

PA 11-125

HB6422

Education	502-510, 557-560, 662-664, 735, 743	18
House	3211, 3256-3257	3
<u>Senate</u>	<u>6549, 6573-6578</u>	<u>7</u>
		28

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**EDUCATION
PART 2
343 – 672**

2011

or urban, but are economic and leaving out the issue of race. I think the economic issue is driven to a large part by the racial issue. We know where blacks and Latinos are in this state in terms of economics and that's why I think you get what you get. And that's not to say that whites at the lower end of the economic scale have the same experiences as those at the other end of the scale, but it is to say that we are not having honest discussions.

So I think this is why you see me sitting here. This is why -- your urgency is why I'm talking about looking at the tool itself. Doing all of the other things that are recommended in this bill, but looking at the tools. Because in places like Montgomery County, Maryland, you see that in the order of four to five years, they've done a lot to reduce their achievement gap to the point where, you know, they're hoping to actually have it closed very shortly.

Because of -- to a large degree-- I think like looking at the tools they used. And so we have to be better. Not just -- not just as a body, but particularly those who spend a lot of time talking about what communities they represent in here. We have to be better ourselves about representing those communities. This is perhaps, in my opinion, the most important issue that we could deal with.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you both very much. Any other questions for the gentlemen? Thank you. We look forward to continuing to work with you.

Next is Representative Pam Sawyer. Welcome, Representative.

REP. PAM SAWYER: Thank you, Madam Chair and good afternoon, Chairman, ranking members and members of this committee. Very interesting

HB 16422

dialog in that last bill and I would like to make one comment at the end of my testimony regarding that.

But I'm here to testify today on the Bill 6422 on the transportation tuition costs for students whose health conditions require them to attend a different school, which is different from that which they normally would be assigned.

You know in a large school district if you have a child that is ill because of the building -- let's perhaps use the term "sick building syndrome" -- a child who has respiratory issues, who has a health problem that is so severe that it places them in the hospital repeatedly after attending school. In a large district it's very easy, they can take the child from one elementary school and place them in another elementary school.

The issue comes about in the small towns, particularly, where there is only one school in the town. And there's that nice artificial line that goes around the town and the child is now locked into that school district with one school and the child is ill, repeatedly ill.

I've had three instances in my career of 18 years here in which a child has been ill. So we're not talking about a large number of children. A very small number, as a matter of fact. In one instance the parents had the ability to move and moved the child to another town. The second family did not have the ability to move but did have the ability to pay for the child to go to a private school. However, the third family had neither of those options because of financial reasons. What they had to do, ladies and gentlemen, was they had to lie.

And they had to say that that child lived at another address, the address of a grandparent and go to school in another town because the building that their child should have gone to school in made them ill.

Schools make every effort to try and remediate the situation. If it's mold in the walls or under the floors, and I can tell you after this last winter, I suspect there are going to be many schools that have had leaky situations and we're going to find mold situations coming up in the next year that are second to none.

So I'm very concerned about it. This bill was brought forward to open a dialog and I will tell you that I agree that it is not well crafted for the needs right now. But I would like it to be a work in progress to be able to find ways to come up with articulation between towns so that they could send a singleton child from one district to the next where schools are sometimes within three or four miles of each other and take away that artificial barrier of the town line. To be able to find a way, perhaps with the magnet school situation or some other situation for a child that can go to -- can go to a school in which it is a healthy environment for them.

So I want to thank you very much for allowing me to testify on that bill and I appreciate this committee's indulgence in trying to find a way to solve these solutions -- find a solution, rather.

I'd like to just refer to one moment to the achievement gap and that is one of the things that I have found in my study of the achievement gap in the inner cities, but also I the rural poor, is that it is economic and the

economics are exacerbated by teenage pregnancy. And I would like to ask you to turn to this morning's Hartford Courant to read the editorial and perhaps, two weeks ago to go back and look at Helen Ubinas' article on the issue of the achievement gap and the teenage pregnancy issue for students. Because what we do know, as many of you know on this committee, that if children have children and they are in poverty, so very often they stay in poverty for the rest of their lives.

Education is what lifts people out of poverty unless they win a lottery ticket. That is a very special situation that doesn't happen very often.

So as I say, thank you for allowing me to make that one comment because I'm very concerned about the federal funding regarding the teenage pregnancy issue right now. It is threatened and it is something that will affect our state greatly. And I would take, certainly, any questions, Madam Chairman.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you, Representative. You mentioned you had a few incidences in your constituents, from your constituents, which is why this bill is here, 6422.

Other than mold are you aware of any other health issues that might be a problem for children in your district?

REP. PAM SAWYER: It could be carpeting. And it could be, you know, forced air, hot air situation. It could be the issue of dust in the forced air for the heating.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you. I was trying to -- as I was reading through the bill -- I was trying to understand what health issues there are and

we certainly know that some of our schools still need some attention in terms of their infrastructure. So I would like to think issues such as that can be addressed within a school. But obviously, the taxpayers want to fix those issues in order for them to be taken care of.

REP. PAM SAWYER: They do, Madam Chairman. The cost is sometimes extremely high when they begin to try and crack into some of these old buildings. For many children, they have tremendous immune systems and don't have a problem whatsoever. But it is the frailest and those that have compromised immune systems that would have a problem with it. And it could be -- the answer could be as simple as moving a child to another building.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you. Anyone else?
Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Thank you, Madam Chair. Another quick follow up on 6422. As I view this as a thoughtful and compassionate bill that aimed to help, you know, families and children with these special circumstances, I can also already hear the voices of concern that will be raised about this bill. You hear it oftentimes from superintendents and boards of education that are resentful of unanticipated significant costs that hit them in the budget.

And so I just wanted to ask you what response do you have to those boards of education and the superintendents who will say, well, this is well intended, but we can't afford the transportation bills that we're going to be looking at as a result or and we can't anticipate them and it's difficult for us to budget them.

REP. PAM SAWYER: Absolutely and I have thought about that and I have had discussions with my superintendents in my district particularly on this. And what I would say is that we're talking about a situation usually that involves only one child. We're not talking about busing many children out of town.

We have now a situation in Connecticut -- which you have actually, Mr. Chairman, been instrumental in crafting and that is the magnet school program in which the towns now are required to send the children to certain other schools. And I appreciated that because it was the answer to a great need that we had. And we found that the -- the school districts found a way to fund the transportation for that, sometimes not.

But I would say that in the case where this is a singleton issue for a very few districts in the town, I would tell them not to fret over it because in this case it is for the sickest of sick children. It is not intended for a child that complains that they have a stomachache because of the anxiety, perhaps, that has been anticipated in classroom, something that could be solved by moving the child from one classroom to another. But it is something that again I would like to say, is a work in progress to be able to see if there is a way for us to create articulations perhaps between two neighboring schools where the schools are very close together.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you, Representative. Due to the power of electronics here, I have some testimony in front of me from Kane and their response to this bill is one that mentions that they believe legislation's unnecessary since the existing federal law both the Americans with Disabilities Act, Title 2 and section 504

already covers the rights of students in this situation. Can you comment on that, please?

REP. PAM SAWYER: The child -- yes -- thank you, ma'am -- because I had not seen that, I don't have my computer in front of me. If we list a child as disabled, that puts a whole different label on that particular individual, that the child has to go through -- jump through quite a few hoops to be listed as disabled.

In this case, where it is a situation that goes away in a healthy -- say air environment -- we'll just use the word air in this case to make it easy. A healthy air environment and the issue goes away, the child is not disabled. So there is some question about that and whether you list a child as a 504 child and not for a short period of time, to be able to obtain other dollars perhaps is something we should talk about.

SENATOR STILLMAN: And one last question from me anyway on this issue. You mentioned in your remarks that you thought the bill was broadly drafted and it is. And that you had some suggestions so I would like to suggest to you that you get them to us as soon as possible.

REP. PAM SAWYER: Thank you, ma'am and I appreciate your consideration.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you. Any other members have questions? Representative Giuliano.

REP. GIULIANO: Thank you, Madam Chair, thank you, Representative Sawyer, for your testimony. You know, as a follow up to Senator Stillman's comments, this does, you know, raise some issues that whether or not school districts would accommodate this kind of rather atypical health issue under a special education category

of other health impaired or in a 504 accommodation plan.

In your experience and just drawing from this, say, just a short -- short span of times or occurrences, have you found that those more typical vehicles, such as cited in the testimony by the state Department of Education or in case testimony, do you find that those vehicles of an educational identification of other health impaired or a 504 plan are truly usable and functional for the health conditions that you are trying to remedy in this instance?

REP. PAM SAWYER: The three instances that I was involved in, none of them were applied -- that you just described. And it ended up in one case with legal battles. So I would have to say no, they were not and that's one of the reasons that I felt that this -- we should bring this issue forward to begin a dialog on how to create a remedy for children in this circumstance.

REP. GIULIANO: I appreciate the response and it does seem to me that given these available remedies that were not applied, I think that that probably speaks to the kind of individualistic and sometimes idiosyncratic application that individual school districts can offer to these circumstances. And so would I be correct in presuming that this bill is attempting to address that broader context that is currently not being serviced by the more standard IDEA civil rights accommodation plans, Representative Sawyer?

REP. PAM SAWYER: I would say absolutely. Representative Giuliano, you know, we have situations where our superintendents have different legal counsel. Each district -- some have in house counsel, but many of the small

districts rely on an outside counsel and they get different opinions as to how they can move forward with some of these issues. And in some cases, they have been told that they cannot use these different approaches so -- according to how their counsel read the statutes.

REP. GIULIANO: Thank you. Your testimony is helpful in understanding the commentary from others. Thank you, Representative Sawyer. Thank you, Madam Chair.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you, Representative. Anyone else wish to comment, question? Thank you, Representative Sawyer. Appreciate it.

REP. PAM SAWYER: Thank you, ma'am.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Before we move on, we're going to start alternating between the elected officials and the public since we're a little more than an hour into our hearing.

Apparently we have been joined by another new member of our committee. Representative Kokoruda. Kokoruda, thank you. If you'd like to introduce yourself, say a few words, you can turn the microphone on. Tell us where you're from and congratulations on your victory in the special election.

REP. KOKORUDA: Well, thank you very much. I'm -- I'm -- just really got sworn in on Friday. I am from the 101st, which is Madison and part of Gilford. I still serve, but not for much longer, as a selectman in my town of Madison. I'm going to finish up the month. And I'm looking forward to -- obviously, education's a big issue in our community and I've watched this committee for several years thanks to channel -- CTN. And I look forward to working with you all. Thank you.

host of other issues in terms of interpreters and, you know, reports written in native languages and things like that. But yes, absolutely, that five days you know, it certainly helped, you know, to seek outside help to translate and understand the report.

REP. SRINIVASAN: And that is the reason for the question is is that five days then with language and all of that being such a major barrier and as I heard in some communities anywhere from 20 to 30 different languages are spoken, I believe, would the five days in your opinion, be an adequate amount of time to get these families to comprehend what the situation is, what do you feel about that?

PETER MAHER: I don't think it can be, you know, perfect in every case. I think it's a step in the right direction. You know, those instances where there are languages -- 20 or 30 languages -- I think that's going to create a problem whether you had five days or ten days or longer. But for some of the more common second languages, I think that that extra five days would certainly help allow parents to better contribute and participate in the process.

REP. SRINIVASAN: Thank you, thank you, Chairman.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Thank you. Any other questions? If not, thank you for your testimony and advocacy.

PETER MAHER: Thank you.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: We go to Robert Burbank, First Selectman of Andover.

FIRST SELECTMAN ROBERT BURBANK: good afternoon and thank you for the opportunity of addressing the board. First off, I'd like to say as the First

HB 1422

Selectman of Andover and the town of Andover we certainly support our education in the town. Over 80 percent of our budget goes to education so it's something that we really watch very closely and it's also an education system that is, in my opinion, will stand up with the best of all of the educational schools in the state.

That being said, I'm here to offer my opposition to the Senate Bill 6422, which basically is the bill that Senator Pam Sawyer spoke about today, that is stated that with the doctor's note any child can decide that he no longer wants to go to your public school, but can pick a school of his choosing and the town would have to pay for his schooling and his transportation.

This I believe is very onerous in the fact that no criteria has been set. Anybody that wanted their student to go to a private school, all he would have to do is have his doctor write a note stating that he was not -- he had an illness or how did they state this -- stating that the doctor had a health concern. This is so vague that it's almost impossible to follow. So any parent that wanted their student to go to private school, all he would have to do is have a doctor stating that there's health concerns.

Now the town is responsible not only for the school but for the transportation. No stipulation in there what school he would go to. He might pick a school in New York. Is the town then responsible for the transportation to New York? We could be going in ten different directions and the town would have to pick up the cost for this.

I think the overall fallacy or problem with this bill is that it takes away from the

education. We have a lot of money in our school systems and if we have to spend it to send kids to private schools it's going to take away from the monies that we have for the public schools.

And as everybody's aware, this is an expensive proposition if you have to pay for all these students going to all these other school systems, that that money has to come from somewhere and it would probably have to come from the school system's budget itself. And it almost puts public school systems in jeopardy. Thank you.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Thank you for your very clear and cogent testimony, and just for members of the committee, there was no written testimony submitted by the First Selectman. He preferred to -

FIRST SELECTMAN ROBERT BURBANK: There was written testimony put in by the superintendent of our school system. So you should have that and it more or less follows the thought line that I have suggested to you.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Makes good sense. Are there questions for the First Selectman?
Representative Srinivasan.

REP. SRINIVASAN: Thank you very much, Chairman. In your testimony you made a comment just a note from a doctor would suffice. And I find that a little difficult to accept inasmuch as a physician would not just write a note because a note has to be written. A note would be written by a physician in the event that it was necessary. I just want to get your thoughts on that about this comment about just a note.

And the other thing as I see -- I mean, this bill may be inadequate in many things, but the assumption here is that when the person, the child is moved from location A to location B, hopefully not to New York but to something close by, where we can afford the transportation, location B has ample capacity to take care of what has been the health hazard by where the student has to be switched from A to B. So from school A to B is not an automatic switch just because a doctor wrote a note, but a, because there's a medical reason, which could not be taken care of in location A and there is enough data that it can be taken care of in location B. Thank you.

FIRST SELECTMAN ROBERT BURBANK: I understand your concern, but the bill as proposed is so vague that it doesn't -- it doesn't have to be a particular problem at a school. It's stated strictly as a health concern. And it is stated in the bill as a note. And if would -- we're all aware that we have a case in Wisconsin where doctors are writing notes to teachers so that they don't have to attend school. They certainly -- many doctors -- wouldn't have a problem writing a note for a student saying that he's getting -- who knows, stomachaches, headaches, loss of weight, go on and on, from a health concern in that school. The health concern does not even have to be addressed according to the bill as presented.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Other questions? If not, thank you very much for your testimony.

FIRST SELECTMAN ROBERT BURBANK: Thank you.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: We now go to Julia Giaccone of CREC to be followed by Joan McNulty of SLP.

posted and if the job goes to an interview the position can be filled in a few weeks. If that hiring has to be approved by the board of education, the person cannot fill the job until after the board's next meeting. This provision could thus slow the process another four weeks. That delay leaves students without a certified teacher and negatively impacts their learning. While there are many praiseworthy aspects of Senate Bill 1040 and the SVFT supports continuing legislative efforts to improve our system, we believe that provision needs to be reconsidered. Thank you.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you, Mr. Leavey. Questions for the gentleman? Thank you, your testimony is quite concise and we appreciate it.

Kachina Walsh-Weaver. There she is, sorry, I didn't recognize you with the light over your head.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: You saved the best for last, right?

SENATOR STILLMAN: Actually, we have one more -

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: Awww.

SENATOR STILLMAN: - Dr. Vivian Cross. Okay. She'll be playing clean up.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: Senator Stillman, Representative Fleischmann, members of the committee, thank you very much for allowing me the opportunity to testify before you. For the record, I am Kachina Walsh-Weaver. I'm with the Connecticut Conference of Municipalities. And I usually have the arduous task of having to testify against very well meaning, well intentioned bills.

HB 1042

And unfortunately, we are here in opposition today of House Bill 6422, which would mandate that local and regional boards of education pay tuition and transportation costs for certain students to attend other schools.

While we certainly understand the genesis behind this bill and we think it is a worthy commitment that the Representative has on this, it would impose yet another unfunded mandate on local governments. This would further exacerbate an already tough financial situation on the local level.

Similar to special education costs the costs of this mandate would also be unknown and unpredictable. You could have no children come forward in the school district or you could have multiple children come forward under the proposal. In addition, while the bill specifically addresses certain types of children who could avail themselves of this option, CCM has a concern that if you open up the door for one type of privilege then other parents and children might come forward saying that they, too, want a similar type of treatment for a different type -- for a different reason.

And as we have stated many times in the past on other similar types of mandates being pushed forward, if the state does feel very strongly about this then we would fully encourage you to take on the financial responsibility to making this happen. Thank you.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Well, thank you very much. We had testimony from the Department -- if you don't mind, I could just sort of quickly read it in relationship to this bill and see if you think your organization would feel the same way.

They're suggesting that they would support the bill "if it provided that the student's educational needs are such that attendance in a particular school building poses an immediate and long term health risk to the student. Decisions regarding the impact of that health care need on the student's education and the need for accommodations or special education and related services and placement, which include transportation to and education at another school would be made by the student's PPT." Or section 504, which I believe a law already allows section 504.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: If I under -- I'm not -- the PPT generally comes through a special ed -- education classification, correct? Do I understand that correctly?

SENATOR STILLMAN: Yeah.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: I -

SENATOR STILLMAN: Well, the testimony's online.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: Okay.

SENATOR STILLMAN: So if you want to look at it just -- just give the committee some feedback.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: Sure, I'll certainly do that.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Just so you understand that the Department's position. I have no idea if we're going to move this bill forward or not but in case someone raises that issue to you, I just thought I'd let you know.

KACHINA WALSH-WEAVER: Okay, I'll take a look at that right away.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**EDUCATION
PART 3
673 – 986**

2011

Education Committee
February 28, 2011

TESTIMONY OF

GEORGE A. COLEMAN, ACTING COMMISSIONER OF EDUCATION

ON

RAISED BILLS 1038, 6432, 6431, 6433, 1039, 1040, 6422

RAISED BILL 1038: AN ACT CONCERNING INDIVIDUALIZED EDUCATION PROGRAMS

The State Department of Education (CSDE) **opposes in part and supports in part** S.B. No. 1038, AAC Individualized Education Programs, to improve the dissemination and communication of information regarding individualized education programs to parents and guardians and to improve the quality of education for teachers in the implementation of individualized education programs, as written.

While CSDE believes that the process for dissemination and communication of information regarding the individualized education programs (IEPs) to parents and guardians is vital, it is equally important that the process by which this information is communicated does not impair the ability of the district to provide services to the child in a timely fashion.

CSDE has concerns with the language in Section 1(8)(B) that would require the Planning and Placement Team (PPT) to meet with the parents before the PPT meeting to go over the evaluations. When a child is evaluated, the evaluations or reports must be considered at a PPT meeting for the purpose of identification or reviewing, revising or writing the IEP. Requiring an additional meeting to do the same thing that is required at a PPT is a burden to a system that has to meet very rigid timelines for the completion of evaluations and the writing and implementing of IEPs.

The CSDE also has concerns with the language in Section 1(8)(G) requiring that copies of the assessments and evaluations used in the determination of eligibility be provided to the parent five school days before the initial PPT meeting for the child for the initial determination of eligibility. The Federal Individuals with Disabilities Education Act (IDEA) requires that parents receive a copy of the evaluation report, but does not stipulate when the report must be provided to the parents. Districts would be required to schedule the initial PPT meeting around the availability of reports and evaluations which would compromise the district's ability to meet timeline requirements for the completion of evaluations.

The CSDE would also recommend adding language to address the use of an outside evaluator during the initial evaluation process: if an outside evaluator is used, the probability of being able to get a copy of the report before the PPT meeting is unlikely. This would severely restrict access to outside evaluators and might deny children with appropriate evaluations.

The CSDE would be in support of this proposal if the timelines for referral and identification were changed to the IDEA standard, that is, the initial evaluation must be completed no later than

Education Committee
February 28, 2011

summer of 2009 and many students that were currently enrolled in the school who resided in Norwalk and Stamford enrolled at Abbott Tech in Danbury. The purpose of these grants were to supplement the districts' costs to transport their students to Abbott Tech given that it is a greater distance to Danbury and the costs were not anticipated.

As such, CSDE supports in part and opposes in part Raised Bill 1040.

RAISED BILL 6422: AN ACT CONCERNING TRANSPORTATION AND TUITION COSTS OF STUDENTS WHOSE HEALTH CONDITION REQUIRES THEM TO ATTEND A DIFFERENT SCHOOL THAN THAT WHICH WOULD NORMALLY BE ASSIGNED FOR SUCH STUDENT

The State Department of Education (CSDE) **opposes** H.B. No. 6422, *AAC Transportation and Tuition Costs of Students Whose Health Condition Requires Them to Attend a Different School Than That Which Would Normally Be Assigned for Such Student*, to require local and regional boards of education to be financially responsible for the transportation and tuition costs of a student whose medical condition requires such student to attend an alternate school in the district or a school in another district that is more appropriate for such child's health condition.

Local and regional boards of education are obligated under state and federal laws to consider the appropriate educational placement for students through the special education planning and placement team (PPT) process or Section 504 team process, with input from physicians and other appropriate health care professionals.

This bill assigns a physician as the sole decision maker for the educational placement of a student with health conditions, without consideration or consultation from a team that local or regional boards of education already have in place for these situations. If a student's educational needs are such that attendance in a particular school building poses an immediate and long term health risk to the student, decisions regarding the impact of the health care need on the student's education and the need for accommodations or special education and related services (which could include transportation and education) should appropriately be made by the student's PPT or Section 504 team.

CSDE would support this bill with additional language to the effect that "... and (3) provided that if a student's educational needs are such that attendance in a particular school building poses an immediate and long term health risk to the student, decisions regarding the impact of that health care need on the student's education, the need for accommodations or special education and related services, and placement (which could include transportation to and education at another school) would be made by the student's PPT or Section 504 team."

With that said, CSDE **opposes** H.B. No. 6422, as written.

H - 1101

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2011**

**VOL.54
PART 10
3113 - 3437**

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

189
May 17, 2011

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, about to vote on today's Consent Calendar, there are items that have been listed on the Consent Calendar. Maybe we're not. Hold on a moment, please.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we are about to vote on them. I'm going to move those items to the Consent Calendar.

The items are Calendar Number 314, Calendar Number 404 and Calendar Number 500. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

HB. 6422
SB 1025
SB 1041

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Motion before the Chamber is to place items Calendar Number 314, 404 and 500 on the Consent.
Without objection? Without objection? Seeing none,
so ordered.

Would the Clerk please call Calendar 432. 432.

THE CLERK:

On Page 28, Calendar 432, Substitute for House Bill Number 6557 AN ACT CONCERNING LIABILITY FOR THE RECREATIONAL USE OF LANDS. Favorable Report of the Committee on Judiciary.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Baram of the 15th, you have the floor, sir.

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

234
May 17, 2011

On Page 18, Calendar 314, Substitute for House
Bill Number 6422 AN ACT CONCERNING THE NOTIFICATION OF
MEDIATION AND ARBITRATION DECISIONS IN DISPUTES
BETWEEN BOARDS OF EDUCATION AND TEACHERS BARGAINING
UNITS. Favorable Report of the Committee on
Education.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Olson of the 46th, you have the
floor, madam.

REP. OLSON (46th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, we are
about to vote on today's Consent Calendar. These were
items that we had moved previously. Items Number 314,
404 and 500.

HB6422
SB1025
SB1041

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

Representative Olson.

REP. OLSON (46th):

Yes, and in fact I move that we pass these bills
and move passage. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The question before the House is passage of the
Consent Calendar. Further on the motion? Further on
the motion? If not, we'll proceed to voting.

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

235
May 17, 2011

Staff and guests please retire 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 today's Consent Calendar by Roll Call. Members to the Chamber.

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

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

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

And would the Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

On today's Consent Calendar.

Total Number Voting	144
Necessary for Passage	73
Those voting Yea	144
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	7

DEPUTY SPEAKER ALTOBELLO:

The Consent Calendar passes.

S - 632

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2011**

**VOL. 54
PART 21
6546-6914**

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

496
June 7, 2011

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Ah, thank you, Madam President.

Moving to calendar page 13, Calendar 511, House
Bill Number 6356.

Madam President, move to place the item on the
Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Continuing calendar page 13, Calendar 512,
House Bill Number 6422.

Madam President, move to place this item on the
Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Continuing on calendar page 13, Calendar 514,
House Bill Number 6590.

Madam President, move to place the item on the
Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

520
June 7, 2011

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

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

THE CLERK:

Madam President, the items placed...

THE CHAIR:

I would ask the Chamber to be quiet please so we can hear the call of the Calendar for the Consent Calendar.

Thank you.

Please proceed, Mr. Clerk

THE CLERK:

Madam President, the items placed on the first Consent Calendar begin on calendar page 5, Calendar 336, House Bill 5697.

Calendar page 7, Calendar 421, Substitute for House Bill 6126.

Calendar page 8, Calendar 449, Senate Bill 1149.

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

521
June 7, 2011

Calendar page 10, Calendar 470, Substitute for House Bill 5340. Calendar 474, Substitute for House Bill 6274. Calendar 476, House Bill 6635.

Calendar page 12, Calendar 499, Substitute for House Bill 6638. Calendar 500, House Bill 6614. Calendar 508, House Bill 6222.

Calendar page 13, Calendar 511, House Bill 6356. Calendar 512, Substitute for House Bill 6422. Calendar 514, House Bill 6590. Calendar 515, House Bill 6221. Calendar 516, House Bill 6455.

Calendar page 14, Calendar 517, House Bill 6350. Calendar 519, House Bill 5437. Calendar 522, House Bill 6303.

Calendar page 15, Calendar 523, Substitute for House Bill 6499. Calendar 524, House Bill 6490. Calendar 525, House Bill 5780. Calendar 526, House Bill 6513. Calendar 527, Substitute for House Bill 6532.

Calendar page 16, Calendar 528, House Bill 6561. Calendar 529, Substitute for House Bill 6312. Calendar 530, Substitute for House Bill 5032. Calendar 532, House Bill 6338.

Calendar page 17, Calendar 533, Substitute for House Bill 6325. Calendar 534, House Bill 6352.

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

522
June 7, 2011

Calendar 536, House Bill 5300. Calendar 537, House
Bill 5482.

calendar page 18, Calendar 543, House Bill 6508.

Calendar 544, House Bill 6412. Calendar 546,
Substitute for House Bill 6538. Calendar 547,
Substitute for House Bill 6440. Calendar 548,
Substitute for House Bill 6471.

Calendar page 19, Calendar 550, Substitute for
House Bill 5802. Calendar 551, House Bill 6433.
Calendar 552, House Bill 6413. Calendar 553,
Substitute for House Bill 6227.

Calendar page 20, Calendar 554, Substitute for
House Bill 5415. Calendar 557, Substitute for House
Bill 6318. Calendar 558, Substitute for House Bill
6565.

Calendar page 21, Calendar 559, Substitute for
House Bill 6636.

Calendar page 22, Calendar 563, Substitute for
House Bill 6600. Calendar 564, Substitute for House
Bill 6598. Calendar 566, House Bill 5585.

Calendar page 23, Calendar 568, Substitute for
House Bill 6103. Calendar 570, Substitute for House
Bill 6336. Calendar 573, Substitute for House Bill
6434.

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

523
June 7, 2011

Calendar page 24, Calendar 577, Substitute for
House Bill 5795.

Calendar page 25, Calendar 581, House Bill
6354.

Calendar page 26, Calendar 596, Substitute for
House Bill 6282. Calendar 598, Substitute for House
Bill 6629.

Calendar page 27, Calendar 600, House Bill
6314. Calendar 601, Substitute for House Bill 6529.
Calendar 602, Substitute for House Bill 6438.
Calendar 604, Substitute for House Bill 6639.

Calendar page 28, Calendar 605, Substitute for
House Bill 6526. Calendar 608, House Bill 6284.

Calendar page 30, Calendar number 615,
Substitute for House Bill 6485. Calendar 616,
Substitute for House Bill 6498.

Calendar page 31, Calendar 619, Substitute for
House Bill 6634. Calendar 627, Substitute for House
Bill 6596.

Calendar page 32, Calendar 629, House Bill
5634. Calendar 630, Substitute for House Bill 6631.
Calendar 631, Substitute for House Bill 6357.
Calendar 632, House Bill 6642.

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

524
June 7, 2011

Calendar page 33, Calendar 634, Substitute for
House Bill 5431. Calendar 636, Substitute for
House, correction, House Bill 6100.

Page 34, Calendar 638, Substitute for House
Bill 6525.

Calendar page 48, Calendar 399, Substitute for
Senate Bill 1043.

Calendar page 49, Calendar 409, Substitute for
House Bill 6233. Calendar 412, House Bill 5178.
Calendar 422, Substitute for House Bill 6448.

Calendar page 52, Calendar 521, Substitute for
House Bill 6113.

Madam President, that completes the item placed
on the first Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

We call for another roll call vote. And the
machine will be open for Consent Calendar number 1.

THE CLERK:

The Senate is now voting by roll 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.

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

525
June 7, 2011

Senator Cassano, would you vote, please, sir.

Thank you.

Well, all members have voted. All members have voted. The machine will be closed, and Mr. Clerk, will you call the tally?

THE CLERK:

Motion is on option Consent Calendar Number 1.

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

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar Number 1 has passed.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

We might stand at ease for just a moment as we prepare the next item..

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)