we ought to not fund this program, fine. If you think that we ought to just wait forever to fund a program like this, I'll tell you, every year when I bring the issue up, we say next year, next year, next year. And, what happens is every year, there are fewer and fewer youngsters participating in the program.

I think this is the year to address it. It isn't going to cost us anything in the coming year, and in the following year, we can adjust the cost by simply adjusting the percentage funding for ECS. I would urge passage of the amendment.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the amendment?

Representative Beamon of the 72nd.

REP. BEAMON: (72nd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question to the proponent, through you, to the proponent of the amendment, please?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Please proceed, Representative Beamon.

REP. BEAMON: (72nd)

abs

368

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

Representative Farr, if the equalization aid formula in your proposed amendment is very well, would you think that more suburban schools would bus their children into inner city areas? Through you, Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Farr.

REP. FARR: (19th)

Mr. Speaker, through you, no. This amendment won't in any way affect the other side of the issue, which is the question of magnet schools. This amendment simply addresses the issue of busing youngsters from inner cities into suburban communities. That's this grant program that we are dealing with. It doesn't address the issue of magnet schools.

REP. BEAMON: (72nd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, a follow-up question to the proponent of the amendment. If that is the case, Representative Farr, would you think that what we are trying to do with Project Concern, even though I agree with the concept. The concept is fine. If there were those type of incentives, through you, Mr. Speaker, would inner city schools and school systems in the inner city also request that suburban schools bus their children into the inner city?

abs

369

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

Through you, Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Farr.

REP. FARR: (19th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, this in no way, as I understand it, will affect that. The programs for magnet schools are funded under different grants. I am not aware of how this grant would in any way apply. This grant is specific to what's called programs for inter-community programs for disadvantaged youngsters. It's dealing with busing disadvantaged youngsters to other communities. I think what the Representative is referring to is busing youngsters, non-disadvantaged youngsters, into another community. This program in this amendment has to deal with the busing of disadvantaged youngsters. And so, I don't think its passage will in any way affect magnet school concepts, one way or the other.

REP. BEAMON: (72nd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, just one concluding comment. I feel very strongly that all students should have an equal chance to participate in desegregated schools. But, if what we are doing here in this amendment would serve to provide some incentives for our school systems to take a different look at how we

abs

370

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

educate, not only in suburbia, but also in the inner city, it would also seem plausible to me that what we would also do is provide incentives for inner city school systems to take on suburban students.

Therefore, I oppose this amendment, because I really don't see it being as the added incentive for us to really start integrating our schools fully. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark? If not, staff and guests, please come to the Well. Members, please be seated. The machine will be opened.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call. Members, kindly report to the Chamber. The House of Representatives is taking a roll call vote. Members, please report to the Chamber.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Have all the members voted, and is your vote properly recorded? Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted, and is your vote properly recorded? If all the members have voted, the machine

abs

371

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

will be locked. Clerk, please take a tally. Clerk,
please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Amendment Schedule "B" to HB7579:

Total Number Voting	142
Necessary for Passage	72
Those Voting Yea	71
Those Voting Nay	71
Those absent and not Voting	9

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The amendment fails.

House Amendment Schedule "B":

After line 693, insert the following:

"Sec. 12. Section 10-262h of the general statutes,
is amended by adding subsection (c) as follows:

(NEW) (c) Notwithstanding any agreement made pursuant to subsection (b) of section 10-266j, for the fiscal year ending June 30, 1991, and each fiscal year thereafter, (1) for a town which is a sending district, as defined in section 10-266j, the following amount shall be subtracted from the equalization aid grant entitlement for the town pursuant to this section for each such year: An amount equal to one-half of the equalization aid entitlement on a per pupil basis for the town for the preceding fiscal year, multiplied by the number of children participating in intercommunity programs pursuant to section 10-266j for such preceding fiscal year for whom the town is responsible by law for providing an education program and (2) for a town which is a receiving district, as defined in section 10-266j, the following amount shall be added to the educational aid grant entitlement for the town for each such year: An amount equal to one-half of the education aid grant entitlement on a per pupil basis for each sending district for such preceding fiscal year, multiplied by

abs

372

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

the number of children from each such sending district for whom the receiving district provided an educational program in such preceding fiscal year."

REP. SCHLESINGER: (114th)

Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Schlesinger.

REP. SCHLESINGER: (114th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. If you'll indulge me, a question, through you, to the proponent or the Chairman of the Education Committee.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. SCHLESINGER: (114th)

Thank you, sir. Through you, Mr. Speaker, the first section of this bill portends to include the roof repairs in a school in the MER calculations. My question, through you, and it was touched upon by Representative Young before-- My question, through you, is how do we substantiate this, when we consider roof repairs now as a capital expenditure in the way we plan at the state level, and we do not pay for it out of an appropriation? We pay for it in long term bonding.

REP. COHEN: (15th)

abs

373

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

Mr. Speaker, I'm sorry. I am going to have to ask to have the question repeated. I could not hear it.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

(gavel) Members, please quiet it down. We are closing in on the end of the day. I know people are tired. Representative Schlesinger.

REP. SCHLESINGER: (114th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, again. Roof repairs are handled at the state level in the last few years as not an appropriation, but rather as a bonding item. Yet, here when we are using the local calculation of the MER, we are converting to a yearly expenditure includable in the MER. Isn't that a dichotomy that shouldn't be approached? That's my question.

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Cohen.

REP. COHEN: (15th)

I have two responses to Representative Schlesinger's question. It is my understanding, first of all, sir, that the money for the roof repairs is in fact bonded now, a change a previous General Assembly made. But, the interest on those bond funds is paid out of the appropriation's General Fund account. So,

abs

374

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

we pay in two ways for those roof repairs.

This issue was discussed, sir, in terms of changes to the ECS formula when we adopted it last year. And, that's all I can say, really. Thank you.

REP. SCHLESINGER: (114th)

Well, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Schlesinger.

REP. SCHLESINGER: (114th)

We have been very generous to our communities through the new ECS formula, and it doesn't seem fair to me to let these funds be circumvented through the educational system and end up in other areas of a local town's budget, because of a particular leadership or whatever in that particular town that says, "Hey, we can use the money somewhere else. We don't have to include it, because we don't have to worry about the MER, because now this roof repair can go into our educational expense cost MER determination."

I don't think that's really fair, especially considering the generosity this state has had to our local municipalities over the last several years. I'd have to oppose the bill for this reason. I really don't think this is a technical bill, that aspect. The other parts are fairly technical, but that aspect is

abs

375

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

pretty substantive, and I don't think I am ready to buy on and let towns take GTB or call it ECS funding and use it for other parts of the budget. That's not what we meant with educational funding, and I don't think it's right.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

Will you remark?

REP. NORTON: (48th)

Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Norton of the 48th.

REP. NORTON: (48th)

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I have a question to the proponent of the bill, on section 3, subdivision (17c), roman numeral I. Here, it says, and I guess I am talking about line 67 and 8, and it brackets out the phrase under (c) "expenditures directly attributable to", and then it says "tuition received on account of non-resident students."

It then seems in lines 83, 84, and 85 to take that language and put it into, I don't know, subsection (d), "expenditures of funds from private and other sources and--" I am sorry, then, (e), "tuition received on account of non-resident students." And, I am wondering

abs

376

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

what's getting done there? It seems to be the same seven words moved from section (c). I guess, I am-- roman numeral I and then moved over here to (d). And, I don't understand what's going here.

And, the reason I am asking is that I have a town that contracts with another town for the education of its high school students, and the bill's summary seems to say that there is a change in the reimbursement. The bill's summary on page 18 says, "This means the towns that pay tuition for their students to attend a school in a regional district are ineligible for the extra grant." And, I am wondering what's happening to towns like mine?

Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent of the bill.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Cohen.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

No, I--

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Oh, excuse me. Representative Millerick.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, you're referring to line 34?

REP. NORTON: (48th)

abs

377

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

No, line 67 and 68. It might, the language, some of the same activity might be going on in line 34.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

34 is the key to it. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. NORTON: (48th)

Well, I--

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

The wording was changed from "as" to "such".

REP. NORTON: (48th)

Okay.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

From "a" to "such", and what that accomplishes, it tells us that the student must be in the district or dealing with the district, in order to have the money come to their sending district. In other words, if your school district is associated with a regional district high school, say. Then, this says, if that is such a case, then you do get the bonus. And that's why the wording was changed.

REP. NORTON: (48th)

Okay. I won't pretend to be absolutely clear on that just yet. I-- My town, the town of Salem, which I represent, contracts with the town of East Lyme for its high school students. Now, East Lyme is not a regional school district. So then, it doesn't even

abs

378

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

matter at all. Is that the case? It's not at all relevant?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Millerick.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

It does not qualify.

REP. NORTON: (48th)

Okay. So, it doesn't-- Okay, thank you very much, Mr. Speaker, and I am glad to have had that clarified. Thanks for your time.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Thank you.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further? Representative Tiffany of the 36th.

REP. TIFFANY: (36th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question, following that same vein. I find somewhat of a contradiction in the fiscal statement where it says Municipal Impact. It gives as none. And then, following previous speaker's question, the OLR report would seem to indicate that perhaps there are some towns that are now presently sending students to a regional school district, who are getting that bonus and will not, after the passage of the bill. And, through you, sir, that is my question.

abs

379

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

Are there indeed some towns now getting this \$25 bonus?

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, to my knowledge, there are not. And, that's why the changes are made in the file copy, to reflect that. They are not under policy now, and they are making it very clear that they won't be in the future.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Are there any other--? Representative Maddox of the 66th.

REP. MADDOX: (66th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I just want to, if I can-- And I hate to keep beating a dead horse, but I just want to get it clarified. As I understand this, either to the proponent of the bill, dealing with construction cost. Current practice is: we are not allowing municipalities and school districts a credit on their minimum expenditure requirement for these costs now. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Millerick.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, we are now. Under the new formula, we are. Construction expenditures are

abs

380

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

included now.

REP. MADDOX: (66th)

What's being proposed in the bill? Or, what was actually the law?

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

It is actually the law. The bill is clarifying it.

REP. MADDOX: (66th)

Maybe it would be better, Mr. Chairman, if it's okay, maybe if the Chairman of the Education Committee--?

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Would you like to talk to an expert? One moment, please.

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Mr. Speaker, may I ask Representative Maddox to repeat his question to me, please?

REP. MADDOX: (66th)

Gladly. Through you, Mr. Speaker, I just want to get it clarified. Under current practice, right now, we are not allowing, which actually is written in statute as we speak now, municipalities to count certain capital expenditures like roof repair towards their minimum educational requirement. Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. COHEN: (15th)

abs

381

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Cohen.

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Yes, that is correct. Under the GTB, you are correct, sir.

REP. MADDOX: (66th)

And what I understand that this bill is seeking to do is to make a technical change, to allow that to occur for a capital expenditure to count towards their MER, right? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Cohen.

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, you are partially correct, Representative Maddox. We are allowing capital building expenditures, if you read the file copy, except for those things which are provided in certain sections of the statutes. So, we are talking about capital building expenditures which are not funded through some other provision of the statutes.

REP. MADDOX: (66th)

And through you, Mr. Speaker, would this not down the road, therefore, have a fiscal impact upon the State of Connecticut? Down the road. I am not

abs

382

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

talking necessarily right now, but down the road, in the sense that the MER is being changed for different municipalities depending on their level of construction. Through you, Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Cohen.

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I can't really say, Representative Maddox. The MER that will occur under the ECS formula, which is what this bill addresses, is calculated in a different way from the MER under the GTB, under which we are now operating.

REP. MADDOX: (66th)

Well, through you, Mr. Speaker, would it be plausible that there could be some change in the ranking of the municipalities and towns for state reimbursement due to this change in their MER? Through you, Mr. Speaker?

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The new MER will not rank, sir, in the way that the old MER ranks. The new MER will say that every town must spend a minimum amount, and that the state will pay to each town a certain percentage of the MER. That is different from the way the current MER works.

abs

383

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

REP. MADDOX: (66th)

Correct. But, if a certain municipality were to take on a major capital expenditure, such as replacing roofs, that could run into the millions of dollars on a large building, wouldn't that effect that region's MER and overall effect the state's? Of course average spending? Through you, Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Cohen.

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, when a district bonds for a major multi-million dollar capital expenditure, as you describe it, the expenditure is usually funded over a twenty year or longer period, so we are not talking about multi-million dollar expenditures in one year of a district's funding.

REP. MADDOX: (66th)

I understand that. But, there could be of course some up front preparation costs, and there would still be that amortized over ten, fifteen or twenty years. And, would it not affect their MER? I mean, to me, what I am trying to get at, Representative Cohen, is: don't you believe that with this change, that there is going to be some fiscal impact upon a district's MER, depending upon how much capital construction they may

abs

384

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

count towards their MER? Through you, Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Cohen.

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, it was my understanding as the Committee debated this bill, and discussed it, that there would not be a major fiscal impact to the state. We began this discussion to change statutory references which currently existed for GTB to ECS, sir.

REP. MADDOX: (66th)

I understand that, Representative Cohen. And I didn't say there would be a major. I am talking about any fiscal impact. In your opinion, Representative Cohen, would there be any fiscal impact? Through you, Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Cohen.

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, according to the OFA fiscal analysis, all sections of this bill are technical, are clarifying in nature, and thus have no fiscal impact.

REP. MADDOX: (66th)

No, I understand that, Representative Cohen. I read the fiscal note. But, we just spent the last ten

abs

385

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

minutes, and as I understand it, we are changing some portion of that, not to say of course that OFA would ever be wrong. But, I am just asking what you, personally, believe, after, based on our last ten minutes' conversation. Through you, Mr. Speaker?

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe OFA, Representative Maddox.

REP. MADDUX: (66th)

Well, Mr. Speaker, I'll have to be honest with you. I'd love to believe OFA, and I wish last year, we had all believed OFA's revenue estimates, and some of us did and some of us didn't. I honestly believe that this is going to have a maybe minor but some sort of fiscal impact down the road, just for the section, just for the reasons of what Representative Cohen and I have just recently discussed, the fact that we are allowing now municipalities to go and count towards their MER certain construction costs.

If a municipality undertakes these certain construction costs, even if they do it on their own over a period of ten years, upgrading a roof, whatever else may be covered on this, it is going to, in my opinion, change their MER and potentially could change their state reimbursement. I just wanted to share this

abs

386

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

with the body. I hope you'll consider this is reviewing this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the bill?

REP. KRAWIECKI: (78th)

Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative-- Representative--

REP. KRAWIECKI: (78th)

Krawiecki, Mr. Speaker, Krawiecki.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

I indeed know the name, sir. It was a matter of liquid. Representative Krawiecki.

REP. KRAWIECKI: (78th)

A question, through you, to the proponent of the bill, please.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Please proceed, Representative Krawiecki.

REP. KRAWIECKI: (78th)

And I don't know whether Representative Millerick is answering now, or Representative Cohen, or both or some or either or or whoever. My question, I think, is rather simple. Lines 532 through 539 of the bill, subsection (10) formerly is being deleted from the

abs

387

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

bill. So, I have a two-fold question. Number one, why is it being deleted? And, number two, is it supposed to be brought back anywhere? Or, is it one of these obsolete sections that is made reference to in the OLR report at the end of the bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker?

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Mr. Speaker?

REP. KRAWIECKI: (78th)

I'll take any answer, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Millerick.

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

May I yield to Naomi, please?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Cohen, do you accept the yield?

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Yes, thank you, sir, I do. That is being deleted, Representative Krawiecki, through you, Mr. Speaker, because that language refers to the GTB formula and not to the ECS formula.

REP. KRAWIECKI: (78th)

And through you, Mr. Speaker, the new formula deals only with total population? Is that a correct assumption?

abs

388

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the new formula deals with total population. Also, it deals with guaranteed wealth level, sir.

REP. KRAWIECKI: (78th)

Right. Thank you.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Jaekle.

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A question, through you, to the proponent of the bill, please? I am referring to section 5 of the bill, which has to do with the equalization grant payments as I, anyways, have kind of read the file against the statute. It talks about the payments going out 25% in October, 25% in January, and the balance of the grants in April. That's current law, but there is a new provision in this file that talks about towns that have not adopted the uniform fiscal year, where they would get the balance, 50%, that last 50% of their grants in the month of March rather than April, if that is what would bring it

abs

389

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

into the fiscal year.

My question, specifically, is for a town that may have, I know, a rather unusual fiscal year, let's say April 1st to March 30th, and there are towns like that, I can assure you. Would that mean that if a town receives some educational grant money, in essence their equalization grant money, let's say April of '88, they are going to get 25% of the new grant in October, 25% in January, and the last 50% in March? In essence, more than 100% of their annual grant money in that town's fiscal year? Because of this change? Through you, Mr. Speaker?

REP. MILLERICK: (22nd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I think I'll have to yield to our Chairman again on this.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Cohen, do you accept the yield?

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Yes, thank you, sir. Through you, it's my understanding that no town can ever receive more than 100% of its grant in any fiscal year. And, that this language would provide for it. No one from the Council of Small Towns, the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities, the State Department of Education or anyone raised to us throughout discussions of this bill

abs

390

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

the problem that you raise now, Representative Jaekle. So, I am not aware that it is a problem, sir.

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

Thank you. I appreciate the answer, and I guess I want to indicate it's not a problem to the State of Connecticut. We pay out our moneys in our fiscal year, July 1st to June 30th, and I am not even saying it is a problem for a town. They won't get less than 100% of their grant, and I am not sure any town would come before you and complain that they might be getting 150% of their grant in their fiscal year.

I cannot find any language in the file copy or in the statute that would prevent for next year a town that receives some equalization moneys after April 1st of 1989, this year, in essence receiving 100% grant in our state's next fiscal year, but still within their April 1, 1989 to March 30, 1990 fiscal year.

Could the distinguished Chair of the Education Committee give me any guidance in the statute or the bill as to where there is indeed a prohibition of a town receiving more than 100% grant payments in the town's fiscal year? Through you, Mr. Speaker?

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, my answer to Representative Jaekle is yes and no. No, I cannot tell

abs

391

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

you exactly where in the total General Statutes of Connecticut the language appears, but yes, I am certain that there is language in our statutes that provides that if towns receive overpayment of grants, that overpayment will be deducted from subsequent year grants, sir. So, I am not overly concerned that the State of Connecticut will be paying out to municipalities more than they are entitled to.

And, as I said to you before, because no one in the grant processing division of the State Department of Education pointed out to us that there was a problem with this, I feel fairly comfortable in saying that I believe that it will work, regardless of town's fiscal years.

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the distinguished Chair of the Education Committee, I know that this file, if passed, becomes like the latest education laws. Indeed, I gather that's why we are doing it. It is making technical revisions to our education grant formulas. Lines 125 through 130 of the file copy seem to call for 100% payments of grants for non-uniform fiscal year towns, to be happening between July 1, '89 and March of 1990.

Is-- Am I misreading that section? Does it say

abs

392

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

unless provided elsewhere? Would that not become the controlling law, the latest, if you will, grant distribution law of the State of Connecticut, if we pass this file as is?

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, let me suggest that this would become the current law. But, I do not believe, and you could correct me, sir, if I am wrong. I do not believe that it would obliterate other statutes which deal with grant payments. And, I do believe that there are other statutes which deal with grant payments which suggest that no town can receive more than its entitled to, and should that happen, through error, then the overpayment will be deducted from the subsequent year grant.

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, then, through you, would the effect if that is correct of lines 125 through 130 mean that a state would receive a windfall in their current fiscal year, the April 1st to March 30th fiscal year town? And, thus in the next fiscal year actually lose 50% of their education grant money from the State of Connecticut?

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I have to say again,

abs

393

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

Representative Jaekle, that I don't believe that that will happen, because of what our Committee was told by the Grants Processing Division of the Department of Education. If you are aware of an example where you could cite to us how you think this language would relate to a particular town's fiscal year and why that would happen, I would welcome that information, sir.

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. My town, up until very recently, has had a uniform fiscal year of April 1st to March 30th. And, we are now in the process of paying certain mini-tax bills, because the present Council in my town has said it would be to our town's advantage to make this conversion and provide a supplemental tax on our citizens in the town of Stratford. And, now I am wondering, if we pass this, whether I should go home and indicate to my town that maybe we'd better undue what we just did, because we may get an extra grant payment from the State of Connecticut under my reading of this law, because we were - and I suppose are, in essence, until July 1st - a non-uniform fiscal year town, April 1st to March 30th.

And, it looks to me like between July 1st and next March 30th, if my town remained with that fiscal year, we'd receive 100% of our educational equalization grant

abs

394

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

money. And, the moneys that we got in after April 1st, just this month, is a bonus to my town. I might be able to go back home with some news that will not only save my constituents this supplemental tax bill, but provide a surplus to my constituents as well. There is a concrete example, and I am wondering why I shouldn't bring this information to my town, if we pass this legislation with section 5 language intact?

Through you, Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Cohen.

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I would never presume to advise you, Representative Jaekle, on what to tell your town. But, I would suggest that if you are considering giving them the message that you just suggested that you also remind them that if indeed you are correct, there are other statutes which apply to language which deals with overpayment of grants and subsequent deductions. And, should a town, if you are correct - and I frankly do not know whether you are correct or not. But, if you are correct, that your town might find itself having money deducted from a subsequent year grant, sir.

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

abs

395

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

Then, Mr. Speaker, I would like to repose my question. If the affect of this change in the law will provide a windfall to a community in one fiscal year and a loss of 50% of their education grant moneys in the next year, why in the world are we making this change which will ultimately hurt municipalities, taxpayers, and more importantly and devastatingly the students receiving education in those municipalities?

Why are we making this change? Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the distinguished Chair of the Education Committee?

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, let me be very clear. We are not making this change to hurt any students in the State of Connecticut. We are making this change because when last year's ECS bill was reviewed, it was told to us by the Department of Education Grants Processing Division that there were technical corrections that needed to be made. What you see, beginning in line 125, is one of those corrections.

I am making the assumption, sir, that that language was developed following a complete look at every town, its grant payments and its payment schedule, and that the Department would not be suggesting that the state create windfalls and then take away grants in

abs

396

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

subsequent years, if it felt that that were a problem. I cannot tell you other than that, and I am sorry.

REP. JAEKLE: (122nd)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I am, too. I won't belabor it, but I believe this section of the technical corrections bill is ill-advised for, I realize a small number of towns that are indeed an apparition, and also out of compliance with our law on going to a uniform fiscal year, July 1st to June 30th. But, I believe that my reading of this is correct.

And, any town that received an equalization grant after April 1st of this year, that is getting it in this month, or I suppose, in May or June of this year, will get a 100% equalization grant under this technical change. Anything they are getting in during this fiscal year from the state is a bonus to that town. And, it is not going to be an overpayment in the state's fiscal year, but for the town's fiscal year. And, for those towns thinking of converting to a uniform fiscal year, I thought we wanted them to and not reward them for staying off of it. And, this is working in the wrong direction.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?
Will you remark? Representative Belden of the 113th.

abs

397

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, along with Representative Jaekle, I am very concerned over lines 125 to 130 of the file copy. It does a couple of things which I think are outside of the purview of the Education Committee. It establishes a policy which encourages or enhances towns' continued disregard for Connecticut law concerning the uniform fiscal year.

It encourages them to continue on with their course of whatever their fiscal year is, and they are going to get their funds anyway. In fact, as I understand the file, and I think Representative Jaekle is right, they may get a bonus one year.

Mr. Speaker, I believe that there are other committees in the General Assembly that have cognizance over this matter. I am trying to figure out in my own mind which one has cognizance over municipal fiscal years, and I would believe it is Planning and Development. All matters relating to local government. And, Mr. Speaker, I would move that this bill be referred to the Committee on Planning and Development.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question asked, I believe by Representative Belden, was the thought that this bill may belong in

abs

398

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

the-- The motion raised by Representative Belden was whether or not this bill belonged in the Planning and Development Committee. Representative Cohen.

REP. COHEN: (15th)

Mr. Speaker, I rise to oppose the motion for a couple of reasons, the first of which is I do not believe that Representative Belden is correct in saying that the Education Committee, through this bill, has encouraged towns to violate another statute which requires them to be on a uniform fiscal year. I believe what the bill says is that we are looking for an orderly way to pay towns grants whatever their fiscal year is.

Secondly, I would point out to you, Mr. Speaker, that in my recollection over the seven years that I have been here, that when this Chamber has debated school funding matters, and when we debated most recently ECS, those bills never went to Planning and Development. And, I don't think that based on past precedent that tonight is the night to start that.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the motion to refer? Will you remark further? If not, we'll try your minds. All those in favor of referral, please signify by saying aye.

abs

399

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

All those opposed, nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

No.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The motion is refer fails. Will you remark further
on the bill? Will you remark?

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Belden.

REP. BELDEN: (113th)

Mr. Speaker, I suppose in the words of former
Representative Dorothy Goodwin, on balance there is
probably more good than evil in the bill, and I will
probably support it. But, I have just go to say, you
know, we are over here, pushing and shoving this way
over here and now in lines 124 to 128, we are pushing
and shoving over here.

You know, I had another bill in the Finance
Committee this year to set up a penalty in grants to
towns who failed to adopt a uniform fiscal year. We do
not have an even handed tax policy by the

abs

400

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

municipalities fostered on the residents in those municipalities. When one town does not reevaluate for fifteen years, you don't get the same tax structure that the town next door does that follows the law.

So, I suppose I will vote for this bill, but let me say, I believe we need to be a little more even handed with our policy that we incorporate into these omnibus bills. Thank you.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Will you remark further on the bill as amended? Will you remark? If not, staff and guests, please come to the Well. Members, please be seated. The machine will be opened.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call. All members, to the Chamber please. The House is voting by roll call. All members, to the Chamber please.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Have all the members voted, and is their vote properly recorded? If so, the machine will be locked. Clerk, please take a tally. Clerk, please announce the tally.

CLERK:

abs

401

House of Representatives

Wednesday, April 26, 1989

HB7579, as amended by House Amendment

Schedule "A":

Total Number Voting	143
Necessary for Passage	72
Those Voting Yea	124
Those Voting Nay	19
Those absent and not Voting	8

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The bill as amended is passed.

CLERK:

Calendar 365, on page 12, HB7538. AN ACT

CONCERNING THE LEASING OF BUILDINGS TO THE STATE.

Favorable Report of the Committee on GOVERNMENT
ADMINISTRATION AND ELECTIONS.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Frankel.

REP. FRANKEL: (121st)

Mr. Speaker?

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

Representative Frankel.

REP. FRANKEL: (121st)

Mr. Speaker, I move that this bill be referred to
the Committee on Appropriations.

SPEAKER BALDUCCI:

The question is on referral. Is there objection?

S-292

CONNECTICUT
GEN ASSEMBLY
, SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
1989

VOL 32
PART 5
1510-1902

WEDNESDAY
May 3, 1989

1647

8
aak

Calendar 339 is marked Passed Temporarily.

Calendar 340, Substitute HB5977, I move to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR O'LEARY:

341, Substitute HB7478, I move to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR O'LEARY:

Calendar 342, Substitute HB7579, I move to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR O'LEARY:

Page 9, Calendar 343 is marked Go. 344, Passed Retaining. 345, Go. 346, HB7303, I move to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR O'LEARY:

Calendar 347 is marked Passed Temporarily. Page 10, Calendar 348 is marked Passed Temporarily. 349, Substitute HB5108, I refer to the foot of the Calendar.

WEDNESDAY
May 3, 1989

1663
24
aak

return to the Chamber. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Please give your attention to the Clerk who will read the items that have been referred to the Consent Calendar.

THE CLERK:

The first Consent Calendar begins on Calendar Page 2. Calendar 201, Substitute HB7265. Calendar Page 3, Calendar 274, Substitute HB7376. Calendar 285, SB67.

Calendar Page 4, Calendar 286, Substitute SB1041. Calendar 293, Substitute HB6394.

Calendar Page 6, Calendar 326, Substitute SB708. Calendar Page 8, Calendar 338, Substitute SB572.

Calendar 340, Substitute HB5977. Calendar 341, Substitute HB7478. Calendar 342, Substitute HB7579.

Calendar Page 9, Calendar 346, HB7303. Calendar Page 10, Calendar 350, HB7470. Calendar 351,

Substitute HB7490. Calendar Page 11, Calendar 354, Substitute HB5519. Calendar 355, Substitute HB7274.

Calendar Page 12, Calendar 360, Substitute HB7395. Calendar 361, Substitute HB5318. Calendar 362, Substitute HB7135. Calendar 363, HB7367.

Calendar Page 13, Calendar 364, HB5704. Calendar

WEDNESDAY
May 3, 1989

1664
25
aak

366, HB7438.

Calendar Page 15, Calendar 182, Substitute SB768.
Mr. President, I believe that completes the call of the
first Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Matthews.

SENATOR MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I would like to remove
on Page 6, SB708 Calendar 326, AN ACT CONCERNING RADIATION
CONTROL. I would like to remove it from the Consent
Calendar for the purposes of adding an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

It's removed. Further changes or omissions?

SENATOR MATTHEWS:

Thank you. I move adoption of the amendment...

THE CHAIR:

Excuse me, not right now. We are going to take up
the Consent Calendar, then immediately take up your
amendment.

Further changes? The motion is to adopt Consent
Calendar #1. The machine is open. Please record your
vote. Has everyone voted? The machine is closed.
Clerk please tally the vote.

The result of the vote:

36 Yea

WEDNESDAY
May 3, 1989

1665
26
aak

0 Nay

The first Consent Calendar is adopted.

The Senate will stand at ease. May I have order please. Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Calendar Page 6, Calendar 326 which was removed from the Consent Calendar. It is File 492, SB708, AN ACT CONCERNING RADIATION CONTROL. Favorable Report of the Committee on FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING. Clerk is in possession of one amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Matthews.

SENATOR MATTHEWS:

Thank you, Mr. President. I move adoption of the amendment...

THE CHAIR:

No, we have to move for adoption of the bill first.

SENATOR MATTHEWS:

I move adoption of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

There is an amendment, Clerk please call the amendment.

THE CLERK:

LCO6381 designated Senate Amendment Schedule "A" offered by Senator Matthews of the 9th District.

JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS

EDUCATION
PART 5
1399-1728

1989

15
kfh

EDUCATION

March 27, 1989

REP. COHEN: Thank you very much. Bob Brewer.

BOB BREWER: Good morning. My name is Bob Brewer. I'm here on behalf of the Department of Education to speak in support of HB7579 and HB7552. Some written testimony has been distributed, so I'll just highlight the key provisions.

REP. COHEN: It's very short, Bob. I can't wait to hear the highlights.

BOB BREWER: HB7579, AN ACT CONCERNING REVISIONS TO THE STATUTES CONCERNING EDUCATION EQUALIZATION AID provides for some technical corrections to a law that was passed last year for the new education cost sharing grant. The key provisions are the clarifying that only regional, members of regional school districts will be eligible to receive a bonus on these provisions of the statutes.

It clarifies certain expenditures that will not count in school district's computation of meeting their minimum expenditure requirements. It excludes certain things such as tuition revenues, capital expenditures and so on. It clarifies that to make it more compatible with the former, to meet statute requirements under the GTB laws.

It provides that towns not operating under the uniform fiscal year can continue to receive their federal payment in time for the close of their school year, and it clarifies the minimum expenditure requirement for members of K through 12 regional school districts to provide that all towns in such districts will have the same minimum expenditure requirement.

In viewing this piece of legislation, we noted a few minor technical added sentences that have to be made to the bill as it's written and we will share that information with you.

HB7552, AN ACT CONCERNING AUTHORIZATION OF STATE GRANT COMMITMENTS FOR SCHOOL BUILDING PROJECTS, there is the annual legislation under which the General Assembly authorizes the State Department to enter grant commitments for school construction projects.

H.B. 7579
AN ACT CONCERNING REVISIONS TO THE STATUTES
CONCERNING EDUCATION EQUALIZATION AID

1686

What H.B. 7579 Does:

- o Makes technical corrections to the ECS program as follows:
 - Refines definition of regional bonus by limiting eligibility only to towns which are members of a regional school district.
 - Refines definition of regular program expenditures by excluding expenditures supported by private and other source revenue, excluding tuition revenues received on account of nonresident students, excluding capital expenditures for land and building, and to preclude deduction of certain types of school construction projects which allow towns to receive credit towards their MERs.
 - Provides that towns not operating under the uniform fiscal year will continue to receive their ECS grant payments in accordance with the schedule for GTB grant payments.
 - Provides that all towns which are members of a K-12 regional school district are to have the same minimum spending level in order to be consistent with provisions under the GTB/MER program.
 - Fixes MER cap for each town based on the data of record as of December 1 of the year preceding the grant year.
 - Additional revisions delete references to and repeals obsolete sections concerning general state aid.