

Act Number:	09-137	
Bill Number:	6541	
Senate Pages:	4661-4666, 4794-4796	9
House Pages:	3542-3550	9
Committee:	Public Safety: 539-540, 679	3

Page Total: 21

S – 590

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2009**

**VOL. 52
PART 14
4324 – 4666**

ch/ks/hl
SENATE

134
May 29, 2009

anything.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Prague.

Will you remark? Will you remark further on House Bill 6540 as amended by House A? Will you remark further? Senator Prague.

SENATOR PRAGUE:

If there's no objection, Mr. President, I'd like to place this on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

The Senator has requested that this item be placed on Consent. Without objection, so ordered, ma'am. Thank you.

SENATOR PRAGUE:

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Calendar page 16, Calendar Number 657, Files Number 231 and 963, House Bill 6541, AN ACT CONCERNING FIREFIGHTER I CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS, as amended by House Amendment Schedule A, favorable report of the Committee on Public Safety.

THE CHAIR:

ch/ks/hl
SENATE

135
May 29, 2009

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Good afternoon.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon, ma'am.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

I move the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Acting on acceptance and approval of the bill, ma'am, would you like to remark further?

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. This bill which was -- the underlying bill is different from the title of the bill because it was amended in the House to now require the fire police officers who are directing traffic to wear, at all times, certain clothing to protect themselves and so that the public is aware that they are there to protect the scene of either an accident or a fire.

It is also what I believe is common sense and obviously a very important bill for the public safety of our public safety folks, so I urge its passage.

Thank you.

ch/ks/hl
SENATE

136
May 29, 2009

THE CHAIR:

Thank you ma'am.

Will you remark further on House Bill 6541?

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO:

Thank you, Mr. President. Just a few questions to the proponent of the bill just so I understand it more clearly.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR FASANO:

Through you, Mr. President, to Senator Stillman, is it anybody who directs traffic has to wear these types of protective, or I should say maybe more observable clothing, or is it just folks who are either policemen or fire policemen or traffic personnel? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

I thank you. Through you sir, these are individuals who usually volunteer in communities. They are appointed as fire police individuals. So it's not someone that might pull over to help at a

ch/ks/hl
SENATE

137
May 29, 2009

scene, although we would hope that people would be careful doing that. And so these are people who have been trained to make sure that they wear the appropriate gear and are protected as they are assisting the public safety community in the case of an accident or a fire.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO:

Thank you, Mr. President. And I was wondering -- it talks about the fact that the headgear meets national, state and local traffic safety standards. Just out of curiosity with respect to this, is this -- do they do this normally or most towns have this protective gear, and there are a few that do not, and that's the bill is sort of to grab the ones that just haven't gone that far with respect to that protection?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President, through you, this is permissive legislation. It depends on the rules that the Public Safety Department deems is appropriate for

ch/ks/hl
SENATE

138
May 29, 2009

their personnel.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO:

And through you, Mr. President, is this going to incur, as a result of this bill, (inaudible) end up incurring more cost to comply with these new provisions? Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Through you, Mr. President, as I said, it's permissive, and at the most, according to the fiscal note, there is an estimated cost of \$275 per officer, but as I said, it depends how the municipalities choose to supply the clothing and equipment that is specified in the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO:

Thank you, Mr. President. I thank the Senator for her answers.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

ch/ks/hl
SENATE

139
May 29, 2009

Will you remark further on House Bill 6541?

Will you remark further on House Bill 6541?

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. If there isn't any objection, I'd like to place this on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

The good Senator has asked for this item to be placed on the Consent Calendar. Without objection, ma'am, so ordered.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Calendar page 27, Matters Returned from Committee, Calendar Number 275, File Number 340, Substitute for Senate Bill 891, AN ACT MODERNIZING CONNECTICUT FERTILIZER LAW, favorable report of the Committee on Environment, Finance, Revenue and Bonding, Judiciary, Planning and Development and Appropriations.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you Mr. President. Mr. President, if

S - 591

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2009**

**VOL. 52
PART 15
4667 - 5018**

ch/ks/hl
SENATE

267
May 29, 2009

SENATOR GAFFEY:

Mr. President, if there's no objection I'd ask that the bill be moved to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

The Senator has requested that the bill be placed on the Consent Calendar. Seeing no objection, so ordered sir.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President. Mr. President we had one item previously placed on the Consent Calendar that I would move now to remove from the Consent Calendar and to mark it pass temporarily. And that was Calendar page 8, Calendar 582, House Bill 5436.

THE CHAIR:

There's a motion on the floor to remove an item from the Consent Calendar and to PT it. Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you Mr. President. Mr. President, if the Clerk might now call the items on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk please call Consent Calendar Numero

ch/ks/hl
SENATE

268
May 29, 2009

Uno.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate on the Consent Calendar. Will all senators please 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.

Mr. President the first Consent Calendar begins on Calendar page 1, Calendar 681, House Joint Resolution Number 121; Calendar page 4, Calendar Number 401, Substitute for House Bill 5669; Calendar page 5, Calendar 456, Substitute for House Bill 5019; Calendar page 7, Calendar 532, House Bill 6448; Calendar page 8, Calendar 8 -- correction, Calendar 580, Substitute for House Bill 6531; Calendar page 9, Calendar 597, Substitute for House Bill 6114; Calendar Number 600, House Bill 5635; Calendar page 10, Calendar 605, Substitute for House Bill 6200.

Calendar page 14, Calendar Number 644, House Bill 6391; Calendar 650, Substitute for House Bill 6540; Calendar page 16, Calendar 657, House Bill 6541; Calendar page 29, Calendar 330, Substitute for Senate Bill 954; and Calendar page 34, Calendar Number 504, Substitute for Senate Bill 939.

ch/ks/hl
SENATE

269
May 29, 2009

Mr. President that completes those items placed on the first Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, please call the Consent Calendar again, the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

The Senate is now voting by roll call on the Consent Calendar. Will all senators please return to the chamber. The Senate is now voting by roll call on the Consent Calendar. Will all senators please return to the chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Have all senators voted? If all senators have voted please check your vote. The machine will be closed. The Clerk will call the tally.

THE CLERK:

Motion is on adoption of Consent Calendar Number 1.

Total Number Voting	36
Those voting Yea	36
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

/ Consent Calendar 1 passes.

H - 1047

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2009**

**VOL.52
PART 11
3246 - 3577**

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

7
May 12, 2009

On Page 5, Calendar Number 199, House Bill Number
6541 AN ACT CONCERNING FIREFIGHTER I CERTIFICATION
REQUIREMENTS. Favorable Report of the Committee on
Public Safety.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Linda Gentile.

REP. GENTILE: (104th)

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Good afternoon, Representative.

REP. GENTILE: (104th)

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

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question is the acceptance of the Joint
Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the .
Will you remark?

REP. GENTILE: (104th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the Clerk
has an Amendment, LCO Number 6822. I would ask the
Clerk to please call the Amendment and that I be
granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

8
May 12, 2009

Will the Clerk please call LCO Number 6822, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A".

CLERK:

LCO Number 6822, House "A", offered by
Representative Gentile.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize. Is there any objection to summarization? Any objection? Seeing none, Representative, you may proceed with summarization.

REP. GENTILE: (104th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, this is a strike-all Amendment, which essentially becomes the Bill, and the makes a number of changes to our existing fire police statutes and our fire police officers are individuals who direct traffic and have other responsibilities at fire scenes.

This Amendment will allow fire police officers to work in any, rather than just adjoining municipalities when working with their municipalities or their fire departments, which is something that they do already with inter-municipal and intra-municipal agreements.

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9
May 12, 2009

It continues to allow municipalities to supply fire police officers with their work clothing and equipment, so it is optional.

And it requires the officers to wear a traffic safety vest, regardless of color, as long as it meets national, state and local traffic safety standards.

It allows fire police officers to wear other headgear that meets these standards as an alternative to a helmet, and it allows municipal fire department officials to appoint members of the department as fire police officers.

And Mr. Speaker, I move adoption.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question before the Chamber is adoption of House Amendment Schedule "A". Will you remark on the Amendment? Will you remark on the Amendment?

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO: (113th)

Mr. Speaker, thank you very much. A few questions for the proponent of the Amendment, if I may.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Please proceed, Sir.

REP. PERILLO: (113th)

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10
May 12, 2009

Through you, Mr. Speaker, just to clarify. This Amendment was a bill that we had already seen in the Public Safety Committee, but it is a little bit different than the original version.

As I recall the original version of the Amendment, of the bill, rather, there would have been a mandate on municipalities to provide certain reflective clothing.

Is that the case in this , and should anyone construe that there is a mandate in this ?

Through you, Sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE: (104th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no, there is no longer a mandate.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO: (113th)

I thank the gentle lady for her answer, and one follow up question.

Also in the original version of this , the language as to who could be a fire police officer was

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11
May 12, 2009

somewhat restrictive, and I see that that language is a little bit changed.

Could the proponent elaborate on who would be eligible to be a fire police officer under this Amendment as proposed? Through you, Sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE: (104th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, yes, generally fire police officers are individuals who have been members of a fire department active members, but are no longer fighting fires.

This Amendment allows them to continue to be appointed through either the fire department or another individual in the town to be a fire police officer.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO: (113th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and just one follow up to that. Through you, Sir, does this Amendment restrict eligibility to be a fire police officer to only those individuals who have served historically or served presently as a fire department member, or could

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12
May 12, 2009

anyone, even if you're not a firefighter in the department serve as a police officer? Through you, Sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE: (104th)

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no, it does not necessarily restrict anybody but generally that is the way that it has been. They usually are a member of the fire department.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Perillo.

REP. PERILLO: (113th)

Mr. Speaker, thank you, and I thank the gentle lady for her answers to my questions.

This is a fair Amendment. It is a reasonable proposal, and I support it and I urge its adoption.

Thank you, Sir.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Will you remark further? Representative Coutu.

REP. COUTU: (47th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for this . I have a question pertaining, through you, Mr. Speaker,

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

13
May 12, 2009

relating to the change of adjoining to other, and just to expand on that, an example of why we would do that.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Gentile.

REP. GENTILE: (104th)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, through you. Right now when there is a particular big fire or a big storm or something, we do have intra-local agreements and inter-local agreements that take place, so it doesn't necessarily have to be an adjoining city.

For instance, in the City of Ansonia, when we had the big latex fire, we had representatives there from numerous fire departments helping our department, but they were not necessarily adjoining.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Coutu.

REP. COUTU: (47th)

Thank you, Sir. I agree. The fire police are essential. It's great when you arrive to the scene you have somebody coordinating exactly what's going on. I think this clarifies, related to the helmet, that there really is no color.

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

14
May 12, 2009

It clears up the rules so that our fire police could do their job in an efficient manner. So this is a good and thank you for your effort.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Thank you, Representative. Will you remark further on the Amendment? Will you remark further on the Amendment?

If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of the Amendment please signify by saying Aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

All those opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The Amendment is adopted.

Will you remark further on the as amended? Will you remark further on the as amended?

If not, staff and guests please come to the Well of the House. Members take their seats. The machine will be opened.

CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by Roll Call. Members to the Chamber.

pat
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

15
May 12, 2009

The House is voting by Roll Call. Members to the Chamber.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Have all the Members voted? Have all the Members voted? If all the Members have voted, please check the board to make sure your vote is properly case.

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

Will the Clerk please announce the tally.

CLERK:

House Bill Number 6541 as amended by House "A".

Total Number Voting	141
Necessary for Passage	71
Those voting Yea	141
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	10

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The as amended is passed.

Are there any announcements or introductions?
Any announcements or introductions? Representative Mazurek.

REP. MAZUREK: (80th)

Okay. Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon to you. It's great to see you up there.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC
SAFETY AND
SECURITY**

**PART 2
357 - 735**

2009

TED SCHROLL: Good morning still, Representative Dargan, Senator Stillman, and members of the committee. My name is Ted Schroll. I'm a Legislative Representative for the Connecticut State Firefighters Association.

Connecticut State Firefighters Association has some mixed emotions about raised House Bill 6541, An Act Concerning Firefighter I Certification and Requirements. And I should have stated before, I'm going to briefly mention -- talk about two bills. And the other bill we are in support of is Senate Bill 1010 and there will be a lot of people speaking about that bill, so I'll leave the expertise to that.

You've got written testimony -- some written testimony that I submitted on our letterhead, and I'll just briefly try to touch base on all of that. But we agree that all individuals, including firefighters should be familiar with CPR and AEDs. We do not feel that this bill is the way to do that and we believe that the training should be done at the local fire department level. Excuse me -- Firefighter I is a voluntary training program in Connecticut. It does not seem logical to add a mandatory requirement to a voluntary program. One major -- a couple of factors, is time involved, Firefighter I now incorporates about 162 hours of training. Suggested delivery time for the requirement, this new requirement, is approximately eight more hours. As the Regional Training School is instructing mostly volunteers, this relates to between two and four additional sessions which are usually at night for volunteer firefighters. The cost of the program, Firefighter I program, now it costs to put on between 500 and 600 dollars, the individuals

have to pay for that. This requirement would add up to about between 140 to 150 dollars to the cost of Firefighter I.

And finally, we do not see anything in this bill that offers any funding to offset the costs of providing this additional training. Because of the budget constraints more than \$400,000 -- of state budget constraints, more than \$400,000 of funding to pay for Firefighter I training reimbursement has already been removed from the Commission of Fire Prevention Control budget as part of the state's deficit mitigation plan. Also, the Firefighter I training reimbursement program for the 2010 and 2011 biennium has been suspended, it has been zero funded for both years. Firefighter training has once again become the burden of the municipality and in some cases the individual firefighter. In some of the small towns individual firefighters have to put their money upfront in order to get into Firefighter I training, and once they complete it they may get their money back depending on whether the municipality has any money left at the end of the year.

The Firefighter I training and especially requirements of this bill truly become an unfunded mandate on the municipalities and we feel that we should oppose this bill. And I will try to answer any questions if I can.

REP. DARGAN: Thank you, Ted.

Questions from committee members? Any questions?

Thank you very much then, Ted --

TED SCHROLL: Thank you.

T 1A



CONNECTICUT STATE FIREFIGHTERS ASSOCIATION, INC.

March 3, 2009

Senator Andrea Stillman, Co-Chair Public Safety & Security Committee
Representative Stephan Dargan, Co-Chair Public Safety & Security Committee

My name is Ted Schroll, Legislative Representative for the Connecticut State Firefighters Association. Our Association represents approximately 28,000 career and volunteer firefighters in Connecticut.

The Connecticut State Firefighters Association has some mixed emotions with Raised House Bill #6541, AN ACT CONCERNING FIREFIGHTER 1 CERTIFICATION REQUIREMENTS.

While we completely agree that everyone should be competent in performing CPR, and be familiar with AED's, we do not feel that this is the way to accomplish this training. At a meeting of the Education committee of the CSFA on July 24, 2008 this initiative was thoroughly discussed with the Director of Certification of the CFPC. It was determined that the Certification Office is not intending to evaluate CPR & first aid skills. Although these skills are included in the new NFPA 1001 standard, they are considered as skills that are subject to determination of inclusion into a training program based on the local Authority Having Jurisdiction. In the case of Connecticut, this AHJ would effectively be the local fire department.

The Commission on Fire Prevention & Control is charged by statute with the task of promulgating voluntary training standards for the Fire Service. It does not seem probable to add the mandatory requirement contained in Raised Bill #6541 to the voluntary Firefighter 1 program.

FIREFIGHTER 1 IS NOT REQUIRED TRAINING IN CONNECTICUT.

There is certainly merit to providing medical response training for firefighters. However, with a Firefighter 1 program currently consisting of approximately 162 hours of training, we find it difficult to add more programs within this training. It is our understanding that the American Red Cross delivers a professional rescuer CPR course for Adult, Child, & Infant with AED training. The suggested delivery time is 8 hours.

Additionally, is the cost of this additional training. Currently the cost of the Firefighter 1 course at the Regional Fire Schools is between \$500-\$600. One option would be to contract the course to the American Red Cross or the American Heart Association. The American Red Cross course fee is approximately \$80. There would be the additional cost of books (\$40) and pocket masks (\$20) for the students. There would also be additional costs for manikins and AED simulators. It is felt that this training would add approximately \$140-\$150 to the cost of Firefighter 1 training.

Finally, we do not see anything in this bill that offers any funding to offset the costs of providing this additional training. Who will pay for this training? Because of budget constraints, more than \$400,000 of funding to pay for Firefighter 1 training reimbursement has been removed from the CFPC budget as part of the State's deficit mitigation plan. Also, the Firefighter 1 training reimbursement program for the 2010/2011 biennium has been suspended. It has been zero funded for both years. Firefighter training has once again become the burden of the municipality, and in some cases, the individual firefighter. Firefighter 1 training and especially the requirements of this bill truly become an unfunded mandate on the municipalities. We feel that we must oppose this bill.

We thank you for the opportunity to provide this testimony.

Respectfully Submitted,

Ted Schroll, Legislative Representative
Connecticut State Firefighters Association