Legislative History for Connecticut Act

Act Number: 01-9 (June Special Session)

Bill Number: 7507

Senate Pages: 4053-4055 3

House Pages: 8116-8188 73

Committee: No Hearings

Page Total: 76

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

Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2012

S-463

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
SENATE

PROCEEDINGS
2001

VOL. 44
PART 13
VETO SESSION
JUNE SPECIAL
SESSION
3799-4122

A. EMERGENCY CERTIFICATION

HB7507 An Act Concerning the Expenditures of the Office of Policy and Management.

6/29 House Passed with House "A" and "B"

End of Senate Agenda #3

THE CHAIR:

Senator Jepsen.

SEN. JEPSEN:

If the Clerk could call HB7507.

THE CLERK:

Calling from Senate Agenda No. 3, Emergency Certified Bill HB7507, An Act Concerning the Expenditures of the Office of Policy and Management, as amended by House Amendment Schedules A and B. The bill is accompanied by Emergency Certification, signed the Honorable Kevin B. Sullivan, President Pro Tempore of the Senate, the Honorable Moira Lyons, Speaker of the House of Representatives.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Crisco.

SEN. CRISCO:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move adoption of the bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage in concurrence with the House. Will you remark?

SEN. CRISCO:

Yes, Madam President. I ask permission to briefly summarize. Madam President, if I stated that this was the Encyclopedia Britannica, perhaps I would be somewhat correct. But, it is a very extensive implementing bill which addresses many issues that needed to be addressed, many technical. Some are of substance, and I move its adoption.

THE CHAIR:

Question is on passage. Will you remark? Will you remark? If not, would the Clerk please announce a roll call vote. The machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber. An immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? If all members have voted, the machine will be locked. Clerk please announce the

tally.

THE CLERK:

Motion is on passage of Emergency Certified Bill as amended, HB7507.

Total Number Voting	24
Those voting Yea	23
Those voting Nay	1
Those absent and not voting	12

THE CHAIR:

The bill is passed. Senator Jepsen.

SEN. JEPSEN:

Madam President, I move for immediate transmittal of HB7506 to the Governor.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SEN. JEPSEN:

And I move for immediate transmittal of HB7507 to the Governor.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered. Senator Jepsen.

SEN. JEPSEN:

There being no further business, I thank everybody for their patience, and I move we stand adjourned, sine die.

THE CHAIR:

H-862

CONNECTICUT
GEN. ASSEMBLY
HOUSE

PROCEEDINGS
2001

JUNE
SPECIAL
SESSION
JULY 23
VETO
SESSION
JULY 23
SPECIAL
SESSION

VOL. 44
PART 24
8038-823

CLERK:

H.B. 7507, Emergency Certification, AN ACT CONCERNING THE EXPENDITURES OF THE OFFICE OF POLICY AND MANAGEMENT, LCO Number 9203, introduced by Representative Lyons and Senator Sullivan.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis, you have the floor, Madam.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And good morning.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Good morning, to you.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

And good morning to everyone else too. I move adoption and passage of Emergency Certification H.B. 7507.

SPEAKER LYONS:

The question before the Chamber is on adoption. Will you remark, Madam?

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. First of all, before I begin a summary of this, I just wanted to take the opportunity to thank you and everyone who has participated in this lengthy and enjoyable process and frustrating process. There's just been a lot of time committed by so many people and I know many, many people

have thanked you in the past, but I think now that we're coming to the end of this wonderful period of time that we spend together, that once again I do think that we need to do that again.

There are numerous technical changes that were made to this bill. There are 130 sections, as I'm sure you've noticed if you've taken a look at it.

I'm, obviously, not going to walk you through every one of them. But I will hit just a few highlights.

As I said, many of the technical changes actually occurred in a lot of the legislation that we've already done this session. Some, as recently as yesterday.

A few of the other highlights include changes that we've made to the residential underground storage tank amnesty program, which effect eligibility and reimbursement.

There's a change that will allow the commissioner of DECD to establish an entrepreneurial training program for former recipients of TNF general assistance.

There's also a study that will be conducted within here regarding aerial pesticide spraying and alternative methods for applications of pesticides.

And there's also another -- there was a fix to an unintended consequence regarding lake patrol and carrying batons, which I know many people were pleased

about.

It also requires the Department of Health to conduct a study on the feasibility of establishing a program testing newborns for el-chat and similar protein deficiencies.

It requires the Department of Social Services to make information available concerning pharmaceutical company programs for indigent persons.

It continues to provide benefits for certain legal aliens over the next year. That's something I know we've all been talking about recently and that was a very positive thing that we were able to do.

It also returns to current law, changes that were made in the definition of the college and university pilot program. It does return it back to its current language as it exists. The reason it had been changed initially was due to some positive changes that we were hoping to make to help colleges and hospitals, but upon further investigation of the language, it was determined it needed more work. So we're returned it, at this time, back to its current language.

And finally, it establishes a commission to study current and alternative voting technology and absentee ballot counting technology and it permits municipalities to use this technology on a pilot basis for the

November, 2001 general election.

Madam Speaker, I move adoption.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Once again, the lady has moved adoption of the Emergency Certified bill.

Do you care to remark? Do you care to remark further on the bill that is before us?

Representative Cardin.

REP. CARDIN: (53RD)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I have a couple of questions to the proponent of the bill.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Please frame your question, sir.

REP. CARDIN: (53RD)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, in regards to Section 42, I know one of the issues that we debated in the past, I should say, regular legislative session, was the issue of contracting the emissions testing services out to, let's say, other companies besides the one that's currently providing the service to the constituents of Connecticut.

Am I to read that in Section 42 of this special bill, H.B. 7507, that small repair shops in Connecticut can provide this service, assuming that the Commissioner may authorize or appoint these dealerships or repair

shops to do so?

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'd like to yield to Representative Cocco who will be able to provide you with more detail on this issue.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cardin, if you would please redirect your question to Representative Cocco, I'm sure she would be more than happy to answer your question.

REP. CARDIN: (53RD)

Thank you. Yes, through you, Madam Speaker.

Section 42 of this bill, H.B. 7507, talks about the Commissioner may authorize or appoint any motor vehicle dealer or repairer that is licensed in accordance with Section 14-52 that has qualifications established by the Commissioner to conduct emission inspections.

I guess generally put, my concern is that any dealer, repair shop, any auto sales shop, any Pep Boys in Connecticut may, if the Commissioner deems appropriate, to provide the emissions testing that is now provided by the current company that the State has contracted with.

Is that how I read this bill?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cocco.

REP. COCCO: (127TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. This section of the bill is drawn very broadly, Representative Cardin, in order to attract, to bid numerous people. In other words, we did not want to exclude ourselves to one particular company who actually have a leg up since they own all of the places where emissions inspections are done at the present time.

So we broadened the aspect of the bid in order to garner other bids as we go forward. That does not mean, sir, that we are saying, by virtue of this bill, that indeed we are going out to repairers or dealers and I will express to you that during session, when we had public hearings and when we had discussions, we had little interest from that particular group.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cardin.

REP. CARDIN: (53RD)

I guess I'll say at the outset, I apologize my colleagues. I know the hour is late, but I feel that this is a very important issue.

If I could ask just a couple of more questions,

through you, Madam Speaker.

The current company that is contracted with the State, when does their contract expire?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cocco.

REP. COCCO: (127TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. June 30th or July 1st, 2002.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cardin.

REP. CARDIN: (53RD)

And the way I read this legislation, Madam Speaker, through you, is that when that contract expires, the State or essentially the Commissioner of, I believe it's DMV, can contract with anybody that is with the company that he deems appropriate that submits a bid to the State for these emission testings.

Is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cocco.

REP. COCCO: (127TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. Obviously, the State, I'm sure the Commissioner and the Office of Policy and

Management will decide on a bid. However, that language does come to the Transportation Committee of the Legislature for review.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cardin.

REP. CARDIN: (53RD)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm glad to hear that that contract will come before the committee of cognizance.

However, if I'm reading the legislation correctly, through you, Madam Speaker, this legislation does not preclude the small repair shops, the Chevy, the Ford, the Buick auto dealers in Connecticut to form an association to bid on this contract.

Is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cocco.

REP. COCCO: (127TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. Probably not. However, I would say to Representative Cardin that when we're talking about part of the contract which deals with OBD or on board diagnostic testing, that testing would probably be done in dealerships, since they are the people who are already up and running with that kind of

equipment. They do this test already. We are, in fact, hopeful that in the future, we will be moving toward that sort of test rather than going to a fixed site doing the MS-40, which we're doing now, which is the tailpipe test.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cardin.

REP. CARDIN: (53RD)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Do those auto dealerships, the small repair shops have the technical capabilities to deal with those tail pipes emission testing right now or will they in 2002?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cocco.

REP. COCCO: (127TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. Most of those small repair shops do not have the equipment to do this and I think one of the reasons that we did not get an interest from them when the Governor first proposed that we go out and do this sort of contract, was because they didn't want to go through the expenditure of buying machinery that we believe will probably not be used for more than three to five years from now when more sophisticated types of testing come into favor.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cardin.

REP. CARDIN: (53RD)

So, through you, Madam Speaker, do we know exactly what the Commissioner of DMV is going to be looking for in a future contract in terms of tail pipe emissions testing?

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cocco.

REP. COCCO: (127TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. As I said before, the language is extremely broad so that the Commissioner may receive for bids, any numbers, any varieties of testing methods and then will decide what is best for the people of the State, bring it to the Transportation Committee for review.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cardin.

REP. CARDIN: (53RD)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I appreciate that answer from the Chair of the Transportation Committee.

Through you, Madam Speaker, is it fair to characterize then that we're going from emission testing process that's very rigid, very stringent in terms of what we're looking for, essentially throwing that

process out and offering bids that essentially could range from apples to oranges?

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cocco.

REP. COCCO: (127TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I will say to you that at this minute that bid should have been written and been out since we're talking about exactly one year from today to the time that we need to have a new contract in place. And yes, we are looking to put out a broad bid to see what comes forward, what we attract in the way of new sophisticated testing for the fleet of cars in the State of Connecticut, knowing that we have forgiven four years and younger, knowing that cars '96 and forward have the capability for OBD testing, knowing that more sophisticated testing will be coming forward very quickly, on the road testing, and so on.

So, indeed, we are looking for a variety and from that variety, we hopefully will select the very best for the citizens of the State.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cardin.

REP. CARDIN: (53RD)

I thank you again. Through you, Madam Speaker to the Transportation Committee Chair.

I guess I'll ask again. Is it possible that there would be a bid proposal that's recommended by the Commissioner of DMV to the Transportation Committee or the committee of cognizance, that small repair shops, auto body repair shops, Ford dealerships, Chevy dealerships, etcetera, etcetera, could be the winning bidder to provide the service? Is that possible?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cardin. I apologize, sir. I believe the question was asked of the lady.

Representative Cocco.

REP. COCCO: (127TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And through you. As I said before, because there was very little interest expressed by this group of people when the Transportation Committee held public hearings, it's unlikely that we're going to have that kind of bid.

However, the language is broad enough to be able to accept that kind of bid. I would say that given the playing field, that if that is true, that would be only a portion of what we would be looking at as far as testing of emissions is concerned in the State of Connecticut.

In other words, then we would be looking at a true

variety, perhaps some fixed sites, perhaps some OBD testing on the cars '96 and younger. And also, perhaps, some fixed sites. A variety can possibly be what comes forward when we go out for this bid.

And quite frankly, that is what we are exposing ourselves to purposely in order to get the very best of what we can for the people of the State.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cardin.

REP. CARDIN: (53RD)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I appreciate those responses from the committee chair.

I guess I would raise a concern with my colleagues here in the Legislature that, you know, I'm sure most of us are bringing our automobiles or our trucks to different auto body repair shops, whether it be for an oil change, whether it be for repairs, whether it be for maintenance, but I know that the gentleman that I bring my car to, he's very concerned about this legislation and I think it's evident in the Committee Chair's responses that none of these shops came to the committee seeking out this change.

Some of the concerns that I heard from the repair shop that I go to for my oil change is that, one, the concern of the volume of cars and automobiles that would

be going through his shops. You know, we get a lot of calls on different issues here in the Legislature. Some of the calls in the future might be that they can't get their cars into these small auto body repair shops, assuming and possibly they win the bid on this contract. Not only could those calls be in the dozens, but it's conceivable that they might be in the hundreds.

Another concern that has come up in the public debate is that these or that the existing contract, there was, unfortunately, some malfeasants and some graft that was going on with the private contractor and one of the other concerns that I heard from the auto body shop that I bring my car to for an oil change, is that the extensive graft that we're opening ourselves up to in the oversight or the lack of oversight that the State would have on the numerous auto body repair shops that could possibly, again I say possibly, providing the service in the future.

I'm not really sure how I'm going to vote on this bill. I had sent in an amendment to delete these sections because I think there are things that can be worked out with the private contract that is now providing the service to the State and I think that those problems that we've had in the past could be corrected.

My amendment would strike out these sections to hopefully correct those problems that we have with the private contractor and look into this process a little bit more thoroughly before we go forward with these possible changes in the future.

I guess I would ask my colleagues to read this a little bit more carefully and think about it as they ponder their vote on this bill.

I appreciate my colleagues' time and I thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further on the bill that is before us?

Representative San Angelo.

REP. SAN ANGELO: (131ST)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. If I could, a question to the proponent of the bill, through you.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Please frame the question.

REP. SAN ANGELO: (131ST)

Thank you. The question I have is with regards to Section 6, which looks to me like $1,400,000 going to implement the statewide centralized voter registration system. And frankly, I'm not sure if the question should

go to you or the Chairman of the GAE Committee.

It looks to me that this is to bring on those towns that are not currently in that system. Is this $1,400,000 just going for those towns that are not part of the system now or are we revamping the whole statewide voter registration system? Or exactly what are we trying to do with this $1,400,000?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I believe your interpretation is correct, but I would yield to the Chairman of the GAE Committee just for confirmation and clarification.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative San Angelo, if you would please redirect your question to Representative Knopp.

REP. SAN ANGELO: (131ST)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Knopp, the question I had is in regard to Section 6. It's $1,400,000 over, I believe, a two year period to either redo the whole voter - centralized voter registration system or to correct the problem in a number of towns.

Could you tell me what we're trying to do with this

$1,400,000?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Knopp.

REP. KNOPP: (137TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And good morning to you and good morning to my dear friend, Representative San Angelo.

I believe that the purpose of this money is really three-fold.

First of all, there are about 26 or 27 town that remain to come on line and the purpose of this money would be to purchase the computer, the printer, and to install the ISDN line that would allow those towns to join the system.

Second, there's an effort to enhance and redesign the system so that we do away with the current system and upgrade it to a web based system that's more user friendly in the future.

And the third point is and I believe that this has been the real crux of the problem with the registrars of voters around the State, that the Secretary of State's Office, thus far, has not developed enough support personnel to respond to questions from registrars in a timely manner. And therefore, there needs to be more of

an ongoing consumer friendly support effort in the Secretary of State's Office to respond to questions and help solve problems that may arise.

And I believe that the size of this funding authorization would allow all three of those functions to be served. The amount of money needed to purchase the computers, printers and install the ISD end line for the 25 or so remaining towns, is about $86,000, which would indicate that the larger appropriation or the larger authorization would support those additional functions of enhancing the system itself and providing additional support.

Through you, Madam Speaker, that's my best guess about what these funds will be used for.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative San Angelo.

REP. SAN ANGELO: (131ST)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Knopp, is there any requirement, as I heard you say, 28 towns are not part of the centralized voter registration system. Is there any kind of requirement that those towns will now have to be of what this Legislature is intending to be, a statewide system. Do they have to come aboard or will towns still be able to refuse and therefore will be spending money on this system that really is not

statewide?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Knopp.

REP. KNOPP: (137TH)

Madam Speaker, the answer to that question is there is no requirement for towns to join. However, I think it's a pretty clear conclusion that even towns that are not on line have expressed an interest in doing so if the system were more user friendly and therefore, the hope is that these improvements will encourage the towns that are on line now to stay on and will encourage the towns that are not on line to join, but there is no mandate in this bill or elsewhere in our statutes that requires every town to join.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative San Angelo.

REP. SAN ANGELO: (131ST)

So, just to be clear, we're going to spend $1,400,000 to implement a statewide system that may not be a statewide system when we're done spending the $1,400,000?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Knopp.

REP. KNOPP: (137TH)

I think the goal here is to spend $1,400,000 to create a statewide system that at the end of that expenditure, will be a statewide system.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative San Angelo.

REP. SAN ANGELO: (131ST)

Okay. And through you, Madam Speaker. I'm trying to understand what we're doing here. We implemented what was supposed to be a statewide centralized voter registration system years ago and we still have 28 towns that haven't come up with our old statewide voter system. So now we're going to spend $1,400,000 to redo the system to try to bring on those 28 towns.

And I guess it's my understanding that the reason those 28 towns aren't on board is because our system isn't very good and they, in fact, have better systems than we currently do. Is that an accurate description?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Knopp.

REP. KNOPP: (137TH)

Madam Speaker, I would say that is not an accurate

representation.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative San Angelo.

REP. SAN ANGELO: (131ST)

So could you, through you, Madam Speaker, could you tell me why the 28 towns have not joined the current system if, in fact, the system doesn't seem to be up to par since we have to upgrade the system to attract those towns? Why are they are part of what is called is a "statewide centralized system"?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Knopp.

REP. KNOPP: (137TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. The current system was designed quite a number of years go before the development of internet and web-based information technology systems.

Therefore, for example, someone from the Secretary of State's Office has to go now and load onto a hard disk in a registrar's office all of the data and if for some reason that registrar's office, by error or for some other reason, ends up not being able to operate that system and accidentally erases from the hard drive some part of the voter list, somebody from the Secretary

of State's Office has to go back down there and help them reload it as opposed to, I think, what we all expect on an internet or web-based system in which the uploading is done remotely through the internet without this kind of manual loading onto a hard disk.

I think from the testimony that I've heard from the towns that are not on it, are that, by and large, they have heard from the towns that are on it, that there were problems in operating this older style system and so the hope has always been that by enhancing the system, changing it to a web-based system and testing it in local elections, that this will encourage those other towns to join and by providing more user support through the Secretary of State's Office that the experiences of towns on line now will improve so much that, in fact, there will not any rational reason why the remaining towns won't want to join and the towns on line, won't want to stay on.

So, I think that until we try this incentive-based system, it's my feeling that the General Assembly is not yet willing to mandate that we join - that every town join such a system and that's why this seems to be the better approach.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative San Angelo.

REP. SAN ANGELO: (131ST)

Okay, Madam Speaker, I'm done asking questions. It's 2:30 in the morning and I don't want to belabor the point.

I just want to make a couple of comments with regard to this. Some of us would be more than happy to go home and some of us don't understand why we've had to go through this session as we've have. I would much rather be doing this at 2:30 in the afternoon instead of 2:30 at night.

I do want to say this, Madam Speaker, is that we spend a ton of money to bring up to date what was supposed to be a statewide centralized voter registration system. It seems we've failed tremendously at that effort and it just makes me wonder why we're going to spend $1,400,000, not mandate the system put in place, when we wasted a ton of money on a system that hasn't even been brought up to where it was supposed.

So I do have some concerns about this section. Either we're going to do this or we're not going to do this, it would seem. It seems that for too long, this system hasn't been addressed. Everybody knows it's been a complete failure, but we haven't done anything to address this in the last couple of years when these 28

towns haven't been brought on.

So, either we have a system that makes sense, that uses tax dollars in a fair and reasonable way or we don't and it just seems to me we're throwing more money at their process and we don't seem to really be fixing what the problem is.

So, thank you, Madam Speaker and I thank the Chamber for putting up with me over the last ten minutes on this issue.

Thank you.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Kerensky.

REP. KERENSKY: (14TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I also have a question regarding the same section for the Chair of the GAE Committee.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Please frame your question, Madam.

REP. KERENSKY: (14TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Representative Knopp, I would like to know to whom the $1.4 million will go to redesign and develop the system.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Knopp.

REP. KNOPP: (137TH)

It will go to the Secretary of State's Office.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Kerensky.

REP. KERENSKY: (14TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Is there someone in the Secretary of State's Office, through you, Madam Speaker to the distinguished Chair of the GAE Committee, who currently possesses this expertise? Will they need to go out for training? Why this amount of money and will it enhance or totally replace the existing system?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Knopp.

REP. KNOPP: (137TH)

Madam Speaker, the process, as I understand it is this. That the Secretary of State's Office has taken a very good initiative to enhance the current system and transform it and improve it into a web-based consumer friendly system. That is done partly through their office, partly through a contract with IMB that they have had to maintain the old and develop the enhanced

system, and partly through the Department of Information Technology.

So, it is a result -- it's a process that's guided by the Secretary of State. It's her initiative, but it's done with cooperation with the Department of Information Technology and is through a vendor contract with IBM.

I have strongly encouraged the Secretary of State's Office to work cooperatively with local registrars of voters, especially in those towns where they have developed very good systems. For example, the great city of Stamford, Connecticut has an excellent information technology system. Stamford, Connecticut has wonderful registrars of voters who do a terrific job. I had the great privilege to travel to Stamford, Connecticut on one of my off days to meet with their registrars, to meet with their town clerks, to meet with their information technology office and it was a great experience. And I learned that they are doing a wonderful job in Stamford, Connecticut. It turns out that their Director of Information Technology is a neighbor and constituent of mine in Norwalk. So, in fact, a gentleman from Norwalk, John Linquist, actually is the Information Technology Officer for Stamford. And they're doing a terrific job.

So, we have encouraged the Secretary of State's

Office to make sure that registrars who have very good systems, like in Stamford, have the ability to utilize many of the functions of their current systems like generating labels, generating letters, doing other kinds of subsidiary IT functions can do that in cooperation with the new enhanced system and I think that's going to produce a very good result for the State of Connecticut .

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Kerensky.

REP. KERENSKY: (14TH)

Thank you, Representative Knopp and thank you for your indulgence, Madam Speaker.

I have one question remaining and it really is more for legislative intent than for any other reason.

And that is that I understand, as I look at this legislation, and from your explanation, that no town will, at this time, be required to join.

Is it the intent that if a year or two down the road or even three of four, there is the goal of mandating that every town be required to join the system?

Through you, Madam Speaker to Representative Knopp.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Knopp.

REP. KNOPP: (137TH)

Madam Speaker, I think it is widely recognized and, in fact, has been endorsed by, I think, almost every caucus of the General Assembly, that a statewide centralized voter registration system is an important element of a modern election system in order to prevent fraud and abuse.

At the moment, the General Assembly has made a decision not to mandate that municipalities join such a system, but rather that we try to encourage them, through inducements of free computer to the town, computer, printer, and ISD on line, through the enhancements that we encourage towns to join the system.

If the General Assembly, two or three years from now decides to take another look at it and to take other action, I don't think I can speak to the future intent of legislators, but I do say this, having a centralized statewide voter registration system is a key part of preventing election fraud and abuse. And I hope that towns will see the benefit of joining the system, that we have a new system that will work better, be more user friendly and as a result, we don't ever have to face the question of mandating or not because, in fact, towns

will recognize that we have a new system that will be easy to use and is a tremendous public policy benefit preventing election fraud.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Kerensky.

REP. KERENSKY: (14TH)

Thank you very much. Thank you for your responses, Representative Knopp and thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you.

Representative Prelli.

REP. PRELLI: (63RD)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, this has been a long and arduous process and Representative Nafis got up, from your side of the aisle and thanked all those that helped with this process and I just didn't want the staff that spent so many long hours with us, to think that this side of the aisle also didn't appreciate their fine efforts and thank all those that helped on the bill.

As I said, I think there are many sections in this bill we might not agree with, but I think in general they are cleanups that are needed in our statutes and I would urge support of the bill.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir, for your remarks.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. A question, through you, to the proponent of the bill.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Please frame your question, sir.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker to the proponent. Is there an expectation that there is a substantial cleanup amendment that would be coming on this OPM implementer?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. That is correct. In fact, I was just about to call it.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary, you still have the floor, sir.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. Would the lady have a number as to what might be coming?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Sir, when you say number is to what is coming --

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

It would be an LCO number of what might be coming for an amendment she's expecting to call.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Well I think, sir, probably it would be more in line to let her call the amendment.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

But, Madam Speaker, I have a number of other questions on the bill, if I'm not quite sure what might be coming.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Well then, perhaps I might suggest and I appreciate your interest, but perhaps that if we are completing this, if we would let the lady call the amendment and then that might help you frame your questions on the bill.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I believe that there are

a number of both technical and a few substantive problems with the bill and I am going to let the lady call the amendment in hopes that both the substantive and technical problems are cleared up.

So I thank the lady for her answers and thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

And I look forward to discussing the amendment.

Thank you.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Nafis, you would now have the floor, Madam.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. The Clerk has, in his possession, amendment 9232, LCO 9232. May the Clerk please call and I be allowed to summarize?

SPEAKER LYONS:

The Clerk has, in his possession, LCO 9232. If the Clerk would please call. The lady has asked leave to summarize.

CLERK:

LCO Number 9232, House "A" offered by

Representative Lyons.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis, you have the floor.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. This is an extensive technical clean up of the underlying bill. There are a few other things that it does, though.

It transfers $230,000 from OPM from anticipated federal revenues to the State Police and Chief State's Attorney's Office. This will be used to extend a current traffic stop statistic study by one year.

The remaining items within the amendment are, I believe, pretty technical in nature and I move its adoption.

SPEAKER LYONS:

The question before the Chamber is on adoption of the amendment.

Would you care to remark? Would you care to remark on the amendment that is before us?

Representative Cleary, would you now like to direct your questions?

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

I certainly would, Madam Speaker because at least I have just received this amendment. It has an awful lot to it for a bill this large.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Please proceed.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

I'd just like to make sure, Madam Speaker, that I understand it.

Through you, Madam Speaker. The first section of the amendment, to the proponent of the amendment, in line 222, line one of the amendment, if the lady could please tell us what exactly that does.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. What this does is it takes the next $230,000 that is anticipated to be received from federal revenues and it transfers that money to the Chief State's Attorney's Office and the State Police Office so that we may extend the period of time that we will be conducting the current traffic stop statistic study by approximately one year.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. Where in the budget would that $230,000 be transferred from?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

May I have a moment, please?

SPEAKER LYONS:

Take your time, Madam.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Please proceed.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Thank you. I need to make a correction on that. That money is coming from the marshals' fees. It's a one time transfer from the marshals' fees.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. What produces the revenue for those marshals' fees?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. That revenue is produced by a $5 charge. That is, all civil actions will

be charge an additional $5 filing fee and all of that money will be generating money within this new account.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Through you, Madam Speaker to the proponent. If I'm understanding this, then a $5 surcharge would go to each service fee of each marshal or the filings in the State of Connecticut to go into what fund, Madam Speaker?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. The fund is established for the Marshals Commission and that is correct.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. If the lady could point out to me in the bill as to where that money is established and/or transferred.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. Section 11 of the bill is where the account is established.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

I thank the lady. I'm trying to understand the amendment and through you, Madam Speaker, the amendment has $230,000 being transferred to the Department of - the Office of Policy and Management for other expenses.

Through you, Madam Speaker, what would those other expenses be?

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. It is the cost -- it is being transferred for use for the cost to continue the traffic stop statistic study by one year.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I wasn't able to hear

the lady.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis, if you would repeat that.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

It is being used to, through you, Madam Speaker, to extend the traffic stop statistic study by one year.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. Would that be line three of the amendment where it says, "subsections (f) and (g) of Section 54-1m? Would that be the traffic study?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I believe that is correct, (f) and (g) of the statutes is the study.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

I thank the lady. I'm now looking at lines 6, 7, and 8 of the amendment. And Madam Speaker, it's very difficult because we just did receive this and we're

trying to put it all together.

Through you, Madam Speaker to the lady. What might section (e) of this section mean?

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. Could you please rephrase that question?

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. What would the effect of lines 6, 7, and 8 of this amendment be?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I believe the intention of lines 6, 7, and 8 is to transfer the money the Office of Policy and Management to the State Police and the Chief State's Attorney's Office for purposes of conducting the study.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. That language, as I

read it, in combination of what's before us, would allow OPM to transfer that money to anywhere they would like. Is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I believe the intention is for OPM to have the ability to transfer to the offices requiring funds for those purposes.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

I thank the lady and I guess now that we have some legislative intent -- because it's a little unclear. Through you, Madam Speaker, if the lady could explain the need for line 9 of this amendment.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. One moment please, we're checking.

Through you, Madam Speaker. That is a technical change. It was inadvertently left out of the underlying bill.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I thank the lady. I think I've now figured that out.

If we could go on, Madam Speaker, the question would be, what is the intent of lines 10 and 11 of this amendment?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. The intention was to change the words from -- excuse me, just a minute.

It was to go from a division to a department.

Through you, Madam Speaker. It's purely technical in nature.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Moving right along. It is very late. I'm trying to understand this and also to be able to make sure that it's reasonably technically correct.

Through you, Madam Speaker to the lady. Would you be able to explain what lines 14, 15, and 16 do in the bill?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. Yes, that also is a technical change. Inadvertently, medical emergency transportation was left out of the underlying bill. It was bracketed and it was not --

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I have line 3644 before me. I understand that there was a technical flaw with the brackets around "emergency medical transportation".

Through you, Madam Speaker to the lady. How did we change eye examinations and glasses from the underlying bill of glasses if this would be a technical correction?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis, do you care to answer?

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. That was actually a mistake and it should also - I'm sorry, I should have said that in my first response. "Eye examinations and" should also have been included.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. Does the lady have, in her possession, an amendment that would correct that fairly substantial mistake?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. This does correct that mistake.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I'm reading the amendment on lines 15 and 16. I'm reading the file copy on lines 3644 and 3645. Through you, Madam Speaker. Could the lady explain to me which mistake is being corrected in the amendment before us?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. The underlying bill took out "emergency medical transportation", inserted new language, "glasses".

The amendment replaces the inadvertent language

that was taken out for emergency medical transportation and includes the language that was also missing from glasses, which is eye examination and glasses.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. If the lady could point out to me in line 3644 where the words "eye examination" might fall.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I understand there is another amendment coming to correct this language as there is still a technical flaw and it does appear that you are correct.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary, if your concern, sir, is to get to the amendment, I'm sure we would allow that time to have it. And meanwhile, if that is the concern, we could let other people continue the debate.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

I thank you, Madam Speaker. I think that was my initial question as to whether or not there might be an amendment coming and the lady might be calling it.

We can move onto some other sections, Madam Speaker. I do appreciate the lady's answers.

Through you, Madam Speaker. On line 30 of the amendment, it changes some language in line 3790. If the lady would be so good as to tell me what exactly that does.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. That corrects a misspelling.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. If I could just have a moment to read that.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Oh, take your time. We've got a lot of time tonight.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

I'm sure we have amendments that are being drafted, Madam Chairman and we have quite some time.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Well sir, I think there are other people who would like to speak and as I said, I'm sure we would be happy to let you have your time with your amendment if others have the opportunity to make their debates.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

I thank the lady for her answer. I think I now understand that section.

Through you, Madam Speaker to the lady. On line 38 of the amendment, which impacts Section 128, if the lady could please refresh us as to what that cite and that line does.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. Could you please repeat the question?

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. On line 38 of the amendment, it changes the language or adds to the language in Section 128.

If the lady could inform us as to exactly what that

does.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. This was a correction to the DSS implementer and what this does it extends the reporting requirement for Sections (g) and (h) of Section 54-lm, an additional year to 2003.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, Madam.

Representative Cleary.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

It is the data collection and reporting section.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Madam Speaker, I thank the lady. I think that was maybe in reference to an earlier section of this technical amendment.

And through you, Madam Speaker, just to be clear, this amendment in Section 40 and 41, I presume is part of that same section. Is that correct?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. That's correct.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

I thank the lady. I believe there maybe some other folks who would like to review a few technical aspects of this section. And I thank the lady for her answers and I'm sure we'll get back to the rest of those sections.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Malone.

REP. MALONE: (47TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I'm eager to vote on this bill and hope we do so very quickly.

I only rise to speak about one particular portion of this bill because I feel so very strongly about it.

And that is contained herein are some references to some action taken relative to prison overcrowding. We started this year with the hope that we could do something to contain a growing problem in the State of Connecticut and that is the number of people incarcerated, approximately 18,000.

With enthusiasm, we addressed this topic and moved forward. A number of people in this Chamber, both Chambers, from the executive branch worked, addressed this problem. We worked forward. However, we did not get there for whatever reason. I won't identify the reasons.

This doesn't get to where we really should have been this year and I say this not casting any blame anywhere, but to caution this body that we will be back here or the year after dealing with either the problem of, again, more people being in prison and the enormous cost it has brought to the State of Connecticut. We either have to deal with that problem. We've incarcerated a number of people. We have to -- we'll be back again.

Thank you, Madam Speaker, for the opportunity to speak.

SPEAKER LYONS:

We do appreciate your remarks, sir, and once again, if you care to expand on this while we're on the bill, I'm sure people would believe very much in what you're stating and would be more than happy to entertain your comments, which are very much - very important to many people.

Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us? Will you remark further on the amendment

that is before us?

If not, let me try your minds.

All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Will you remark further on the bill, as amended?

Representative Malone, I didn't think that we did not want to cut you off because, sir, I know you were trying to make very important comments.

So, sir, if you would like to proceed once again.

REP. MALONE: (47TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. For some reason, it escapes me and perhaps others that worked on the amendment. I rose to speak of the matter of prison overcrowding.

We engaged in the process at the beginning of the year and we didn't get where we wanted to me. It's in here. We'll do something. We'll touch on the topic, but we will be back here again next year or the following year either dealing with the issue of prison overcrowding or the enormous costs that we've brought to bear on the State of Connecticut.

I wish we could have gotten there this year. I'm anxious to engage in that process next year and hope that we can do so in a proactive manner instead of addressing the matter here where we're looking for tons of money to incarcerate people in the State of Connecticut when we should be doing other things to deal with some of the social ills that are dealt with by just sending people to prison.

I thank you very much for the opportunity to speak on that topic at this time.

Thank you very much, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir, for your remarks.

Representative Boukus. Well, I guess since she's not here, she doesn't want to speak.

Representative Stratton.

REP. STRATTON: (17TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I rise with a couple of questions about different sections of this bill. I think it is very unfortunate that we are discussing something that has so much substance to it at this hour and I, like many of my colleagues, are struggling to try to deal with that.

But I do have a couple of questions for the proponent of the bill.

Let me first deal with Section 117, which deals with the powers of CRRA and extending those powers on line 4027. It talks about remediation of property, which I understand the purpose of that, but in the process, we're also dealing with that remediation that says, "remediation or development of property owned by the authority."

And I guess my question to the proponent of the amendment that we have adopted is, does that language of development embrace sort of any kind of development whatsoever or does that development pertain to existing powers of the authority?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

One minute please. One minute please. Madam Speaker, I'd like to yield to the Chairman of the Appropriations Committee who has more information on this issue.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Stratton, if you could please redirect your question to Representative Dyson.

REP. STRATTON: (17TH)

I would be happy to do that, Madam Speaker.

Through you, Madam Speaker, my question is, I well understand the need for the authority to be able to take action with regard to the remediation of properties that they may currently own or acquire. My question is whether the development of such properties associated with that in this language on 4027, whether that development would have to be consistent with powers already granted to the authority or whether that is an opened ended development granting there.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

REP. DYSON: (94TH)

Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. DYSON: (94TH)

I'd like to respond to that question in this way. We, in the process of putting together this document that you have before you here tonight, have requests submitted to us by the Office of OPM and the difficulty we have here is that OPM cannot speak on the floor here, but this is an item that was submitted to us by OPM and has been included in this document.

Now, what impact that has and what effect it's going to have and what it means, I'll try to secure that information for you, if you would wait just a moment.

Thank you.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Please take your time, sir.

REP. DYSON: (94TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, the understanding that I have gotten is that it's limited in that it allows CRRA to deal only with those properties that are in their possession.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Stratton.

REP. STRATTON: (17TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. I would just like a little bit of clarification of that. I understand that this language only deals with properties in their possession. My concern is what they may do with those properties.

Under current statute, CRRA has specific authority to do certain things. This language says that they may remediate or develop properties owned by the Authority. My concern is to assure that the remediation of those properties does not, in any way, expand the existing authority of the CRRA as to what they do on those properties once they are remediated.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dyson.

REP. DYSON: (94TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. My understanding is that it does expand CRRA's authority, but only to the degree for properties they have in their possession presently for purposes of redevelopment.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Stratton.

REP. STRATTON: (17TH)

Madam Speaker, I guess I'm even more troubled by the answer than I expected to be.

This language before us and we had bills that were presented to this legislature early in the session that would have dramatically expanded the authority of CRRA to do other activities than they are currently authorized to do under existing statute.

I understand and I fully appreciate that the Authority has come into a possession or may come into possession of properties that need to be remediated and redeveloped.

My question, solely related to the question if those properties are remediated and redeveloped, is that redevelopment consistent with the existing powers of the authority? And from what I just heard from the Chair of

the Appropriations Committee, he was saying that that authority or that redevelopment possibility was not limited by existing statutes.

If I'm incorrect in his response to my question, I would love to have that clarified because I did not expect that to be the intent of this language.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dyson.

REP. DYSON: (94TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I don't know what the expectation was, but the explanation that I can give is that yes, the Authority has been and will be expanded and that there will be an enormous amount of scrutiny placed on they're not abusing that authority and given that what we're dealing with here, hope to deal with, is remediation and development of only those properties within their possession.

So, is the Authority expanded? Yes. Concern that some individuals may have? Probably. Are they going to pay close attention to what they do? I would suspect so. Any guarantee that I can give you? None.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Stratton.

REP. STRATTON: (17TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. That's very heartening. I guess I would actually, at that point, then really say that this language is somewhat disingenuous because it sort of infers that what we are granting to the Authority is the ability to remediate and develop properties that it may own. But the answer that I just got to my questions says that remediation and development, that development that follows that remediation, is open ended. Our other statutes limit the development and the authority of CRRA to certain activities.

The answer I just got to that question says that this language has no limits and supersedes the other authorities that this Chamber has already laid upon that authority and I find that extremely troubling and very, very - what shall I say -- not in the faith of the language before us. And if there anything in what I have just said, that the Chair of the Appropriations Committee would take issue with, that this is not an open ended development authority on those properties, I would really like to hear it.

If it is, indeed, an opened ended development authority without any judgment of this Chamber as to changing the powers of CRRA, which we have empowered, I find that extremely troubling.

And I guess, through you, Madam Speaker, I would really just ask for a further clarification from the Chair of the Appropriations Committee as to whether he has, indeed, said that his interpretation of this language is that this is an unrestricted development authority granted to CRRA?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Dyson.

REP. DYSON: (94TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. I don't think I suggested unrestricted. And now when I use the term "unrestricted", it suggests wide open and I don't think I said that or intended for that meaning to be conveyed.

Now, is the authority that is being asked here expands? Yes. I do think there's a limit to the universe of what that authority would permit, based upon what it is that we are confronted with and we are confronted with properties owned by. And by virtue of properties owned by, there is a limitation placed on that.

So I think any notion that this opens up a universe, far exceeds anything imaginable here, I think is erroneous. I think it says here, "properties owned by" and I think that, within itself, provides

limitations on what it is that we expect them to be able to do in terms of their remediation and development.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Stratton.

REP. STRATTON: (17TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. My concern is not the properties owned. It is what occurs on those properties. I have no problem, whatsoever, with the remediation of properties owned by the Authority. But there have been many proposals before this Chamber to dramatically expand the abilities or the powers of that authority to operate different kinds of activities on property it does own and I am extremely troubled by the inference that this language to merely say that because they remediate a property, that they can develop it to do anything. And I have a real problem with that because we have, in the interpretation that I have just heard, said that the CRRA suddenly has unlimited development possibilities on those properties. And I find that very troubling, but I will not pursue that question any further.

I have one other section of the bill that I would like to address. And through you, Madam Speaker, a question to the proponent of the amendment.

On Section 13, which deals with a section of this

bill that intercepts funds that are currently taken from rate payers, electric utility rate payers of the State of Connecticut and deposit it in Energy and Conservation Management Fund that is overseen by a board that takes those funds, which are significant and assures that they are used for the purposes of energy conservation in a cost effective manner.

Section 13 of this bill intercepts those funds outside of the legislative authority and the statutory authority that this Chamber set up several years ago for those funds and says that OPM may use those funds for purposes of enacting conservation measures within state buildings, which we have long been required to do anyway.

And my question to the proponent of the bill, before I remark on this section, is that in it we talk about that the receipts from the fund, which are three mils for every kilowatt hour, that those are from the State by each fund for the purchase of electricity.

And I guess my question, through you, Madam Speaker, is to determine whether the language in this bill, on lines 259 through 206, assures that the purchase of those funds come from, each of the funds for their expenditures for electricity?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Through you, Madam Speaker. That, as far as I know, is correct. That is the way that I understand it.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Stratton.

REP. STRATTON: (17TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. And I appreciate that clarification.

I am not going to beg the indulgence of the Chamber for two amendments that I have drafted to this section because I have serious reservations and concerns about us, at this point, intercepting funds that we are taking from rate payers of the State of Connecticut, significant funds to the tune of $83 million a year to assure that those funds are used in a cost effective manner to effect energy conservation in the State so that we can reduce our need for energy in the State. And this section takes $12 million, $1 million a month from the rate payers of the State of Connecticut and says that we are going to give that $1 million a month of rate payers' funds to the Office of Policy and Management to do things that the State of Connecticut

has been required to do for many, many years.

I am deeply troubled by that and I know many of this Chamber share my concern and know of my concern. I also know that it is 3:30 in the morning and that I have made this argument for many weeks in this Chamber and that I'm not likely to win that argument, but I feel very, very strongly that this is a totally inappropriate interception of a process that we have set up. We have a fund that exists. We have a board that this process, if the State of Connecticut or anybody else wants to come to a board and propose a plan that is cost effective in the amendment that I would have proposed would have required that any expenditure of funds from this "meet" requirements of the existing Energy and Conservation Management Board in terms of cost effectiveness, could have applied to that, could have been approved, could have gone through the process that this General Assembly established and once again, as we have done in many other issues in the last couple of days, we have circumvented the good intentions, good law, and good policy that this Chamber has established in the past and said, we don't want to go through the process, we just want to intercept and do what we want to do.

I do not, in any way, shape, or form, take issue with the need or wisdom of the State of Connecticut

enacting energy conservation measures. I have applauded that for years, but for us to say that we don't think we have to conform or apply or go through the processes that we require everyone else to do, and that we are going to take funds from the rate payers of Connecticut, not the State of Connecticut, to pay for our conservation measures, I find deplorable, pure and simple.

And for that reason, I will not be supporting this bill. I will not call the amendment that I have, but I am very, very troubled by the direction that we are taking.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Belden.

REP. BELDEN: (113TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Very briefly. The lady was just talking about Section 117 of the file before us. Having served on the CRRA Board of Directors for many years, we're dealing, in this particular section, which is 22a-267 with regard to the fiscal powers of CRRA in terms of where they get their money, how they can borrow, etcetera. And we're specifically dealing with subsection 8 and CRRA owns considerable property that could require remediation.

But without this language in here, it is questionable what kind of contractual arrangements we could enter into to accomplish that.

An example, is the recent acquisition of CRRA from CL&P of the power generating plant which is located adjacent to the Mid-Connecticut Waste Reduction facility in the other side of Hartford. There is contamination on that site, which will have to be remediated and in order for that particular parcel to be cleaned up and possibly used for some other purpose with regard to those powers that are enumerated in other sections of the Solid Waste Act, this language would have to be there in order for contractual arrangements for the money to do that.

So, we're only talking about properties owned by CRRA and yes, I suppose you could say that in that property that we own in the South Meadows, we also require from CL&P, several turbines, jet turbines that are used for peeking power requirements in the State. And there maybe opportunities to expand that or to perhaps go with some fuel cells or a number of other things and if that is, in fact the case, then this language would be required in order for CRRA to be able to implement the powers it has in other sections of the Solid Waste Management Services Act.

So, I look at this as just codifying another section of the statute that covers what goes on and what powers CRRA currently has.

They could do development now. It's a question of how financially it would be handled and this would clarify that we could use, CRRA could use all of the particular financing arrangements that are enumerated in lines 418 to 430, 4038 of the file before us.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Nardello.

REP. NARDELLO: (89TH)

Thank you. Through you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, I'm also going to address Section 13 of this proposal before us, this bill before us.

I have grave concerns about this section. This language appeared before us before the Energy and Technology Committee. And we reviewed this language and we have many concerns. During the public hearing process we asked the Department of Public Works what plan they had for energy conservation and management and they presented no plan to us for those dollars. So that left us with concerns.

However, we did let the bill go through committee by inserting cost benefit language into it. But as I see

it before us, that cost benefit language is not in the implementer bill. And that is of concern to me.

In addition, it's of concern to me that we're setting a precedent and the precedent is that we say that we don't have to go through the process. We took a process and we put it together. We put a conservation and energy and management board for review and we're saying, you don't have to do that because we're the State of Connecticut.

We should be subject to the same process as we have set up. That Board works extremely well and effectively.

The third thing that concerns me is that now when we do this and we reallocate these monies, we're going to take that $83 million, take $12 million out of it and it's not going to businesses and it's not going to go to residential customers and it's not going to go to Moliancon customers because the money has to be reallocated to take that $12 million.

So those individuals are not going to be subject and have the same amount of money for programs that they would have had before.

I think we are setting a very bad precedent. I think we are saying that we put things in statute and then we ignore them. I have grave concerns about this and for that reason, I will be voting against this bill,

as well and I ask my colleagues to consider this as they consider their vote.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary.

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, earlier there was a slight technical flaw, I think, in House "A", which I believe we have adopted.

And Madam Speaker, in order to correct that error, I would like to ask that the Clerk call LCO 9233 and read, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

The Clerk has, in his possession, LCO 9233, which will be designated House "A". Would the Clerk please call and read.

CLERK:

LCO Number 9233, House "B" offered by Representatives Ward and Flaherty.

"Strike line 3644 in its entirety and insert the following in lieu thereof: "services, (8) emergency medical transportation, (9) glasses, and (9) (10)".

SPEAKER LYONS:

Representative Cleary, what is your pleasure sir?

REP. CLEARY: (80TH

Yes, Madam Speaker. I move adoption.

SPEAKER LYONS:

The question before the Chamber is on adoption. Will you remark?

REP. CLEARY: (80TH)

Madam Speaker, I believe this corrects a technical flaw in House "A". I believe that we discussed it somewhat earlier and I would ask for the Chamber's support.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further on the amendment that is before us?

Representative Nafis.

REP. NAFIS: (27TH)

Thank you. Through you, Madam Speaker. I consider this to be a friendly amendment and I would like to thank the proponent for bringing this out and I encourage your support.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you, Representative Nafis.

Let me try your minds.

All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Opposed, nay. The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Will you remark further on the bill, as amended?

Representative Johnston.

REP. JOHNSTON: (51ST)

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Madam Speaker, two things trouble me at this point in the night.

We worked out a budget. It appeared that we worked out an OPM implementer bill. I'm not sure what led to an amendment to add $230,000 at the 11th hour. I don't know how it came about, but I guess it bothers me. I gather it bothers other people in this Chamber.

I think each one of us had some things very near and dear in our hearts that we could not get in here. Some items, very small items. There wasn't money in the budget. $58,000 that would have given a little tiny supplement to some of the oldest teachers in this State. There wasn't money in the budget.

We all understand that. And when you vote on a budget and you vote on a bill, you weigh the good with the bad. And to see an amendment like this to come up with $230,000 bothers me.

The second thing, I guess, that bothers me a little bit, something that I was looking for in this OPM

implementer bill tonight and I've been looking for in bills since we passed the budget, and I never found it and that was some language, as I understand all of these bills that implement the budget and in the budget, I saw a couple of line items, one for $10 million for arts, recreation and culture grants. I saw another line item of $6 million for miscellaneous grants. But I never saw any language as to how we were going to spend that money. So I assume it was coming in an implementer bill.

And maybe I've missed it and I'd like to be corrected if I have, if anyone would know, but the only language that I saw that pertained to these two funds was in the budget document in subsection (b) when it says, "the funds appropriated to the Office of Policy and Management in subsection (a) of this section for energy contingency, arts, recreation and culture grants and miscellaneous grants maybe transferred to said office, to state agencies requiring funds for this purpose."

So I would assume I would have seen what agencies that money was going for and what funds they required to carry out that language.

And so I guess as you try to balance everything out and you try to look at what we're doing and what we're not doing, at least if you have all that information in

front of you, and you know that maybe we're giving an arts grant to a ballet company to do certain productions and we're doing this and we're helping a historical society, and you can see the value of that.

But I can't do that because it's not here. So at some point, I gather after we leave the building at the end of this special session, that decision will be made. Maybe it's been made already. But I don't see evidence of that.

So I guess as you try -- we would fund everything in a budget if we could. There are always tremendous causes and we look at the limited part of money and we say, based upon our priorities, this rises to the top and I'd love to do this, but in order to do this, I would have to reduce funding over here. And so we can balance it out and you can make a rational decision.

I hope that what we see here doesn't become a trend. I don't think it bodes well on our actions. I don't think it's a good policy that we ought to engage in. A budget is a compromised document, but it is a document that we all ought to know everything that's in it.

I listened to the debate in this Chamber earlier this session, hour after hour after hour about FOI, freedom of information and how we have to open up every

darned contract for every municipality, every state agency, for every use and purpose so we can know where every darned dollar is going. And yet, we're voting on policy and we don't know where $16 million is going.

We really ought to re-think this. We ought never to go down this road again.

And thank you for indulging me for this comment.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Thank you.

Will you remark further on the bill that is before us?

If not, staff and guests come to the Well. Members, take your seats. The machine will be opened.

CLERK:

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

SPEAKER LYONS:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Please check the board to make sure that your vote is accurately recorded.

If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

The Clerk will please announce the tally.

CLERK:

Emergency Certified H.B. 7507, as amended by House Amendment Schedules "A" and "B"

Total Number Voting	113
Necessary for Passage	91
Those voting Yea	100
Those voting Nay	13
Those absent and not Voting	38

SPEAKER LYONS:

The bill, as amended, passes.

REP. GODFREY: (110TH)

Madam Speaker.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Yes, sir. Representative Godfrey.

REP. GODFREY: (110TH)

I move for the immediate transmittal to the Senate of the last item voted upon.

SPEAKER LYONS:

Hearing no objection to that motion, it is so ordered.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 2005. I mean bill number. I stand corrected. Emergency Certified S.B. 2005.

CLERK:

S.B. 2005, AN ACT CONCERNING COMMUNITY MENTAL