

PA10-153

SB407

House	3899-3960	62
Senate	1480-1498, 3943, 3945-3946	22
Transportation	523	1
		85

H – 1084

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2010**

**VOL.53
PART 12
3573– 3922**

Mr. Clerk, please call Calendar 434.

THE CLERK:

On Page 23, Calendar 434, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 407, AN ACT REQUIRING MOTORCYCLE TRAINING PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE OF A MOTORCYCLE ENDORSEMENT, favorable report of the Committee on Appropriations.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

The Chair recognizes Representative Larson of East Hartford.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

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

REP. LARSON (11th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In May of 2009, a dear friend of mine, Stephanie Pelletier lost her son Nick Cohen to a motorcycle accident at the age of 19. Nick was operating a motorcycle without having had any motorcycle training.

After losing Nick, Stephanie began to research our state's requirements on obtaining a motorcycle license. This Bill requires all applicants for a motorcycle license, license endorsement, rather than those just under 18 to demonstrate to the Motor Vehicle Commissioner that they have successfully completed a novice training course.

By law, the course must be conducted by the Department of Transportation or a firm or organization conducting a course that uses the curriculum of the Motorcycle Safety Foundation or other educational organization that has developed a curriculum approved by the Department of Motor Vehicle Commissioner.

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO 3956. I would ask the Clerk please call the amendment and be granted leave of the chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Mr. Clerk, please call LCO 3956 designated Senate Amendment "A." the gentleman has been granted leave to summarize.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 3956, Senate "A," offered by

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

326
May 3, 2010

Senator DeFronzo. Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Briefly, this amendment requires that the DOT conduct the course with available federal funds, and simply delays the effective date of this change from October 1, 2010 to January 1 of 2011.

I urge adoption of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

The motion is on adoption. Will you remark?
Will you remark on Senate Amendment "A?"

Representative Zalaski of the 55th -- I'm sorry, of the 81st, Representative Zalaski.

REP. ZALASKI (81st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Glad you corrected that. It's the 81st. I have a question for the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Please proceed.

REP. ZALASKI (81st)

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If somebody from another state like Florida came, and he had to move to Connecticut and he already had a motorcycle license, marked down to

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

327
May 3, 2010

his driver's license in Florida and went to change his license over to Connecticut, would he have to go through the course as, because of this bill?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Zalaski, maybe we want to wait with that question until after we adopt Senate "A." That seems to be on the bill itself --

REP. ZALASKI (81st):

Okay.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

-- rather than this amendment here. That's to a different question. Will you remark on Senate Amendment "A?" Will you remark? Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, a question, through you to the proponent of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Please proceed, Representative.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Representative, in looking at this particular Amendment in the second portion of it, it says that with federal funds available for the purpose of

such course.

My question regarding the funds is, the expectation when this becomes part of the bill is that people will be expected to take the course and that there will be federal funds.

Do you anticipate that there would be an increase in the cost of the course per rider with this amendment?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

No, I don't, Mr. Speaker, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you. Through you, Mr. Speaker, again, in the question of the federal funds becoming available, is there an expectation there's going to be an increase in the federal funds that are going to become available?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

329
May 3, 2010

REP. LARSON (11th):

Currently, Mr. Speaker, there's a \$4 surcharge levied under Connecticut General Statute Section 14-49 on a two-year motorcycle registration, new and renewal, where the DOT currently receives about \$200,000 annually, and those funds are used to support training activities and equipment for the State of Connecticut rider education program.

As well, there is an available grant that the Department is pursuing or is in the process of pursuing. It's SAFTE, safe accountable flexible transportation equity act that they are in the process of applying for, is my understanding. Through you, Mr. Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you. I thank the gentleman for his answer. Do you know how much that grant is that they are applying for and how many riders it would cover?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

330
May 3, 2010

REP. LARSON (11th):

I don't believe that the grant is necessarily rider based. I think it's to allow the curriculum and training and some of the equipment that would be necessary for the training program.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Okay. The reason I asked that question is that the expectation would be there would be a significant number of riders that would be now put into the pool per year, and it would necessitate, because the riders do not come riding their motorcycles because they're coming to a motorcycle safety course, that there need to be the motorcycles for them to learn to train on, and that's a very, very expensive proposition.

I've had the experience of taking the course with my daughter after being a 30-year rider myself. So I'm very aware of the equipment that they have, the type of program that they have and that they've also had, until a year ago, a four-month waiting list for people to ride, and those are those people who chose to, who

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

331
May 3, 2010

voluntarily decided that they would take the rider's course.

So I would ask the question perhaps a little differently, through you, Mr. Speaker. How many more riders do you expect to be added to the yearly list if we were doing an average of say the last few years?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. There are currently 208,000 Connecticut licensees who currently operate motorcycles.

There are some 1,409 active in the, actively as of April of this year with active permits that we know of.

It is the expectation of the Department to provide training, but not to become the sole provider, if you will, of the training. Their expectation is to move this out into the private sector at driver training facilities, or one might get a Connecticut driver's license.

I know that, for example, Tunxis Community

pat/mb/gbr.
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

332
May 3, 2010

College also offers the course and so forth.

And so, I don't have a specific number to answer that question, but I can only acknowledge that what the current level of ridership is and those that are currently in the program. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, sir. Let me make sure I understood their answer correctly, that in the month of April there were about 1,000 riders that currently have their permits, that are either in the program or about to be in the program.

REP. LARSON (11th):

They're in the program.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

And those are those that voluntarily decided that they are going to ride and that we have the equipment for those currently.

May I ask, then, if I'm understanding that correctly, how many riders obtained their motorcycle license last year in total? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

333
May 3, 2010

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

I don't have that figure available, Mr.
Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I did vote no on
this, of the particular, the underlying bill in the
Committee and my concern was the cost. It is a
very, very expensive program to run, and until that
\$4 fee was put on, it was totally borne by the
federal grants.

The federal grants come through,
interestingly, not through the DMV to do the rider
training, but through the DOT, which is an unusual
situation, but that's where the grant comes
through.

So we had a situation a few years ago where we
have limited access. We have a huge backup of
people who want to take the class, and I'll tell
you one of the advantages of taking the class is
you may decide that motorcycle riding is not for

you. You tried it. It sounded great at the time and you tried it and you just didn't have the dexterity, the skill level, the other comfort level to continue and go through the rest of the permitting process and actually go out on the road.

That's one of the best parts of the program because we really don't want someone going out onto the road that is not experienced, is not trained, and what we know is that most of the fatal accidents that occur in the United States are people who have had their license less than three months, a majority.

So let's go back again to the underlying Amendment and the question about, with the federal funds available for the purpose of such course.

Here's my concern, Mr. Speaker. I love the intent of the underlying bill because I believe that everyone should be trained. So much so that I took the course with my daughter to make sure she took it and enjoyed it and we had a little contest who was better, and to tell you the truth, I did better on the tarmac because it's a two-part and she did better by one point, on the written. She's very proud of that and rubs it in every time we go

out for a ride.

But I can tell you that if we do not have enough vehicles, if we do not have enough instructors, then this is going to cause even more frustration and cause people to ride illegally with someone, a friend trying to train them, where today people are riding with a friend who is helping to try and train them, and it's not illegal.

I believe when the state does something we should plan on it and plan on doing it right.

I guess I would like to just ask one more question, through you, Mr. Speaker, if I may.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Please proceed.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Is the expectation, Representative Larson, from your understanding and working so closely with this bill, and you've done a wonderful job. Please accept my congratulations because it's something that's been doing.

Do you believe that with these additional funds that we will be able to reduce the waiting list, or we will be able to take care of the current situation when this becomes effective

January 1, 2011, which is not riding time, but, I'm sorry, within that time.

Do you believe it's actually a very short window of time after January 1, for that next riding season. Do you believe that there is significant time to be able to put together the funds, the equipment, the instructors, who by the way on the state program are almost all volunteers, by the way, and of course, there's going to be an increase. You're going to have to find more volunteers who are willing to give up their riding time to go teach, but perhaps another Representative in this Chamber would love to do that.

But that we could look at, is there enough time for the state to put its piece into place and to work with the private sector to increase the other rider training?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes. The Commissioner may approve other entities such as

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

337
May 3, 2010

licensed driving schools to conduct the motorcycle safety program at really no cost to the State of Connecticut other than to develop curriculum and possibly provide guidance.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate his answers and I'll save my remaining questions for the underlying bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Very good. Will you remark on Senate "A?" Will you remark? If not, I'll try your minds.

All those in favor of Senate Amendment "A" signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Those opposed, nay. The ayes have it. Senate "A" is adopted.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th);

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The Clerk is also, has an amendment, LCO 5082, and I would ask the Clerk to please call the amendment and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Mr. Clerk, please call LCO 5082 designated House Amendment "A."

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 5082, House "A," offered by Representatives Guerrera and Larson.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

The gentleman seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize. Without objection, please proceed, sir.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Essentially what this does, the legislative intent of this amendment is clean up language with the Department of Motor Vehicles.

It has been my understanding that, with this new requirement that the Department of Motor Vehicles currently, already honors out-of-state licenses and this specific Bill, not the amendment,

is supporting those whose, the intent of this bill is to support new riders in the State of Connecticut.

My understanding is the Motor Vehicle Department already will accept an out-of-state license so that that requirement for training would not be necessary for those. This only applies to residents of the State of Connecticut getting a Connecticut license.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. And I move adoption of the amendment.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Motion is on adoption of House Amendment "A." Will you remark? Representative Scribner. Will you remark on Senate, House Amendment "A?" Will you remark?

If not, I'll try your minds. Motion is adoption of House Amendment "A." All those in favor signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Those opposed, nay.

The ayes have it. House "A" is adopted.

Will you remark on the bill as amended?

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. Thank you,
Mr. Speaker.

I think that this is a fantastic Bill. I think it goes a long way toward providing individuals who wish to drive motorcycles in the State of Connecticut an opportunity to do that safely.

There's a number of statistics that prove that enhanced education in this particular field can only do one thing, and that's save lives, and that's the intent, and I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Motion is passage as amended. Will you remark? Representative Scribner. The Amendments were both adopted. This is on the bill as amended.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, a couple of questions to the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Please proceed.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Thank you. It's my understanding that the intent of the bill is to, largely to expand the audience of applications other than the current law, which is only minors under the age of 18 that would be applying for the motorcycle license. Would that be true?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Yes.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

It's also my understanding that the new language that would expand the age requirement for all new applicants for a, to take a safety test in order to obtain a motorcycle license does not apply to current license holders that are above 18. Would that be correct?

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Scribner.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I know that previously the proponent indicated that there was a certain number of motorcycle license holders in the State of Connecticut. I think I heard you say 208,000?

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Scribner.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

With the current number or projected number of new applicants that this would apply to was a figure closer to 1,000? Would that be true?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

The only information that I would have on that would be those currently in a situation where they've applied for a motorcycle permit.

And as I mentioned before, as of April of this year, we have 1,409 who are currently applying for a motorcycle permit. I don't know how statistically that might carry out in order to provide an average for you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Scribner.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It is also my understanding that under present law there are other opportunities and other providers of the stated safety course other than the Department of Transportation. Would that be true?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Scribner.

REP. SCRIBNER, (107th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think it is important to note that in large

part, as I understand it, and having it gone through the public hearing process is that our real interest here is to identify that the need for a safety course really shouldn't only apply to a minor under the age of 18 because the demonstrated need as evidenced has less to do with age and has more to do with lack of experience in handling or operating a motorcycle.

Would you agree with that? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Yes, I would.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Scribner.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Thank you. It is also my understanding that private industry, including some of the motorcycle retailers who currently do provide an opportunity to motorcycle enthusiasts or applicants, do already now and will continue to provide that opportunity for them to take a test there so there is somewhat of a limited potential burden to be placed on the

Department of Transportation to expand the age of the applicants taking a test.

Would you agree with that? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

I was with you up until the last part of it, but in general terms, yes.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

I guess what I'm trying to do is identify that despite the fact that there may be some legitimate concern about a future volume and therefore, burden on the State Department of Transportation to provide the testing opportunity, that the testing opportunities will still be available from other sources, and as a result of that the burden will be far less than what might be anticipated to the State Department itself. Would you agree with that?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, yes. In fact some of our conversations with staff at both DOT and DMV have indicated that they would much prefer to keep this out into the academy, schools and other areas so that they in fact were not doing the bulk of that work.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Scribner.

REP. SCRIBNER (107th):

Thank you. I would just like to say that in general terms I strongly support this initiative. I think that there's plenty of evidence as the proponent cited early in his comments, that the true need here is all about creating a safer environment for all new motorcycle applicants, not to suggest that anyone that currently is a holder and has a length of experience handling and operating a motorcycle, but it really is focused on that new, less experienced operator.

And as indicated in language that was provided, there is opportunity for the State of Connecticut to apply for federal funding through the safety loop program of up to \$100,000. That funding is always subject to continued passage at

the Congressional level, and right now is due to expire later this year, I believe on October 1st.

So there is some risk there in regard to whether or not we would have that opportunity in the future, but it's also noted in information that was provided to the Transportation Committee that there are other alternative sources of funding that could help to supplement the state's cost in the implementation of this program, which could include and does not at the moment, passing that on to the test applicants themselves.

So I urge my colleagues to support this measure. I think it truly is a safety measure being implemented and proposed for the benefit of the motorcycle applicants here in the state. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Thank you, Representative Scribner.

Will you remark on the bill as amended?

Representative Rigby.

REP. RIGBY (63rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good evening.

Mr. Speaker, through you, several questions for the proponent of the bill.

H – 1085

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2010**

**VOL.53
PART 13
3923 – 4245**

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Prepare yourself, Representative Larson.

Please proceed, Representative Rigby.

REP. RIGBY (63rd):

Mr. Speaker, through you, in order to obtain a motorcycle endorsement in the State of Connecticut, an individual must possess a valid Connecticut driver's license, be of a specific age, and also pass a rather demanding road test, which requires the operator to move through a series of cones, demonstrate breaking skills, and otherwise show they can handle a motorcycle in all appropriate situations.

Mr. Speaker, through you, would that test still be in place if this bill were to become law?

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Could you repeat the question, please?

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Rigby, could you just repeat the question, please?

REP. RIGBY (63rd):

Certainly. Mr. Speaker, through you, if this

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

349
May 3, 2010

bill were to become law, would there still exist a test for new operators to pass, a test conducted by a DMV examiner?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

If the applicant for the permit in fact passes the motorcycle training course, that portion of the test would be waived.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Rigby.

REP. RIGBY (63rd):

Thank you. Mr. Speaker, through you, many people in my part of the state, the northwest corner, operate dirt bikes and ATVs, and at young ages.

Is there any exemption for those people that are already skilled in operating a two-wheeled vehicle to avoid having to take the motorcycle safety test?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

I don't know of any such waiver.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Rigby.

REP. RIGBY (63rd):

Thank you.

Mr. Speaker, through you, what would be the penalty for failing to comply with this law, this bill should it become law? Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

The license would not be, the endorsement would not be honored.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Rigby.

REP. RIGBY (63rd):

Thank you. While well intended, I'm going to be forced to vote against this bill. The Bill, the course does nothing to address the fact that it's other drivers on the road in the State of Connecticut that aren't aware of motorcyclists and don't pay attention to motorcyclists on the road.

And also, many accidents are contributed to, you know, high horsepower lightweight motorcycles and I don't think that those concerns are addressed, and I appreciate the chance to ask the questions, and I thank the Representative for his answers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Thank you, Representative.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

Representative Zalaski.

REP. ZALASKI (81st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A question for the proponent.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Please proceed.

REP. ZALASKI (81st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I think I heard you say already, so you probably have answered my question, but I just wanted to double check, and that was if you moved to Connecticut from Maine and you already have a valid motorcycle license, it will be honored here in getting your new license in Connecticut without

you having to take the course. Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

REP. ZALASKI (81st):

Thank you. I would just like to comment that I being a member of the Connecticut Motorcycle Riders Association, we fully and wholeheartedly endorse this bill because education is the key to being a better motorcyclist.

I've ridden motorcycles for 45 years and I even took the course late in life, a more advanced course, and there's many things, even after having ridden for over 40 years, that I learned in the course five years ago, that I think are very important to keep you alive and keep you safe on the highway.

So I hope my colleagues will vote yes on this bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Thank you, Representative.

Will you remark further?

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (122nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A couple of questions. Will this in any way impact motorcycle clubs where they may be forced to wear helmets?

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (122nd):

The only reason I ask that is because of the fact that the way the requirement that they wear a helmet, they were given an opportunity to have special training for all the people who had motorcycle licenses a few years back.

If I were to buy a motorcycle today, would that mandate that I get a license for that motorcycle?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, no.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (122nd):

Thank you. The reason I ask that is if I wanted to ride, say a dirt bike, I guess that would be considered a motorcycle of sorts, I could ride it on my own property, or if I had property in Vermont, or New Hampshire or Maine, I can go on the back roads and ride it as long as I want, again, not needing a license from Connecticut?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, my understanding of the motorcycle differential between maybe a dirt bike and a motorcycle is 50 CCs. So if you were to own and operate a motorcycle in excess of that, you would be required to have the motorcycle endorsement and take this particular class.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

355
May 3, 2010

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER (122nd):

Thank you very much for your answers. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Thank you, Representative.

Will you remark further?

Representative Candelaria of the 95th.

REP. CANDELARIA (95th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A question through you to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Please proceed.

REP. CANDELARIA (95th):

If you have a 50 CC moped or scooter, will you be required to take the novice motorcycle training?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, my best answer would be is, if you're required to have a motorcycle

endorsement to ride those instruments, the answer would be yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

So 50 CC scooter motorcycle qualifies under that definition, Mr. Speaker, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm not familiar with the specific quality of the vehicle, if you will. I would just simply fall back to that if you were looking to have this motorcycle endorsement attached to your motor vehicle license under this program, you would have to take the class.

So if it was subject to the vehicle you were planning on driving on public roads, was subject to a motorcycle license, you would have to take this class.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'm a little bit concerned about that response because it is my understanding that any scooter motorcycle under 50 CC, which is street legal, you do not need an endorsement.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, can he rephrase that or clarify that for me one more time?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson, do you want to take another try at that?

REP. LARSON (11th):

My understanding is that if you operate a motor vehicle in excess of 50 CCs, you're required to have the motorcycle license endorsement on your Connecticut motor vehicle license.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, so basically you're telling me anything under 50 CCs, you do not need an endorsement? Just for clarification, through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that's my understanding.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, once this bill is implemented, what approximately will be the cost for the training? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, my understanding right now is that the cost is \$200. By allowing other entities throughout the state to offer this course, either in places where they are certified, I think that that price would be subject to the market.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95th):

Another question, through you, Mr. Speaker. When we adopted Senate Amendment "A," it spoke

about federal, (inaudible) federal dollars before we can implement this.

A question through you, Mr. Speaker, if we don't receive any federal funding, what would be our other options to secure this training. Would it be through a different vendor? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, there currently under state law is a \$4 surcharge levied on new and renewable motorcycle registrants. The intent is, the Department of Transportation is to acquire federal money to enhance the program, but in fact try to keep this to the public entities and private entities, frankly, that would monitor and administer the course.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95th):

And one more question, through you, Mr. Speaker. Will the training be offered in other languages, per se, Spanish? Through you, Mr.

Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Thank you very much. Through you, Mr. Speaker, one would assume that if there was federal money involved or state money involved, that the program would be offered in other languages.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Very good. Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, so that means if we do not secure any federal dollars for the training then any other outside vendor may not offer the training for those that are of other, more fluent in other languages?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson, care to answer that question?

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I believe that the curriculum is going to be such that if in fact you are going to deliver this through a school or

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

361
May 3, 2010

academy that you must offer it in, with bilingual opportunities.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Candelaria.

REP. CANDELARIA (95th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I thank the gentleman for his answers.

I think this is an excellent Bill, and I think at the end of the day I'll be supporting the bill.

I'm a little bit concerned about those individuals that cannot afford the \$200, who will neglect to get the endorsement but continue to drive the motorcycle without the endorsement. I'm a little bit concerned about that.

And also I'm concerned that there will not be a guarantee that this training will be offered in other languages, per se Spanish, knowing there are a lot of Hispanic motorcyclist enthusiasts out there that may have some language barriers, and taking the novice training in another language will be very difficult, putting them in a position to be fined by the police department for not obeying the law.

I don't know how (inaudible) but I love the intent of it and I wish I can support it, but hopefully by the end of the day or the few minutes that we have, I'll be there with you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Thank you, Representative.

Will you remark on the bill as amended?

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'm just going to speak to the issue of when you would be required to take the on road skills course with regard to DMV.

And as I understand the bill with the amendment, if you took the class and passed their curriculum, and that curriculum had included some kind of a driving skill, you would then not have to take any roads course in conjunction with getting your license at Motor Vehicle.

And when I think about this bill, I think about what we require the average individual getting a passenger license for a motor vehicle to get. My understanding there is that when my

children went through driver's training, someone came out to the driver's training school and quite often took them through that driver's training course, a Motor Vehicle employee, so they had that component.

Motor Vehicle didn't step away from the requirement of showing that they could back a car up and park in the parking space and everything else, turn signals.

But it sounds to me that this bill wouldn't require that, and so theoretically if you took the course, satisfied the instructor, Motor Vehicle then would just you take a written course, or would they accept a certification? Is that correct?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, my understanding is that there's still a written test that needs to be taken along with this program, and passage of this program alleviates the on road portion of it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Miner.

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

364
May 3, 2010

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I take that answer to mean that there is a written component, but would not be a physical, go through the cones component, as I guess Representative Rigby was asking about.

Mr. Speaker, I want to support this bill. I, like everyone else have had constituents that have either been hurt or killed, or someone they know as a result of a motor vehicle accident with a motorcycle.

I'm a little concerned that in my interest in supporting this bill I would actually be supporting something that I think might be a little less strict than what we have right now.

I'm not saying that we wouldn't have a component. It might provide more education than you'd get by learning it on your own. I think that part of it's good.

What concerns me is this kind of opt out provision that for a couple of hundred bucks you can go and take a course somewhere and that's the same as having motor vehicle. You show up at Motor Vehicle and do what I've witnessed people do in

Winsted or wherever, which is where you go through the cones and show that you can actually maneuver the motorcycle in a way that they have deemed to be safe.

And so I'm going to continue to think about this. Maybe I'm the last speaker, but that is my concern in supporting this bill, that by supporting the education component, I've got to kind of swallow the fact that we're no longer going to give the test.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Thank you.

Will you remark?

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

If I may, a few questions through you to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Please proceed.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

In following up of Representative Miner's question, and looking at the language that he was

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

366
May 3, 2010

referring to within the bill on Line 20, where the Commissioner may waive the on road skills portion of the examination. How is that different from the current law?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

My understanding, Mr. Speaker, is that the Department of Motor Vehicles has asked us to remove that language as part of clean up by adding this safety class.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Let me paint a scenario. Maybe you can help me through this then, instead.

If you have a case where you have a young person and they're going to take the class. They go and they pay their money. They, half a day they spend, which is current practice from the state class, half a day they spend doing studying and the other half they spend on the blacktop with the

machine.

But let me clarify, on that blacktop on the machine, you are one of 12 or 15, and so you spend much of your time watching 11 or 14 others go around before you. And most of it is done at about 5 to 10 miles an hour. It is driving through the cones. It is precision control, but at a very, very slow speed and it is not done with other cars or other motorcycles in the presence, so it is done of a very, very, very, very, very, very novice basis and with not much environmental exposure to actually what's out on the road.

Having said that part, if you have a case where a motorcyclist has gone to get his permit, motorcyclist to be, has gone to get his permit, gone to take the course, he's had the course. He's done the roadwork on these cones.

Could he actually go and take the class? I mean, go take the test at the DMV, half the test and actually obtain a motorcycle license without ever having been on the road?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

I'm not really following your train of thought. I have difficulty answering that.

My understanding is that an individual would apply for a permit. Would get a permit, and could in fact, practice. The current law is, you drive around on a permit with some restrictions of actually where you could travel.

You then take another test to get your motorcycle endorsement. Prior to taking that test, and included is part of this training, my understanding is both classroom and some practical application. I'm not exactly familiar with what those, the practicality is of balancing et cetera with the motorcycle, and then you would pass that.

And then in fact after doing the combination of that you would be eligible for the motorcycle endorsement. That's my understanding. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Could you clarify that last part, the combination of what two pieces? Through you, Mr.

Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, you would take a permit out. You would take this class, which would have a combination of classroom work and maneuver ability, practical application for the lack of a better word and then, you know, effectively take your test. And if you were able to pass that, you would be given the motorcycle endorsement.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

And he just described what I was trying to describe. Thank you.

You can actually take this test. You can actually practice very slow at five miles an hour. You can pass the test at the DMV and you can get your motorcycle license, ladies and gentlemen without ever having to be on the road, and certainly without having to own a motorcycle is one of the failings of the system.

If I can go a little bit further, could you

tell me please how much money is going to be needed to meet the anticipated increase in the number of applicants for this program if it were to, in the worst case scenario, stay within the system?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I don't have that. I don't know how many individuals will be applying.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you. And could you please tell me how many more certified instructors are anticipated to be needed to satisfy the increase in numbers because everyone will be mandated to take this course.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I don't have an exact number of certified instructors that are

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

371
May 3, 2010

currently available.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, do you have a percentage perhaps the number of increase anticipated needed? Is it going to be or 10 or 15 or 50 percent increase, do you suspect in the needed instructors, to meet the need for the, for everyone to take this course?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I don't have an actual number.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, do you have an anticipated cost for the training for instructors that is going to be needed for any increase that might be? I don't even know how much

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

372
May 3, 2010

it costs to become an instructor.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

I'm not familiar with exactly what the certification requirements would be to be an instructor, what that process is, but I do know that the Department of Transportation has a certified course that needs to be taken and approved by the Commissioner of the Department of Motor Vehicles. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And it's quite an expensive program that you have to take in order to become an instructor, and currently today, or recently, the last time I talked to someone about this, there has been a shortage of instructors.

One of the problems is, when you become an instructor, then they expect you to instruct and they ask you, just that they beg you to, because there's such a shortage of instructors.

These people volunteer to teach for the State of Connecticut, not unlike the CARE Program, which is an aquatic three source education program teaching fishing. People volunteer to do that.

This takes quite a bit of training to become a motorcycle instructor, but one of the problems is, in Connecticut, the only time we teach motorcycle training is in the good weather.

One of the things that the Department had hoped to do a number of years ago was to find an indoor facility for the bad weather, during the winter months to be able to take the pressure off the good riding season so that they could use their instructors when they didn't want to be out on their own riding in the good weather.

Because, ladies and gentlemen, when they, when an instructor is going to be teaching, it takes away from their own personal riding time, the time that they have for enjoyment, whether they're doing it with friends or with family, if they're going somewhere, they're using it perhaps for a weekend time to be out on the road and to enjoy, certainly, the magnificent back roads of our State of Connecticut.

We have a shortage of instructors. It is something that I've heard from the retailers, the few that do have the courses in the state right now, and I've heard it from the state as well.

I've also heard it from the instructors, that they don't want to give up any more of their personal riding time to volunteer to do these weekends, and it's usually a very busy weekend or a couple of weekends, depending on which course you take.

So it's a problem, and they're not paid for it. They're doing it out of the goodness of their heart because they believe in rider education, which is a fantastic give back to the state.

It is costly. They do it under their own dime to take the course, and we have a situation where there aren't enough, and by the way, we don't have the money in our pocket to put this program forward.

A question for you, through you, Mr. Speaker, is there any understanding through the Department, to the proponent of the bill, is there any understanding how someone who purchases a used machine would know that they have to take this

pat/mb/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

375
May 3, 2010

course before they get their license?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER O'ROURKE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

I don't think that the endorsement is incumbent upon the age of the vehicle. It would seem to me that you would still need to take the course.

However, if you currently have a motorcycle and are driving it, you don't need to take the safety program.

(Deputy Speaker Orange in the Chair.)

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Good evening, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Good evening, ma'am.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

I'd like to talk about motorcycles for just a minute more. Madam Speaker, in the case of,

through you, a question through you to the proponent.

In the case of someone purchasing a new machine, is it expected that the dealerships will require proof that whoever takes away the machine will have to have a license? Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

That's not necessarily a yes or no question. But I guess the answer to that question would be, through you, Madam Speaker, no.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker. Certainly, a motorcycle can be picked up and taken away, taken home on a trailer. It can certainly be picked up perhaps by someone who already has a motorcycle license, and of course a machine that's going to be purchased, if it's private, has to not be put on the road unless it is correctly registered with the DMV, not the DOT.

Again, we're talking about two different agencies here that needs to have their requirements satisfied in order to be able to get this machine on the road.

Through you, Madam Speaker, to the proponent of the bill, is it expected that there will be greater communication between the DOT and the DMV now that it's going to be expected that everyone has to have this.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

I appreciate his answer on that. There has been numerous snags over the years in trying to get people through one program and then get them to the DMV with their correct paperwork and have it approved, so I'm looking forward to that.

Madam Speaker, in my heart of harts, I love the underlying intent of this bill. I think it's

fantastic. I think it's the way we should be going.

But I've got a fiscal concern and it goes back to the not knowing the number of riders that are on average that are going to be coming forward, and must take this before they get their license. And also that we don't have the money in hand to be able to double the program, triple the program, or maybe only bring it up by 50 percent.

We don't know how many that's going to be. We don't even have an estimate and we don't have the money.

The underlying bill says they approximated perhaps \$100,000 it was going to cost. I truly hope that we get the money that comes through. I totally support this program. I made both my children take this program.

I think I didn't tell them quite all the truth. I told them that they had to be 21 to learn to ride and then I think they thought that was the law, but I wasn't too clear on that because I wanted them to be mature. I wanted them to have the training and I wanted them to be able to move forward in the most safe possible way.

We know. We've seen the bumper stickers that says that we're hoping that people are going to be paying attention because there are motorcycles on the road.

So I'd like to thank Representative Larson for all his work on this. I think he's done an absolutely noble job at trying to put this forward.

But, Mr. Speaker, I don't think we have the money yet to do it. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, madam.

Will you care to remark on the bill as amended? Will you care to remark on the bill as amended?

Representative Shawn Johnston you have the floor.

REP. JOHNSTON (51st):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I don't disagree with some of the comments that Representative Sawyer did on the fiscal note, and I'm not speaking on the fiscal implications of the bill.

But very quickly, I just want to make sure I understand and one quick question, and then I'll

make a comment.

The quick question through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

You may proceed.

REP. JOHNSTON (51st):

Madam Speaker, if I understand the bill correctly, once an individual has taken this preapproved course, is it my understanding, through you, Madam Speaker, that he would not have to have a DMV employee certify through a road test that that individual would be qualified to operate a, to receive his motorcycle driver's license?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Larson.

REP. LARSON (11th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I believe the answer to that question is yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Representative Johnston.

REP. JOHNSTON (51st):

I thank the gentleman for his answer. Madam Speaker, when we cast the votes I will be in the negative on this, and Madam Speaker, it's simply

for the reason that I think we ought to hold on to that final okay before someone gets a license.

I know that we've got preapproved courses. I spent many, many years going at the driver retraining component, which was a preapproved course by the Department of Motor Vehicles that had become a joke in the State of Connecticut. It ended up being a no bid contractor for one individual to do the entire state.

Through three commissioners, Madam Speaker, I was unsuccessful in trying to get somebody inroads into that program. Finally the State Police went in with a subpoena, pulled off (inaudible) records. That individual isn't doing driver retraining courses, thank God, in the State of Connecticut any more.

I don't think that we ought to give up our right through our State Department of Motor Vehicles that we have attested that this person is road worthy, that we ought to just take the word of an organization, which could be a private organization, no matter how good the course is.

I think in a perfect world we do this course, which I think is terrific and I think it's good

work that we have this kind of a course.

But I still think at the end of the day it ought to be certified by an actual representative of the Department of Motor Vehicles that that person is road worthy.

So for those reasons, Madam Speaker, I will be voting in the negative on this. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you, sir.

Will you care to remark further on the bill as amended? Will you care to remark?

Representative Clark Chapin of the 67th, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I think early on in the discussion I heard the proponent reference that there were statistics that show that these types of courses certainly decrease the numbers of motor vehicle accidents, and I don't doubt that at all.

But during the debate I did go to the National Highway Traffic Safety Administration's website to look up some statistics on motorcycle fatalities and I found a wealth of information, primarily in

the ten-year period from 1990 to 1999, and perhaps it's in the report I've been looking at, but I haven't been able to find it, but I don't see any statistics on training and whether or not that has an impact.

Again, I think we would all agree that people who do take this course are probably less likely than those who don't take the course, less likely to get into an accident.

But I think it's important to point out that there are many factors outside of the realm of training. For example, I was surprised to find out that 28 percent of those who were involved in fatal motorcycle accidents within that ten-year period didn't even have a motorcycle operator's license.

Fifty-three percent were operators without helmets. We've debated that in the Legislature at least in Committee or at least had the hearings before the Transportation Committee.

Committee in the years that I've been here, 52 percent in 1990 had alcohol as a factor. One of the positives is by 1999 that number was reduced, I think to 36 percent.

Forty percent of the fatalities involved

speeding as a factor. So although training may certainly help the situation, I think we also need to look at some of the other things, some of the other factors that are the reasons for the fatalities we have had.

I think Representative Zalaski and I had similar feelings on this. He came to a different conclusion. He did indicate that he's voluntarily taken the course and he learned a great deal in doing that.

But I think there has been some concerns expressed here that are legitimate ones and I'll be joining others who are in opposition to the bill today.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Thank you. Will you care to remark further on the bill? Will you care to remark further on the bill?

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

THE 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.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

Have all the Members voted? Have all the Members voted? Please check the board to determine if your vote has been properly cast.

If so, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally. And will the Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill Number 407 as amended by Senate "A" and House "A."

Total number voting	148
Necessary for Passage	75
Those voting Yea	117
Those voting Nay	31
Those absent and not voting	3

DEPUTY SPEAKER ORANGE:

The bill passes in concurrence with the Senate. The bill passes with House Amendment Schedule "A" and Senate "A."

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 433.

S - 602

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2010**

**VOL. 53
PART 5
1267 - 1608**

ch/gbr
SENATE

142

April 27, 2010

important issue because the chemotherapy is what saves lives. My wife went through chemotherapy and everything worked out great. But for those who can't have that because of the reaction, then you need this pill and that will solve the problem.

So with that, Mr. President, I support this bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Crisco.

SENATOR CRISCO:

Mr. President, I appreciate the comments of --
of my colleagues and on behalf of making life
better for those who are suffering from cancer I
ask this be placed on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Is there any further discussion on Senate Bill
50 as amended by Senate "A?"

Seeing none, there is a motion on the floor to
place this item on the consent calendar.

Without objection, so ordered.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Calendar page 32, File Number 191 -- File
Number 261, Substitute for Senate Bill 407, AN ACT

ch/gbr
SENATE

143

April 27, 2010

REQUIRING MOTORCYCLE TRAINING PRIOR TO THE ISSUANCE
OF A MOTORCYCLE ENDORSEMENT, favorable report of
the Committee on Transportation and Appropriations.

THE CHAIR:

Senator DeFronzo.

SENATOR DeFRONZO:

Thank you, Mr. President.

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

THE CHAIR:

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

SENATOR DeFRONZO:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, the Clerk is in possession of
an amendment, LCO 3956. I ask that the amendment
be called and I be given permission to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO 3956, which will be designated Senate
Amendment Schedule "A," is offered by Senator
DeFronzo of the 6th district.

ch/gbr
SENATE

144
April 27, 2010

THE CHAIR:

Senator DeFronzo.

SENATOR DeFRONZO:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I move adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR DeFRONZO:

Mr. President, this amendment addresses a fiscal note in the underlying bill and makes implementation of the motorcycle training class called for in the bill contingent on federal funding and I would ask the members of the Senate to approve the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

There's a -- would you remark further on Senate "A?"

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

A question through you to the proponent of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

ch/gbr
SENATE

145

April 27, 2010

Senator DeFronzo.

SENATOR KISSEL:

When you say contingent on federal funding, is this program anticipated to go forward on more than a single basis? In other words, will this be an annualized program? And when you talk about federal funding, does this mean that there has to be a federal funding stream that will take place more than for one year?

And I guess what I'm concerned with is that, you know, the American Recovery and Reinvestment Act that was a one shot for shovel ready projects. They're out; they're moving forward but when that money is gone that's gone but there's nothing going forward.

We've also seen initiatives for more police officers in -- in cities and towns. The federal gave -- government gave some seed money to hire those police officers but after a certain number of years that money dried up and municipalities were -- were left to either let those police officers go or pick up the slack. And so I'm just wondering what exactly this amendment anticipates.

Through you, Mr. President.

ch/gbr
SENATE

146

April 27, 2010

THE CHAIR:

Senator DeFronzo.

SENATOR DeFRONZO:

Through you, Mr. President, this amendment anticipates a federal grant. I've already been informally notified by the Department of Transportation that it's quite likely the state will be getting this grant. I -- I believe it's a -- a repetitive grant but to address the Senator's concerns in the longer term, the current fee for this program is about \$200 and I think the -- the alternative to the federal -- the federal funding in the long term would be to sustain the program through -- through those fees.

Currently, 6,000 Connecticut residents take this course and it's quite likely, obviously when we extent it to -- to those beyond the age of 18, that far more will be -- will be taking this class so that we'll probably be able to generate additional revenue in that way.

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

ch/gbr
SENATE

147
April 27, 2010

Thank you very much.

While I appreciate the response that we anticipate that this grant will be recurring, it doesn't sound like a guarantee. I do have overall concerns about creating programs based upon federal funding streams because I believe the federal government, at this time, is overextended.

I had a town hall meeting with a lot of great folks in Suffield, just last night, where the concern was raised that the federal deficit has gone up more in the last year than it was in the previous eight years. That we are beholden to countries like China as our banker and to prove how beholden we are it was just a few years ago that if the Dalai Lama came to Washington everybody wanted to be photographed with the Dalai Lama.

Well guess what Dalai Lama came to Washington and nobody wanted to be photographed with the Dalai Lama. Well, why is that when there's a Democratic Senate and a Democratic House and a Democratic President. I think it's because China does not favor the Dalai Lama and the independence that goes along with that individual. So if you're looking for signals that our nation is going too far down

ch/gbr
SENATE

148

April 27, 2010

the path of relying on federal funds, I think we're going too far down the path of relying on federal funds.

That being the case, I won't oppose the amendment at this time. I think that it -- it has a laudable goal for the people of the state of Connecticut but I just would like it to be known that I am concerned about our state becoming over-reliant on federal funding streams that I believe are unsustainable.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further on Senate "A?"

Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I rise to support this very good bill that simply extends the requirements for training for those not just under 18 but those over 18 as well. I think it is a safety issue and it -- I do -- further would like to clarify that it is for new applicants for motorcycle licenses and not for those currently holding motorcycle licenses as

ch/gbr
SENATE

. 149
April 27, 2010

well.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Boucher.

We are working on Senate Amendment "A" for --
for those on the floor.

Will you remark further on Senate "A?" Will
you remark further?

If not, let me try your minds. All those in
favor, please signify by saying, aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed, nays.

The ayes have it. "A" is adopted.

Will you remark further on Senate Bill 407 as
amended by "A?"

Senator DeFronzo.

SENATOR DeFRONZO:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I didn't realize this was going to trigger an
international incident here but -- but it is
intended to be a fairly specific bill. Currently,
in Connecticut, Mr. President, individuals under 18

ch/gbr
SENATE

150
April 27, 2010

years of age are required to have a training program before they can get their permit --

THE CHAIR:

Can we hold the chatter down a little bit?
I'm having a tough time hearing Senator DeFronzo.

SENATOR DeFRONZO:

Thank you, Mr. President, thank you.

Before they can get their endorsement, this -- this bill will extent that requirement to those over 18 years of age and Connecticut will then join four or five other states in the country that have this requirement. The -- the state of Connecticut has had a -- historically had a fairly lax program in terms of motorcycle training. Ninety-one percent of those individuals who are killed in motorcycle accidents have not had any prior training before being out on the road.

Using motorcycles is a very dangerous driving pastime and this bill is intended to try and change that. The -- the bill does not apply to individuals who have had a -- an endorsement in the last two years and it doesn't apply to individuals who are coming into state and have an endorsement from -- from an out-of-state entity. And the bill

ch/gbr
SENATE

151
April 27, 2010

will eliminate the requirement for the DMV to test after -- if an individual completes his training course. The current requirement for a DMV test, road test, will be eliminated making the completion of the course tantamount to completion of the -- of the DMV requirement.

So, Mr. President, I think this is a good bill. It was inspired by a -- a tragedy in East Hartford and I would like to yield to Senator LeBeau for a few comments concerning his constituent and the need for this bill.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

Senator LeBeau, do you accept the yield?

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Yes I do, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

And I'd like to first of all thank Senator DeFronzo for bringing forward this bill. Also thank Tim Larson -- Representative Tim Larson from the House for initiating the actions on this bill.

April 27, 2010

We had a very tragic incident a couple of years ago in East Hartford. A young man by the name of Nick Cohen, basically getting up to go to work, hopped on his bike and just like that died. And his mother believed, and I think rightly so, Mrs. Pelletier that -- Stephanie Pelletier, that if Nick had had better instruction in the use of the motorcycle that he would still be alive today.

Now, one, obviously, cannot say that for sure but we do know that the statistics regarding motorcycle accidents are pretty -- pretty glum. Of the accidents that -- that -- first of all, in motorcycle accidents, a study done by DMV showed that 75 percent of the accidents were actually caused by the motorcycle riders and that's contrary to what most motorcycle riders think.

In that -- of the -- of the deaths in the state, of the 63 deaths in the state in the last year, 91 percent of those were self-taught. So if we had this -- if we had this bill in -- in effect, we probably would have saved some lives. I mean that -- that is a -- a fairly solid statement to say that, that lives would have been saved.

And so this is an important bill. We don't do

ch/gbr
SENATE

153

April 27, 2010

a thing -- we don't do things like calling things after people like -- for me this is Nick's bill. Nick -- and I just want to say I knew Nick, as a student at East Hartford High School, and they say only the good die young and this -- this was one of the great young men of East Hartford. He was on his way to college. He was a brilliant young man. He was an athlete; well-loved by everybody at the school and it was a real loss and -- real loss to everybody and particularly to his -- his mom and his stepfather.

So, again, I thank Senator DeFronzo for bringing this forward and -- and I wish -- I hope everybody in the circle will join me in supporting this bill.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

First, let me give all of my condolences to the tragedy in East Hartford and commend Senator LeBeau for working so hard to -- to try to make

ch/gbr
SENATE

154
April 27, 2010

sure that doesn't happen again.

If I could, through you, Mr. President, perhaps a couple of questions -- no more than a couple of questions -- brief questions to the proponent of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Senator DeFronzo.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Senator DeFronzo, am I to understand that if someone is currently licensed to operate a motorcycle in the State of Connecticut that they would not have to go back and take the novice motorcycle training course?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator DeFronzo.

SENATOR DeFRONZO:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Senator McKinney, you are correct.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you and my second question and, hopefully my last, is if someone were licensed to operate a motorcycle in another state, be it

ch/gbr
SENATE

155

April 27, 2010

Massachusetts next door, and were to move to Connecticut and get a Connecticut license, would they be given a motorcycle license or would they have to retake this novice course?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator DeFrönzo.

SENATOR DeFRONZO:

Thank you, Mr. President.

If they currently have an endorsement in another state, it would be -- they would not be required to take this course. If the endorsement had been extinguished for a period of more than two years, then they would be required to take the course when they came to Connecticut.

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you, sir.

Then it's my understanding that the only people who would be required to take this course are those under 18, anyone seeking to get a motorcycle license for the first time or someone

ch/gbr
SENATE

156
April 27, 2010

seeking to get a motorcycle license whose license had lapsed for more two years.

THE CHAIR:

Senator DeFronzo.

SENATOR DeFRONZO:

That is the correct summation, through you, Mr. President.

SENATOR McKINNEY:

Thank you and I just -- I -- I did think that's what I heard through the good Senator in discussion with a ranking member but I was originally opposed to the idea because I thought we were going to make people who had motorcycle licenses for years come back and take this course which would have been unfair.

I appreciate the clarification and will now support the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Or actually the Dalai Lama, those are the other requirements.

SENATOR McKINNEY:

I don't -- I'm not familiar with him, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

ch/gbr
SENATE

157
April 27, 2010

Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, anytime we bring up the subject of motorcycles, we're driving down a very dangerous road because it certainly opens the question about road safety, motorcycle helmets. I know many of us for years have been lobbied about whether to require helmets or not but certainly training, whether it's 16 year olds and -- or 17 year olds and further training for drivers licenses, motorcycle training I think is -- is a win/win.

But I would also like to recognize our good Senator Kissel's cautionary remarks regarding tying anything to federal funding right now. As many of you have probably already received some emails talking about the possibility of losing federal funds for ECS support, educational funding, that could really throw our budget into turmoil going forward. And so there is a very strong and good point to be made in tying any of our programs to federal funding right now could be a risky endeavor for sure.

Thank you, Mr. President.

ch/gbr
SENATE

158
April 27, 2010

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, ma'am.

Will you remark further on Senate Bill 407 as amended by Senate "A?"

Senator DeFronzo.

SENATOR DeFRONZO:

Mr. President, if there's no further discussion, I would ask that this be placed on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

There is a motion on the floor to place this item on the consent calendar.

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, would ask the Clerk to call the consent calendar at this time.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, please call the consent calendar.

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

ch/gbr
SENATE

159

April 27, 2010

has been ordered in the Senate on the consent calendar. Will all Senators please return to the Chamber.

Mr. President, the items placed Consent Calendar Number 1 begin on calendar page 1, Calendar 435, House Joint Resolution Number 102; calendar page 2, Calendar 436, House Joint Resolution Number 103; Calendar 437, House Joint Resolution Number 104; Calendar 438, House Joint Resolution Number 105; calendar page 3, Calendar Number 53, Substitute for Senate Bill 141; Calendar 61, Senate Bill 131; Calendar Number 69, Senate Bill 62; calendar page 5, Calendar 139, Substitute for Senate Bill 173; Calendar 151, Substitute for Senate Bill 149; calendar page 8, Calendar 221, Senate Bill 156; calendar page 11, Calendar 332, Substitute for Senate Bill 153, calendar page 12, Calendar 339, Senate Bill 443; calendar page 26, Calendar Number 54, Senate Bill 190; calendar page 29, Calendar 129, Substitute for Senate Bill 50 and calendar page 32, Calendar Number 191, Substitute for Senate Bill 407.

Mr. President, that completes those items placed on the first consent calendar.

ch/gbr
SENATE

160
April 27, 2010

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

Please call the consent. 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 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 locked. The Clerk will call the tally.

THE CLERK:

Motion is on adoption of consent calendar
Number 1.

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

THE CHAIR:

Consent calendar passes.

Senator Looney.

S - 610

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2010**

**VOL. 53
PART 13
3842 - 4128**

cd
SENATE

388
May 5, 2010

President, move to place that item on the consent
calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Calendar page 32, Calendar 337, Senate Bill 433.

Mr. President, move to place that item on the consent
calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Continuing, calendar page 33, Calendar 424, Senate

Bill 444, Mr. President, move to place this item on the
consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Calendar page 34, Calendar 149, Senate Bill 244, Mr.

President, move to place this item on the consent
calendar.

THE CHAIR:

cd
SENATE

391
May 5, 2010

Calendar page 34, Calendar 149, Senate Bill 244;
Calendar 191, Substitute for Senate Bill 405, 407; and
Calendar 272, Substitute for Senate Bill 199.

Mr. President, that completes the items placed on
the first consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

The machine is opened.

THE CLERK:

The Senate is voting by roll 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.

THE CHAIR:

Will Senators please check the board to make certain
that your vote has been appropriately recorded? If all
Senators have voted and all votes are properly recorded,
the machine will be locked.

Would the Clerk please announce the tally?

THE CLERK:

Motion's on adoption Consent Calendar Number 1.

Total Number Voting	35
Those Voting Yea	35
Those Voting Nay	0

cd
SENATE

392
May 5, 2010

Those absent and not voting 1

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar 1 is passed.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, would move for immediate transmittal to the House of Representatives of all items on the consent calendar requiring additional action by the House.

THE CHAIR:

Motion before the chamber is immediate transmittal. Is there objection? Is there objection? Seeing none, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

If we might stand at ease for just a moment.

THE CHAIR:

Chamber may stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

THE CHAIR:

Would the Senate please come to order?

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**TRANSPORTATION
PART 3
520 – 755**

2010



**STATE OF CONNECTICUT
DEPARTMENT OF MOTOR VEHICLES**

*60 State Street, Wethersfield, Connecticut 06161
ct.gov/dmv*



*Testimony of the Department of Motor Vehicles
Transportation Committee Public Hearing
March 10, 2010*

Raised S.B. 407

**AN ACT REQUIRING THE ELECTRONIC ISSUANCE OF MOTOR VEHICLE
CERTIFICATES OF TITLE**

The Department of Motor Vehicles (DMV) supports the concept of this proposal, which is to begin issuing certificates of titles electronically. However, DMV would like to make the Transportation Committee aware of several issues associated with this bill.

Currently, DMV has an IT modernization project underway that contemplates the issuance of titles electronically. However, to meet this proposed mandate, DMV still must coordinate with an outside vendor and lending institutions to ensure that title-related information is communicated properly between entities. Therefore, DMV believes the proposal's compliance deadline, which is "on and after January 1, 2011," is too aggressive. If the legislature would like to set this policy, DMV respectfully asks that the deadline set in this proposal be extended one additional year to January 1, 2012.

DMV staff would be happy to work with members of the Transportation Committee on this issue.