

PA10-094

HB5526

House	1088-1091	4
Judiciary	3712-3714, 3835-3838	7
Senate	3542-3543, 3550-3552	5
		16

**H – 1076**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2010**

**VOL.53  
PART 4  
895– 1168**

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? Please check the board to make sure your vote has been properly cast.

Representative Boukus here gesturing -- you did vote, madam -- yes.

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

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5542.

Total Number voting . . . . . 145

Necessary for adoption . . . . . 73 E

Those voting Yea . . . . . 145

Those voting Nay . . . . . 0

Those absent and not voting . . . . . 6

SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

This bill is passed.

Will Representative Berger please prepare yourself?

Would the Clerk please call Calendar 355?

THE CLERK:

On page 25, Calendar 355, House Bill Number 5526,

AN ACT CONCERNING STANDARDS FOR THE SELECTION,  
RETENTION AND PROMOTION OF JUDICIAL MARSHALS,

ch/gdm/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

91  
April 20, 2010

favorable report of the Committee on Judiciary.

SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Berger, also of the wonderful  
brass city, you have the floor sir.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon.

SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Good afternoon, sir.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's  
favorable report and passage the bill.

SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The question before the Chamber is acceptance of  
the Joint Committee's favorable report and passage of  
the bill.

Please proceed, sir.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As the Chamber will well remember, this bill was  
before us last year, last session. It passed  
overwhelmingly with no no votes. And, unfortunately,  
during the calendar scurry in the Senate last year at  
the end, it was not able to get out of the Senate. So  
before us, again, today, is the judicial selection,

retention and promotion bill which will require the judicial branch to provide on its website a written summary of employment standards for judicial marshals that must include standards for selection, continued employment and promotion. It also must specify that the chief court administrator must establish employment standards and appropriate training programs.

I move passage.

SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Question before the Chamber is passage of this bill.

Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further on the bill?

If not, staff and guests please return to the well. House members take your seats. The machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

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

SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Have all the members A to Z voted? I believe so. Please check the board to make sure your vote is

ch/gdm/gbr  
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

93  
April 20, 2010

properly cast.

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

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5526.

Total Number voting 145

Necessary for adoption 73

Those voting Yea 145

Those voting Nay 0

Those absent and not voting 6

SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

This bill passes.

Would the Clerk please call Calendar 188?

THE CLERK:

On page 12, Calendar 188, House Bill Number 5500,  
AN ACT CONCERNING THE OFFICE OF SMALL BUSINESS AFFAIRS  
AND ESTABLISHING THE SMALL BUSINESS ADVISORY BOARD,  
favorable report of the Committee on Commerce.

SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Berger, you have the floor, sir.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's

**S - 608**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2010**

**VOL. 53  
PART 11  
3251 - 3554**

I move to place that item on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, moving now to calendar page 36,  
Calendar 374, Substitute for House Bill Number 5225.

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

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President. Moving to  
calendar page 37, Calendar 415, House Bill Number  
5131. Mr. President, I move to place this item on the  
consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President, and Mr. President, on  
calendar page 38, Calendar 454, House Bill Number  
5526. Mr. President, move to place that item on the  
consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Mr. President, in addition there is an item on Senate Agenda Number 2 and that is on Senate Agenda Number 2 under disagreeing actions, substitute Senate Bill Number 330. Mr. President, I would move to place this item on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, we might stand at ease for just a moment.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will come back to order. Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Some additional markings for the consent

Bill 121; calendar page 7, Calendar 377, Substitute for House Bill 5291; Calendar page 8, Calendar 398, Substitute for Senate Bill 231; calendar page 9, Calendar 442, Substitute for House Bill 5141; calendar page 10, Calendar 449, House Bill 5495; calendar page 11, Calendar 451, Substitute for House Bill 5535; Calendar 465, Substitute for House Bill 44 -- 5448; calendar page 12, Calendar 466, Substitute for House Bill 5289; Calendar 473, Substitute for House Bill 5059; Calendar 476, Substitute for House Bill 5117; calendar page 13. Calendar 478, House Bill 5290; Calendar 481, Substitute for House Bill 5119; Calendar 482, Substitute for House Bill 5120; calendar page 15, Calendar 492, Substitute for House Bill 5446; Calendar 494, House Bill 5315; Calendar 504, Substitute for House Bill 5306; calendar page 20, Calendar 532, Substitute for House Bill 5033; calendar page 21, Calendar 534, Substitute for House Bill 5543; Calendar 539, Substitute for House Bill 5350; calendar page 25, Calendar 561, Substitute for House Bill 5419; calendar page 36, Calendar 374, Substitute for House Bill 5225; calendar page 37, Calendar 415, House Bill 5131; calendar page 38, Calendar 454, Substitute for House Bill 5526.

Mr. President, that completes the items placed on Consent Calendar Number 2.

THE CHAIR:

Please call for a roll call vote. The machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

The Senate is now voting by roll on the consent calendar. Will all Senators please return to the chamber. Senate is 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 adoption of Consent Calendar Number 2.

Total number voting

35

Necessary for Adoption 18

Those voting Yea 35

Those voting Nay 0

Those absent and not voting 1

THE CHAIR:

Consent calendar Number 2 passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I would move that any items on the consent calendar requires additional action by the House of Representatives be immediately transmitted to that chamber.

THE CHAIR:

Without objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

And also any other items acted upon today, not on the consent calendar requiring action by the House of Representatives. Also would move that those items be immediately transmitted.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, sir, so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I would yield to any members seeking recognition for announcements or points of personal privilege.

THE CHAIR:

At this time, I will entertain any points of

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**JUDICIARY  
PART 12  
3696 – 4026**

**2010**

We're a little bit under the gun today because it's expected there'll be a Senate session convening in a little over two hours and we have to stop once that begins. Normally we'd stay here all night if necessary but -- so I just hope everybody will be mindful of that in their questions and their -- and their testimony. So welcome and please proceed.

JOE GAETANO: Thank you. Good afternoon members of the Judiciary Committee. My name is Joe Gaetano. I'm a Judicial Marshal in the Hartford District. I am also President of IBPO Local 731 which represents judicial marshals, lead district marshals and judicial security officers in the State of Connecticut. I'm here on behalf of my membership which is in strong support of Bill 5526, AN ACT CONCERNING STANDARDS FOR SELECTION, RETENTION, PROMOTION OF JUDICIAL MARSHALS.

I want to thank all the members of this Committee for taking up this bill. Special thanks to Representative Berger for presenting this bill. We look forward with working with judicial branch receive these bills. At this point I'm happy to answer any questions that you may have.

REP. LAWLOR: That's what I was talking about in short. That's very good. As you know we had this bill last year.

JOE GAETANO: Yes.

REP. LAWLOR: It made it almost all the way through the process and -- and I see no reason why it will get much opposition at all. It's been changed a little bit to deal with some concerns that people have but I'm optimistic. But let me just ask my colleagues if they have any questions. Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL: Thank you very much, Chairman Lawlor.

Mr. Gaetano, nice to see you.

JOE GAETANO: Nice to see you too.

SENATOR KISSEL: We have a bunch of very fine judicial marshals up in my neck of the woods in north central Connecticut. Patrick Crowley, I don't know if that name rings a bell.

JOE GAETANO: Yes.

SENATOR KISSEL: He's a great guy so I figured I'd put that on the CT -- CT Network.

JOE GAETANO: He works in Hartford with me.

SENATOR KISSEL: And he's actually on our Town Council as well up in Enfield. He's a great, great guy and I've known him for decades. And I don't think it's wrong to say that when people do a good job. And it's a difficult job as I'm sure you're aware. What are some of the most difficult obstacles? I noticed the bills about selection and everything else like that.

And I know with Chairman Lawlor we don't want to take too much time but, you know, it's been a long time since I sat in a GA back when the marshals were sheriffs and you know, they had to maintain security. But what's -- what are some of the more daunting challenges that you folks are facing right now?

JOE GAETANO: Right now honestly it's staffing. We are such short staffed I can't even begin to explain. We're running short on courts. Some courts can't be open because there's not enough marshals to open courts. We're doing what we need to do get the job done and service the State. But we desperately need more marshals.

SENATOR KISSEL: Thank you very much, sir and thank you for your service to the people of greater Connecticut.

JOE GAETANO: Thank you.

REP. LAWLOR: Further questions? If not, thanks again.

JOE GAETANO: Have a good afternoon.

REP. LAWLOR: Bob Gyle.

BOB GYLE: Representative Lawlor, Senator Kissel, HB5527 members of the Committee. My name is Bob Gyle. I'm President of the Connecticut State Marshals Organization and also an elected member of the State Marshals Advisory Board. With me today is State Marshal David Hubbs from Southington who is also an elected member of the State

**INTERNATIONAL BROTHERHOOD OF POLICE OFFICERS**

A DIVISION OF THE NATIONAL ASSOCIATION OF GOVERNMENT EMPLOYEES, AFL/CIO

346 Main Street  
Cromwell, CT 06416telephone: 860-632-9832  
fax: 860-635-1358  
www.ibpo.org

March 26, 2010

Joint Committee on Judiciary  
State of Connecticut General Assembly  
Legislative Office Building, Room 2500  
300 Capital Avenue  
Hartford, CT 06106-1591

RE: Raised H.B. No. 5526

Dear Committee Members:

On behalf of the International Brotherhood of Police Officers, Local 731, I would like to express strong support for Raised H.B. No. 5526. IBPO Local 731 represents approximately 700 Judicial Marshals and Lead Judicial Marshals – the very people who would benefit most from this legislation.

The Judicial Marshals would like to thank this Committee for raising the issues in this bill. Discussion about the hiring and promotion of Connecticut Judicial Marshals can be heard regularly both inside and outside our courthouses. The methodology used by the Judicial Branch in the hiring and promotion of Judicial Marshals is outside the scope of the collective bargaining process and as such, the Judicial Marshals and Union rarely have the opportunity to address or discuss the process and practice.

The Union's commentary in this letter should not be taken as a critique of the hiring practices and standards used by the Judicial Branch to date. Local 731 members are proud of the work they do, and would be hard pressed to criticize the process that gave them their jobs. It is crucial, however, that a greater understanding of hiring and promotional standards be provided to everyone affected by the security of Connecticut courthouses.

As you are all likely aware, the number of Judicial Marshals ensuring this security is dangerously low. This shortfall puts court employees, Judicial Marshals, and the public at large in increased danger. Now, more than ever, we need to see the standards used to bring new Judicial Marshals onboard, as well as standards to promote those already in uniform. Judicial Marshals are entirely reliant on the skills and competence of their peers,

and even more so of the supervisory staff directing their actions. Knowledge of the standards used to put those people in place will help Local 731 members perform their jobs with greater confidence.

Simply put, the Judicial Branch needs publicly available accessible employment and training standards for such crucial jobs. At a bare minimum, this information will help those interested in applying for Judicial Marshal position. Clearly discernable standards will help current Marshals understand what is expected of them to climb the promotional ladder while assuring that only the most qualified Judicial Marshals move forward. Perhaps most importantly, such information will help members of the public entitled to the security provided by Judicial Marshals, Lead Judicial Marshals, Supervisory Judicial Marshals, and Deputy Chief and Chief Judicial Marshals.

Thank you very much for your consideration of Raised H.B. No. 5526. Please feel free to contact the IBPO Connecticut Office at (860) 632-9832 with any follow-up questions, concerns, or comments.

Sincerely,

  
Scott Jelescheff, Esq.  
IBPO Regional Counsel

**Daniel D. Tamborra**  
**Judicial Marshal**  
**8 Tetreault Avenue**  
**Norwich, CT 06360**  
**860-889-4619**

**TESTIMONY REGARDING HOUSE BILL 5526**

My name is Daniel Tamborra and I have worked in the Judicial District of New London courts for almost 24 years. I began working as a special deputy sheriff at GA10 New London in July of 1986. My father was a well respected Superior Court judge, Sabino Tamborra, who was the primary reason that I became employed by the High Sheriff in New London.

Even though it was through my father's name and reputation that I received my job, I performed every job as a special deputy sheriff asking for no privilege because of my name. I worked my way up the ranks and ultimately became a supervisor in the Office of County Sheriff in June of 1994.

I supervised the special deputy sheriffs at AG10, GA21 and New London Judicial Court and the Sheriff's transportation unit from June of 1994 until December of 2000 when the state abolished the Office of County Sheriff and created the Judicial Marshal agency.

During my tenure as a supervisor in the New London Judicial District the main function of the sheriff was security at the courthouse and safe movement of prisoners between correctional facilities and judicial district courts. I took my job as a supervisor very seriously and made sure that our job was done in a safe, efficient and cost effective manner.

I supervised the sheriffs and was responsible for the security at the penalty phase trial of Michael Ross in the spring of 2000. I was the transportation supervisor when we instituted a policy whereby the sheriffs picked up morning arraignments at local police departments which allowed local police to patrol the town rather than transport prisoners to court. I, along with other supervisors in our county instituted extensive training in CPR, first aid, pepper spray, handcuffing, report writing and management of aggressive behavior within our county. This was the basic blueprint of the training that is done by the marshal's academy today.

In January of 2001, I became the temporary supervisory marshal at Norwich Family Court. I again handled my duties as a supervisor in a very responsible, sober and efficient manner until July of 2003 when I was demoted to the cellblock at GA21 in Norwich.

Since July of 2003, I have attempted to procure a Lead Marshal or a supervisor position without success numerous times. I began to realize that I must have some shortcomings given my failure with regard to the interview process. I attended a one week seminar in court security called ALERT (Advanced Law Enforcement Readiness Training) in the winter of 2004. I participated in the Judicial Branch's mentor program in 2008. I asked for help from Senator Edith Prague and she set up two meetings for me with judicial interviewers who explained to me my shortcomings and strategies for completing successful interviews. I spoke with the equal opportunity officer of my most recent interview regarding my performance at the interview.

I have been told that my education, my experience, and my ability to perform the job should all come out during the interview process. I have been told by judicial officials that the interview process is the fastest way to screen prospective employees.

I do agree that the interview process should be retained as one piece of the puzzle in screening candidates for promotions but there should also be other factors that demand consideration. Some preference should be shown to individuals based on education, positive job performance evaluations, seniority and military service. The employer should also realize that some people perform better writing than speaking, so there should also be a written test component to any promotion or hiring process.

Would not adding consideration for these other factors in a prospective employee background assure that the branch promote a more qualified and better individual? Is this not in the best interest of the Judicial Branch and those trying to secure a promotion?

Under the present system, a twenty minute gab session is more binding than years of service, education and job performance. I was always told that actions speak louder than words. I have been taught from childhood that what you do is much more important than what you say.

This is why I ask you to support House Bill 5526. I thank you for your time.