

2011 Bill Index

BillNumber	ACT NUMBER	pages	Count
HB6801	(SS2) PA 11-00		
	House		
		10263-10404	142
	Senate		
		7693-7823	131
			273

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2011**

**OCTOBER
SPECIAL
SESSION**

**VOL. 54
PART 24
7508 – 7825**

H – 1122

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2011**

**OCTOBER
SPECIAL
SESSION**

**VOL.54
PART 31
10245-10569**

Thank you very much.

There being no other announcements or points of personal privilege, will the Clerk please call Emergency Certified House Bill 6801.

THE CLERK:

Emergency Certified Bill House Bill 6801, AN
ACT PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION IN
THE STATE.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The chair of the Commerce Committee,
Representative Berger, you have the floor, sir.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon.

I move for acceptance and passage of Emergency
Certification Bill Number 6801.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question is on passage of the emergency
certified bill. Will you remark.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

What we have before us today is very, very
monumental. We have a bill that we are going to
vote on hopefully shortly, after an explanation and
a Q and A, but a bill that is the product of

bipartisan support. A bill that reaches across the aisle, Republican and Democrat, deals with a topic that really isn't Republican or Democrat, Mr. Speaker, but is an issue that affects the lives of all the citizens of the State of Connecticut. And that is, Mr. Speaker, creating jobs in the state, helping business grow, building our manufacturing base, making Connecticut a global power once again, that it was in years in the past. Now we can build again from now into the future. We make that step here today in a bipartisan way.

The Governor, in his direction, after session ended said, let's get together, have a special session, and let's deal with creating jobs. Let's make some substantive changes to law, build on programs that this Legislature has done in the past, and make that difference that we need to make to make us competitive.

Under his leadership, we are here today. The Governor has traversed across the state of Connecticut. The Republican Party and its -- and its leaders have traversed across the state of Connecticut. Democratic leaders have traversed across the state of Connecticut, meeting with

chamber of commerces, meeting with business, getting ideas and thoughts, and coming up with a consensus package that deals in five specific areas.

This bipartisan effort identifies five key areas, small business growth, regulatory environment, innovation, workforce development, and creating enhanced economic development tools. Within the context of this document, is the change and support for business that this General Assembly will expand upon.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to give a short summary and then get into each section. And before I do that, I also should -- I would be remiss in not thanking the Governor, the Governor's staff, the Speaker, the Majority Leader, the Minority Leader, and all ranking members and staff that have worked tirelessly, endless hours, along with the nonpartisan staff to come up with the document that we see here today, a solid document.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to create a summary and then go through sections.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

In a summary context, Mr. Speaker, the bill establishes new and expanding existing business assistance, economic and workforce development, and job training programs. It authorizes a rapid response financial assistant programs for small business. This is key, Mr. Speaker. Because when we look at how we want to grow, we heard about how the State of Connecticut, under recent times, has helped big business.

We heard from the small business out there, how can we improve ourselves? How can we, as a General Assembly, help small business? This bill will move to address that, both in freeing dollars up, allowing training components, and allowing for the hiring of the unemployed. New employees, Mr. Speaker, that are currently unemployed to be able to be businesses, small businesses alike, to be giving tax credits for hiring those, and expanding upon that to veterans, chronic unemployed and disabled, which increases that tax credit.

We expand the first five program and manufacturers' reinvestment account. The manufacturers' reinvestment account was an account

that this General Assembly did last session. And by the way, that was the first state in the country to form an MRA, Manufacturers Reinvestment Account. We're going to expand that here today, open up the field for business, create a bigger incentive for them to expand their business, create jobs, improve their facilities. That is within this package.

It allows state agencies to contract with private entities for building, finance, operating, and maintaining facilities. The bill creates new programs for farmland restoration, town center improvements in small towns, and -- and replacing inefficient, ineffective furnaces and boilers in -- through state bonding.

It authorized additional state bonding in MAA, the Manufacturers Assistance Act, and the Fix-It-First bridge repair program. And soon, within this section, we'll talk about that. And that's a commitment, right now, on the ground.

When we had hearings last week, we heard from the industry, the labor industry, the contractors, the people that do the work of repairing the bridges, concrete, engineers. And they said, you know, we're struggling out here. We need work.

It's been tough for us. Building has been slow.

This document earmarks \$50 million. Let's get that money on the street right now. Let's improve our bridges off a priority list. Let's put people to work right now, and let's make our roads safe. This document addresses that.

We deal with workforce development programs at community colleges and regional vocational technical schools. Now, when we go -- when we go around the state, we talk to community colleges. We talked to vo-techs, and we talked to manufacturers. And we -- that's precision manufacturers, the tool and die, the sheet metal stamping. They need people. They can employ people that can make a solid wage, 50, 75, 80 thousand dollars sometimes with overtime. They can't find those people in the workforce. How do we address that?

We create a learning environment where they can get ahead. They can find jobs and they can be trained and get jobs right away. And that helps all our communities. That helps our tax rolls. That helps our communities. It increases our quality of life and it increases our manufacturing

footprint innovatively, throughout the state of Connecticut, and makes us competitive in the world.

You know, we're not going to be able right now to -- this day today, by this bill, to say, hey, the state of Connecticut is going to be competing with China today after this, or other countries. But you know what? This will make us competitive. This starts the process.

If we start now in this year, in five, in six in ten years from now, that's where we make a difference with our youth and with our retrained incumbent workers. This bill addresses that.

Finally, the bill replaces three existing job creation tax credit programs with a new job expansion credit. And that's what I spoke about briefly before on hiring the chronic unemployed and the veterans.

We also reduce the minimum investment for angel investor income tax credit. This has become very, very important, because this is an area where we're going to be able to -- to store the entrepreneurial side and innovative side of creating business in the state of Connecticut.

We found this to be very successful.

Connecticut has really been on the forefront of this, and this now will enable us to move forward with an innovative, effective, efficient program, Mr. Speaker.

If I could now, I will run through, Mr. Speaker, the sections quickly. That was a quick overview of what the bill does. And then I have -- some of my colleagues will have some Q and A.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Please proceed.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Thank you.

Sections 1 through 5 are dealing with the Small Business Express Program and the Step-Up Program. This bill will authorize \$120 million in bonds for the Small Business Express Program. This bill creates the program so spoken to through the Department of Economic Community Development in providing loans, forgivable loans, or matching grants from 10,000 to 250,000 dollars. This bill authorizes up to 100 million in bonds for the SBEP program, Step Program.

Sections 6 through 9 deal with permitting, the permitting process, and how we are able to deal with that. Now, in going around the state, and certainly we've heard it in the Commerce Committee, other committees, labor, and so forth, about our permitting process, how we can make that efficient and effective. And when we talk about this document, we deal with efficiency and effectiveness in a timely manner.

We address -- we address in Sections 6 -- 6 through 9 permitting. Section 10, we deal with the LEAN manufacturing practices. Section 11, we create a review of regulations and statutes for LEAN practices. Sections 12 through 16 deal with farmland restoration and farm wineries.

Now, in farmland restoration, this will deal with returning farmland to pristine conditions, and establishes dollar amounts for us to be able to do that up to \$5 million. These are existing farms that have been neglected over the years. So now we're going to be able to create an environment which will help our economy but also remain the nature of what Connecticut is, in its pastoral grounds and farmlands, so we remain and keep that

integrity of our land.

Section 17 deals with natural disaster permitting. And this really is directed towards Irene. Helps a lot of our communities on the shoreline. And through you, Mr. Speaker, we'll have an amendment at the end which we'll call as a short fix to Section 17.

Section 18 deals with the manufacturers reinvestment accounts. These are the MRAs that we spoke to earlier. That we, as a General Assembly, both in the House and the Senate, instituted last year. We are going to raise the limit for those companies from \$50,000 a year, which we did last year, to increase it to \$100,000 a year, that they will be able to set -- set aside for training of employees, for hiring of employees, for expansion of their businesses and for innovative manufacturing. This will be used against their earned income.

So it's very similar, Mr. Speaker, to an IRA for a manufacturing company that can defer against their earned income. It's a tremendous opportunity for business. It's a tremendous opportunity for them to be able to put back into their business the

money that they earn.

And, in conjunction with DRS, we will now only tax on the withdrawal of those funds at 3.5 percent, which is more than half of what they normally would be charged. It's a great program. It allows manufacturers to invest back into their businesses, and allows us to be able to gain tax revenue, both on the front end and the back end of a five-year cycle.

The job -- Sections 19 through 22 deal with job expansion tax credits. And those are the tax credits of hiring individuals unemployed for a tax credit, which is double, from \$250 a month to \$500 a month for hiring those individuals.

Now, if that small business of 50 individuals or less wants to higher disabled, a veteran, or a chronically unemployed individual, that credit goes up to \$900 a month in descending value over the course of five years.

Section 23 deals with the business entity tax. Now, let's listen for a minute. The State of the Connecticut today, when we vote on this section, we're cutting a tax. We're cutting a tax to business, because why? We've heard them. We've

said and heard from business, we need relief from this onerous tax. A lot of it's a liability issue. People will form a business entity just to protect their liability, and it's just another hurdle for business to get over.

What we're doing here today, we're essentially cutting this tax in half. An individual business entity now will only have to pay \$250 every two years. We've cut it in half. This General Assembly, by voting on this, cuts a tax.

Section 24 through 27 deals with an area which is near and dear to myself, and certainly the Commerce Committee, and it expands on brownfields development. What we do here is create, basically, a first five for brownfields remediation and development on state-owned property.

It also established a little bit of discretion for the commissioner, if she sees fit, to be able to expand that to an end use program outside of state owned.

It's important to understand two things with this program. Existing programs that we have in brownfields remediation development establish a application process. This program will create a

one-page application process. It will also establish an end use for that property.

So, for those that want to say, hey, we're going to use state dollars. We're going to use bonding monies. Maybe we're going to take it from another program and we're going to clean up a property, a state-owned property. This property is not going to remain vacant. It's not the intent of this to let that then remain vacant.

When we use tax dollars to clean that property up, that property then is going to have an end-use business that will occupy that. That's jobs. That's tax revenue for a municipality. That's tax revenue to the State of Connecticut, decreases blight in all of our neighbors, and increases the quality of life. That is a lot of bang for the buck. That's one of the best jobs components of this bill.

It's a great program. We have committed \$20 million to that, and that is on top of bonding that will occur very shortly this month of \$15 million that will support brownfield remediation and existing programs within the system. That's a leap forward. That's a

commitment to us from all of our municipalities -- 151 throughout the State of Connecticut -- that we are committed. That we are making a difference in cleaning up these properties.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Section 28 establishes a DECD electronic business portal. And we have all heard it. Everyone in this Chamber has heard it. I've heard it. Everyone has heard it here and in the Senate. We're a small business, as an example. We want to find out what programs are available. How do we find out about this? No one can find out. It's a problem within our organizational structure and bureaucracy. No one can find out how to get to these so very important programs.

This portal will establish that access for business within DECD. It's so critical. We could have, Mr. Speaker, the best programs in the world. We could have the best policy in the world. But if our businesses, our employers don't know about them, then where does that place us? That places us at an unfair disadvantage. It's unacceptable.

This portal will help that small business find their way through the bureaucracy and get the help

they needed, and will not duplicate -- it's important to note -- will not duplicate the Secretary of State's portal.

Section 29 deals with the angel investors. Angel investors is a tremendous, tremendous program for innovative growth. This will be able to expand and lower the threshold currently, from \$100,000 to \$25,000 on investment and benefit that angel investors have. It's an area that we really need to corner the market on.

We have many people, certainly in the Fairfield County area, and certainly making our way up the 95 corridor, that want to invest in startup companies, innovative startup companies. This allows the portal, so to speak, for us to be able to open the market up and capture that angel investor market. The people are out there, Mr. Speaker, that want to invest in this -- in these programs. We are allowing and creating the impetus for them to be able to do that.

Sections 30 through 36 deal with workforce development and what we can do to enhance that. How we get our workers and how we're able to train our workers, both in the inner city and in -- in

urban areas, suburban areas, how we retrain them, how we get to the point where we are enabling them to get a job.

Workforce training is so very much a component of this now established within the Department of Labor. It's the right thing for us to do. It's the time to do it, and this bill does it.

Section 38 will be First Five Plus. This is an expansion of the existing First Five Program. Currently, we have four programs that the Governor has announced and we certified in last year's legislation of five companies. This expands First Five to additional five companies that will take advantage of First Five.

We established First Five to help the larger companies. We help in the other components of sections small business. We help small business. We create an impetus for large corporations to come in here. But within the language -- there's some new language -- there's several lines in there now that's say, well, the commissioner now should and could look outside of the State of Connecticut to bring in new business, large corporations into the State of Connecticut.

We've done very well in expanding it now, for what we have, with companies within the State of Connecticut, and now with NBC transforming their footprint from Philadelphia and Rockefeller Center to Stamford. We're going in the right direction with that and we're gaining a lot of momentum.

First Five Plus gets us over that hump to get to that big NBC, to get to that CIGNA, to get to that company maybe that we haven't reached out to yet, that may be in some other part of the country, let's get them here to Connecticut. And that makes us viable throughout the whole United States and certainly throughout the world.

Sections 39 through 45 deal with a airport development zone. This was a bill that we -- that we reviewed last year that needed some tweaks really, honestly, when dealing with census tracts, when dealing with the Connecticut airport authority, which we now have in place, and which will soon be formulated and do their first meeting to assist -- to assist airports.

And when we talk about the airports, the airport development zone has actually five specific airports. That this development zone, which will

reach out two miles from the airport, and deals with enterprise zone credits, Bradley, Oxford, New London, Sikorsky and Brainard are really the five areas and airports that will be able to take direct advantage of aggressive language in here.

Aggressive language that not only deals with airport business but which deals with businesses that are ancillary to airport and -- and manufacturing and servicing of airports in those five areas.

So it's a tremendous -- Mr. Speaker, a tremendous economic driver for those areas, reaching out the tentacles, reaching out beyond the airport, in creating an economic development zone that adds jobs, tax revenue, to not only the municipality but the State of Connecticut.

Section 46, we talked about that earlier. Fix-It bridges. There is a priority list that DOT has, Department of Transportation, of bridges that are in repair. And, Mr. Speaker, we've heard upwards of 30 percent of the bridges in the State of Connecticut are in need of repair. This establishes \$50 million right now. Fix it first, get the money out there. Let's fix our bridges.

Let's make our roads safe. This commits that in a bipartisan way to get that done, get our people employed, and get \$50 million in safety out to the people of the State of Connecticut.

Sections 47 and 48 deal with Manufacturers Assistance Act and Urban Reinvestment Act dollars. This is an expansion of the existing MAA program.

Sections 49 through 51 deal with boiler replacement. Now, we all have a housing authority in our -- our neighborhoods. We all have a nonprofit. Those are individuals that may not have the money to be able to replace a furnace. A housing authority with a building with 20, 30 people in each building, centralized heating system, the heating time is coming upon us -- and it's supposed to be cold -- snowy again this year.

We're dedicating \$5 million to those entities to be able to replace those furnaces, to be able to help those citizens in all our communities. And \$5 million will go a long way. It's a competitive process. We're going to have people get their applications in. Let's get that money out. And we do that here in this bill.

Section 52 deals with CIA recapitalization.

Now what a tremendous program CI is. I believe, back in the late nineties, we first capitalized them at \$3 million. They have tenfold increased those dollars. And we, oftentimes, have went out and grabbed some of that money from them. We're recapitalizing them now, \$25 million. Tremendous program that's going to lead to growth and advancement in innovative areas in the state of Connecticut. It's a tremendous commitment that creates a spectrum of dollars across the state of Connecticut that make a difference in each and every one of our communities.

Section 53 through 55 deal with film tax credit changes, and this deals directly with NBC. But this doesn't also help -- not only help NBC Sports move to Stamford. This helps every other qualified production facility that spends up to \$25 million to be able to get a tax credit over ten years, to have a qualified production in the state of Connecticut.

And this isn't filming a movie in downtown Main Street for one week. This is about bricks and mortar. This is about creating an industry, creating a footprint in the state of Connecticut

for film production and digital animation. This expands that. This puts us on the map. This makes it happen for us in the film industry.

Section 74 through 77 deal with licensing.

78 through 79 deal with Main Street initiatives, and those are for our steep municipalities. Those small towns of 30,000 or less that need to have their downtown areas cleaned up, facades, \$10,000, \$25,000, to make a difference in improvements to our small-town downtowns. This commits that Main Street initiative to that program.

Sections 80 through 88 deal with a somewhat decreased P3, quote, program. In conjunction with a lot of discussion that's gone on on both side of the aisle with our labor unions, we're -- we're going to need look at this expansion of this into 2012 session. We start here.

We start here with the document that we have before us and we look to expand on it. It's a start for us. We need to have the full light of the General Assembly look at this, and we'll do that in 2012. It's a great initiative. An issue that we need to work together on to make happen.

This document gets us started and makes that happen.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and that concludes the sections.

Deputy Speaker Ryan in the Chair.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative Berger.

Representative Mikutel of the 45th.

REP. MIKUTEL (45th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I rise briefly in support of the bill.

Mr. Speaker, this is a good day. This is a good day because this Legislature is helping to create jobs in a state that needs jobs, and because it shows the Legislature at its best working in a bipartisan effort on matters that really are important to our constituents.

I'd like to take this moment to congratulate our Governor for being an activist in the whole area of job creation. I have not always been this -- a supporter of the Governor, but I tell you, I am impressed with his activist approach.

He's got his priorities right. I think the job tour that he took was a great idea to gather input from the employers of the state. And the bill that we are discussing today reflects the messages that it came back from the employers. So this is a real document, a document that reflects the needs of our employers.

I think this is a great opportunity also for us to develop a better partnership with our business community and to change the business climate in the state of Connecticut. This bill shows that and reflects the need for the state to have a role in job creation, so who drives Connecticut's economy is not just the private sector. It's also -- there's also a place for government to create jobs in this state.

Representative Berger did a good job in outlining the whole bill, but there's three small sections of the bill that I would like to briefly speak to. And one of them is the need to better coordinate our educating our people with the needs of the employers.

The biggest complaint that I heard from employers in my area, especially manufacturers, is

that they have job openings but they can't find people to fill them. So this bill does reflect a better coordination of what the schools are doing to meet the needs of our employers, and I'm very, very happy to see that in the bill.

I'm also pleased to see the streamlining of the permitting process. Because, as I understand it, it takes an average of five years to get a permit through the DEP. That is unacceptable. In other states, they can streamline it and get a permit within six months out of their own DEP, or their equivalent, so this is a step in the right direction. And I -- I like what the bill is doing in terms of a consultant and in terms of the Governor's executive order to streamline the process.

Finally, I'm very happy to see a piece helping small business, because the complaint that I have from my small business is that all we do is help the big corporations. We never help the small mom-and-pop stores. So this is a credit to those who crafted this bill, that we actually now can go home to our small business people and say we have actually done something that can help you. That's

going to help all of us and help our constituents,
so that's a good thing.

I just want to close by saying that our job is far from done. We need to change the business climate in this state. And it's not enough just to pass one piece of legislation and think that we're done with -- with our work. No. This is an ongoing process. We can't -- and part of that means we need to have more certainty. The business community needs to have more certainty.

We cannot pass laws one week and then the next session change them. That's not -- especially with respect to tax policy, we must have more stability.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you. Thank you, Representative.

Representative Camillo of the 151st.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

While no bill is ever perfect, in my three years up here, I think this is truly one of the better bills. Not often do I get to stand up here and talk about a bill that really addresses a lot of the concerns that small business has given to us

year after year. A bill that deals with expediting the permit processes and a bill that even cuts a tax, that's -- that's pretty rare up here. As the good Representative said, it cuts the business entity tax which was 250 down to 125.

And, you know, it may not seem like a lot, but you know, if you're a small business, you know, every little bit counts, especially in an economy like this. So hats off to everybody on both side of the aisle that worked on this. And a tip of the cap to the chairman of commerce who really did a thorough job in explaining this bill.

Not much more to go on this, but I certainly, through you, Mr. Speaker, would like to ask him a few questions.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger, if you would prepare yourself. Yes.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you. Sections 1 through 5 deal with small business, as I just mentioned. Some really good stuff in there, certainly, speeding up permit processes and, you know, one-page applications, and

30 day closes.

But one of the conditions for, you know, the -- a loan to a small business in this -- this bill, it states here that a company would have to stay -- would not have -- would not be able to relocate within five years of receiving a loan. If, for whatever reason, they packed up and left after, say, year three, would they be in line for a fine, a penalty, or would we just have to eat the money that we gave to them? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the Representative. I think it's important to note that, in fact, the Representative is correct, that these grants and loans are forgivable. But if a company were not to uphold their obligation under the five-year window, they would also be subject to penalties under the existing language of the loan and full repayment of the loan to DECD to -- and to the State of Connecticut and to its citizens.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Camillo.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you to the Representative.

In Section 4, the definition of eligible small business, I just wanted to know for a point of clarification, states that it's at 100. I want to make sure that's not 50.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. So the question was 100 businesses would be eligible, and that would be correct.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Camillo.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Also, in Section 4, concerning the Step Program, which is the retraining of employees to reenter fields that they may not have been qualified to -- to hold the job in previously, it's a 13 week program.

With each passing week, I just want to -- for point of clarification -- to make sure, who is picking up, as far as their payment of this? I know at the beginning it's -- the State pays for all it, but, for a point of clarification, does the employee start to assume a lot of this debt?

Mr. Speaker, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe in answer to the good Representative's question, the employers are paid to train and hire the unemployed. And that period, it would be over a six-month period that we would assume the cost.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Camillo.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Okay. And the -- the grants that were given, there will -- it says here they will be canceled the date that the new employee leaves employment

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

48
October 26, 2011

with the eligible small business. This is an earlier draft I have, so I apologize. I just want to make sure that's still the case.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Camillo.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you.

In Section 6, Mr. Speaker, the DEP permitting process, we're speeding it up now, as has been mentioned a few times already, with procedures that really look at enforcement and applications that pose the lowest level of risk to the environment, which I think is a good thing. It's a cautious way to go with this.

Are there any time limits now with this expedited process?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. I'm sorry, Mr. Speaker, and I'm sorry to the Representative. I didn't catch the first part of that question.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Camillo.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Sure. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

The DEP permitting processes, we're now speeding it up to those with the lowest level -- applications with the lowest level of risk to the environment. We were talking about speeding it up. What -- what is the time frame -- time limits, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

And I know, through you, that there's, you know, obviously concern by the environmentalist. But what -- what we're talking about here is -- is -- is a decrease in the time frame, but a feasibility -- a look at the feasibility of

developing a methodology for processing these permit applications in -- in a speedy way, an enforcement action based on two-tiered levels, through you, Mr. Speaker, for DEEP to follow, in not only protecting our environment, but also to expedite this process.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Camillo.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you, Representative Berger.

Going on now to, I think, Section 29 and the business portal section. I know the -- Representative Berger had already mentioned that it is not a duplication of services between what the Secretary of State did last year and what we voted on in this. But could you just, through you, Mr. Speaker, just clarify how it is different? Because we're going to get that question over and over again.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I -- I believe the Section 29 was angel investor, but that might be in an older document. But I know where -- through you, Mr. Speaker -- where the good Representative is going. The -- certainly, there was a lot of discussion on the Secretary of State's portal last year on, hey, you know, we've had other -- other ways that we can do this. There's other entities out there that can form this. This, however, is a separate -- a separate issue. We are -- the first contact, the portal for the Secretary of State would say, hey, now you need to go to this section, which would be then they would kick them to DECD, which then DECD would then open up as the portal of location for that business to go to to access the information on small loans, on tax incentives, on workforce training.

So this is a direct portal through DECD that would potentially link with the Secretary of State, through you, Mr. Speaker, that business then would have a one-stop shop access to. Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Camillo.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and thank you to the Representative for that explanation.

Finally, the airport authority section of this bill that concerns expansion of enterprise zones. Through you, Mr. Speaker, will there be any legislative oversight to this, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the answer is yes, there would be.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Camillo.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

In what form would that take? Would it be through this body or through a standing committee?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, through the

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

53
October 26, 2011

committee of cognizance, commerce.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Camillo.

REP. CAMILLO (151st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I thank the good Representative for his answers. I may have some questions later, but I think some of my colleagues have some now. So thank you very much, and thank you to Representative Berger.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Miner of the 66th.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and -- and good afternoon.

I, too, have a few questions, if I might, to the proponent of the bill, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, there are a number of sections in this bill that deal with job expansion tax credits

and similar credits associated with creating what we hope will be new jobs, in some cases, for veterans who are unemployed and otherwise unemployed. And there seems to be some language in here, and I want to get a clarification, as to how the tax credit can be applied.

And so, through you, if an individual is a stockholder within a small corporation, perhaps themselves solely or with a partner, am I correct that that tax credit could be passed through that business to them personally if their income tax structure is set up that way? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

That -- that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Because, like many of you, most of the small business people that I know hire these people.

They operate car dealerships, parts stores. They

operate all sorts of things. But at the end of the day, that personal investment is attributable to them. And more often than not, the tax exposure doesn't exist until it gets to them.

So, for those businesses that have been struggling through this economy, that small business for which they're going to add an employee or two doesn't actually show a revenue exceeding their tax liability. So I think it's important for us to know that this does have a great possibility of helping small businesses that are set up that way.

Additionally, when I read through an earlier draft of this, it appeared to me that through some of the brownfields language, there was an opportunity -- and I'll just say DEEP as an agency -- for an agency to take some of the bond proceeds and use those bond proceeds internally, in terms of their processing of a grant or their administration of a program.

If the gentleman could tell us, to what extent would those bond proceeds, if at all, be used to fund current operating costs of agencies?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that this certainly -- language would be somewhat similar to other programs that we have of administrative costs and to expand on what administrative costs may or may not be. That would be on the establishment of -- of the loan process through DEEP and DECD, the administrative processing of that loan, and -- and the oversight of the operation of that loan for the cleanup of the site, if that's helpful to the good Representative.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I know there are some specific language within the bill where, I think, under the LEAN program, there would be the ability to hire contractors. I think there is some other language in here where we fully expect to have the State engage in to some business relationship with an outside entity.

And for those cases, do those fallen in the administrative process and that portion for which those grant proceeds could be used?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. It -- it could potentially, but it is not the intent of the agency to peel off, so to speak, bonding fund costs for administrative expenses or to expand them to a level beyond what would be under the normal course of operation of the agency and the effectiveness of the loan.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I thank the gentleman for his answer. I know already there have been some references to what I think is Section 6. Section 6 being that piece of this puzzle that deals with the permit process.

My read of Section 6 is that the DEEP, by February of next year, will make a report to the

Committee of Cognizance. And unless I'm wrong, Mr. Speaker, I don't think that actually puts in place a sped up permit process. I think what that does is puts that process in the legislative process and it will be up to us to speed that process up. Am I right in that reading?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It certainly is the intent to speed up the process, but I guess the answer to that question could be yes and no. We will receive a report which we could expand upon in the 2012 legislative session, but it certainly is the intent of the commissioner of DECD and DEEP, within some language that we have here, to expedite certain programs and initiatives in the context of the document that we have here today, and then for us to expand on legislation in 2012 through a document we would receive on or before February 1.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And -- and so that report then could be acted on prior to February 1, 2012, if, for instance, the agencies felt that they wanted to take some corrective action, they could do that almost instantaneously in an effort to address some of the concerns that I think our constituents have raised with us. Is that what I'm hearing?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

There certainly is commissioner discretion to expedite some of these programs and processes.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I do thank the gentleman for his work and his comments.

I don't know if anyone else here is as troubled by where we are as I am. I suspect we all are concerned about the unemployment level. I think we're all concerned about when, in some cases, is a stagnant -- kind of a stagnant economy in the State of Connecticut.

The real estate market is probably having some of its worst times in recordable history. But there are some bright spots. I mean, we do have some industries that have confessed to me and have bragged to me, in fact, that things are looking better. They speak in terms of months. They speak in terms of weeks.

So when we talk up here about front end loading, something to the tune of \$510 million, one of my constituents refers to that as big boy dollars, where someone is actually going to the bank and borrowing the money and trying to do something good with it.

But there's no doubt, Mr. Speaker, that -- that this bill only facilitates -- only facilitates those that would otherwise be thinking about creating a job to create the job. They're not going to put somebody at a desk if they don't think

they can make money doing it. This credit will not be enough money. They won't put somebody behind the machine to make a part if they don't think someone will buy it.

Most of the constituents that have talked to me are the same that have talked to you. They have little different stories. They say we remember the Sick Leave Bill. We remember Senate Bill 1106 and House Bill 6486, both which are now part of an executive order. Things that drive up the cost of business and the cost of government.

So, while today it is my intent to support this bill, because I think it takes a step in the right direction, it sends a signal to other states, we're not asleep here. We don't want you stealing our companies. We want to try and participate in that arena. But we can't let today be the only day. We can't come back here in February and start with a cadre of business-killing legislation. Because today will have been for nothing. These big-boy dollars that we're going to borrow and disperse across the state of Connecticut in the hopes of creating jobs will be squandered.

So I am here today to support this piece of

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

62
October 26, 2011

legislation. And I hope, as we move forward in the year to come, that we'll make an even stronger place to do business, not weaker.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Haddad of the 54th.

REP. HADDAD (54th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, I'd like to add my congratulations to the chairman of the Commerce Committee for very ably describing what's in this bill today, and also to thank the leadership of all four caucuses of the General Assembly for working so hard to bring us a piece of legislation that I think will -- will put us in a much better economic position as a State, as well as thank the Governor for providing the leadership and calling us into special session and in providing us this opportunity.

I do have a couple of questions. We -- we did have a -- a public hearing last week on many of the concepts involved in this piece of legislation. And I just had a question or two to pose to the chairman of the Commerce Committee.

So, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the chairman.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger, please prepare yourself. I hope you can hear the questioner.

REP. HADDAD (54th):

Last week we heard the commissioner of DECD and others talk about many ideas that were created to -- to spur innovation and entrepreneurship. They included, for example, a proof of concept center, which is an idea that's been employed at many different academic institutions to demonstrate that new technology can be brought to market effectively.

It provides protections to IP, to intellectual property. These proof of concept centers also work very hard with involved folks to -- to make sure that there's a smart business plan in place. Additionally, to the proof of concept centers we talked about an IP factory, a mentoring network in innovation centers of various parts around the state.

I was curious -- as I was reading the bill, I didn't see many of these things mentioned. But

it's my understanding that Section 52 which deals with the recapitalization of Connecticut innovations is the section that would provide resources to do many of these initiatives.

Through you, I just wanted to confirm that that was the case.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, to my cochair of the Commerce Committee. The answer is in the affirmative, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54th):

Additionally, the commerce chairperson might also remember that we did a bill last year. We called it the Pre-Seed Bill which ensured that university sponsored companies, that is companies that came out of intellectual property created in their universities were eligible to -- to apply for many of the programs that we were setting up.

And so, in the -- in the small business express package, for example, we have some projects

that require matching funds. And I wanted to ensure that university-related companies could use universe -- private university investments to qualify for these grant programs.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is correct. They will be allowed.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54th):

I thank Representative Berger for his answers. I think, as we proceed with making -- doing the other bill that we're doing today on Jackson Laboratories, which is essentially a doubling down of our investment at that -- at Connecticut Bioscience, it will be important for us to make sure that -- that we're putting those companies that will come out of those initiatives in -- in good standing with our economic development initiatives.

I do have a couple of other questions. I

think that these are probably more appropriately posed to the chairman of the Labor Committee. They concern the public partnership, public-private partnership provisions in the bill.

So, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the chairman of the Labor Committee.

As I was reading the -- the sections that are in the public-private partnerships, I certainly, sir, recognize that public-private partnerships could have a very significant role in our economic future. That being said, I want to ensure, and would like the members of the Chamber to know, if these public-private partnerships will -- are about creating jobs and not privatizing services that are currently provided by public employees.

And so, as I was reading through the language of the bill, I was looking at line 4,896 which -- which deals with noncompete provisions, and specifically, line -- the lines say, "No partnership agreement shall contain any noncompete provisions limiting the ability of the State to perform its functions."

I was wondering if the chairman of the Labor Committee could give me a brief explanation about

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

67
October 26, 2011

what that means.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Zalaski, chairman of the Labor Committee, can you respond to Representative Haddad.

REP. ZALASKI (81st):

Yes. Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I first would like to say that it's a proud day to be here in front of everybody to speak on this bill. It -- it -- I made mention during one of the public hearings that I think it's a great thing that we can come to a resolution between both sides of the aisle to do something great for the State of Connecticut, which they can't do for the country in Washington.

With that, I would -- on line 4896 which the question was about, it seems that many states and cities have made the mistake of -- of signing on to partnership contracts which prevent the State from investing in projects that are alternatives to the public-private partnership, or which require the State to pay a reduced -- reduce the -- when they had a reduced compensation, that they have to fund more money to the partner.

Say, for instance, the partnership might fund a harbor improvement, and the State decides to build a freight line next to it, which cuts down a little on the money that they make at that time. Line 4896 is intended to ensure that these contractors don't -- contracts don't contain any provisions requiring that the State compensate the private partner for the -- in those situations.

The same thing as if we built a parking garage somewhere and the State decided to have a bus running from another parking lot to that parking lot, and the -- the private employers said, well, you've got to pay me for that because we want people to park in that parking lot. So that's what that line is meant to do.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54th):

Thank you to Representative Zalaski for providing that answer.

One additional question. As we execute these contracts, who is going to inspect and monitor the contracts to make sure that partners are complying

with the contract provisions and with state law?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Zalaski.

REP. ZALASKI (81st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Line 4918 through 4925 specifically requires that these projects comply with the State's environmental set-aside licensing and permitting laws. However, generally, the bill does not exempt these projects from all the State laws that make sure the contractors are honoring their commitments. These laws use impartial state inspectors, monitors, and similar employees, to protect the public, and they are fully applicable here.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Haddad.

REP. HADDAD (54th):

Yes. I'd like to thank Representative Zalaski for his answer again. And again, to complement the leadership of all four caucuses. I think it's a proud day that we're here acting on a bill that has bipartisan support in an effort to create jobs here

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

70
October 26, 2011

in the State of Connecticut. I hope that will serve as a model for Washington to follow in the hopes that we can get our national economy on track as well.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Dillon of the 92nd District.

REP. DILLON (92nd):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, a few questions to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, ma'am.

REP. DILLON (92nd):

Thank you.

First, I'd like to congratulate the representative from Waterbury for his hard work and those of you who worked with him on this bill. But I am interested keenly in the benefits of anything we do here to -- that would accrue to the city that hired me to come here. And for that reason, I guess I had a couple of questions on the -- on the impact of some of the language.

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

71
October 26, 2011

Through you, first, are there any (inaudible) provisions anywhere in this bill concerning, let's say, providing -- holding a company to certain kinds of job guarantees?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, to the good Representative from New Haven, that there is protections not only on the loan and grant guarantee side but on job creation side within this document.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON (92nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I won't dwell on that. I just want to say I can't believe I'm saying this year, but I believe the year that Ronald Reagan ran, the second time, I authored what was later called the (inaudible) ordinance for the -- when -- because I was an alderman, and I chaired the budget committee. And I was asked to provide a loan to a local company.

And because I invest in the market, I discovered through the financial press that someone was bragging about using New Haven's money for a leveraged buyout to move to Rhode Island.

And before that, they've made it through committee. We had it tied in knots because it was -- and that was, if there was fire-sale language -- you know, if we gave you land at a certain amount, if you left, you know, five years before the end of it, if you didn't provide x, then you would -- then you would have to pay back the city.

Now, having said that, it was not always enforced in the contracts. I believe it was -- I hope it was used as leverage to get a better deal, because I didn't see it. But I do think because -- I do think that a lot of these companies skip from one state to another once they got the benefit. And at a certain point, it's helpful if we're growing our own -- not just bringing people in from out of state because they might very well leave. I know that that's counterintuitive -- some people here on the other side of that. It's hard to know what the right thing is, but that there's a case to be made on either side.

The second is on the issue of infrastructure. I know that we've been hearing a lot about infrastructure on these -- on these two bills that are going forward. And, through you, Mr. Speaker, I'd like to ask if there is any tie in between the Department of Transportation's initiatives and the job creation that -- that's envisioned in -- in this legislation.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker. If I can understand the good Representative's question, is that certainly within the context of Fix-It First, DOT has a priority list which they review and thereby then work in conjunction with the implementation of the program off a priority list that's been established throughout all our communities.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON (92nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I probably didn't make myself very clear. If you look at New York and the way that it came back actually after the towers went down, or if you look at the state of Montana where one town decided to grow its film industry partly by building what was, at that time, a free bus system which was invested in by -- by the private sector and by the public sector and by the university, so that anybody at that time could get on a bus and get anywhere in the city for free. And the idea, which I think you could argue is not a bad one, is that if -- if you can get the workers to the job, some jobs -- some businesses might actually grow on their own.

And, as it stands now, I believe Missoula charges about 85 cents to take a bus ride. But many of the private companies actually will give you a voucher so that you'll go for free, so that they will take that system.

The New Haven delegation had a bill this year to provide for a shuttle from the Union Station to Southern, and it was defeated. But just to use a local example, there's a nursing home in my district that was closed by the State of Connecticut. Over a hundred jobs were lost. I

don't know what the property is going to do. We could actually do something, maybe, if there was transportation along that corridor.

I'd like to know -- and I see the chair of transportation over there -- is there a plan for the Department of Transportation to look at -- at access beyond trains? And I agree, I'm sure my taxpayers are thrilled that we're doing more trains, although we don't necessarily use them as much as others, but those of us who -- other parts of the State, maybe, we could do more. So the trains are on the right track.

But -- but is there another way of looking at getting workers to work?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

And, you know -- and I know certainly in New Haven they did have issues in the past on -- on, say, bus service. And, through you, Mr. Speaker, during the -- the Department of Transportation, under capital improvement project funds, has the -- has the ability now to be -- to be able to dig into

that, so to speak, issue for cities, like the city of New Haven and others.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON (92nd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, thank you.

This is a very important initiative, and I want to give it the respect it deserves. And that's why I'm asking these questions. But I would suggest the Department of Transportation has not always been sensitive to the context of the -- of the construction that it does, or of the impact on small business when they expand avenues that -- to increase traffic.

So -- and, in fact, if you look at the headquarters of the Department of Transportation, I don't believe it's accessible by mass transit. It looks like the space -- enterprise really.

So that I think -- I would -- I would encourage that we -- that we look at tie-ins, so that maybe some businesses that we don't have to give money to would actually grow on their own if we have a fixed bus service on certain routes

outside of simply the trains on the Gold Coast. We could actually have some businesses grow on their own.

The next question is concerning the Main Street section, and that's Section 78.

I was waiting to see if Mr. -- if the chair was prepared. Okay. Of course he's prepared.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that's -- you described in that section -- describes also, quote, unquote, Main Street, as you know, because you yourself were incredibly generous with helping. There is a Main Street initiative, actually, in the 92nd District of New Haven.

It appears that the language here would not -- it would not be eligible under this language because the Westfall Village is within a town that's larger than 30,000. I wonder, through you, if you envision the ability to make designated communities eligible for those dollars. I see upper Albany, New London, Rose City, Simsbury, Main Street Waterbury and Westfall Village Renaissance are mainstream communities that are within larger cities.

Was that discussed in -- in preparing this

bill, and is there a potential for making those needy, worthy communities eligible for this funding?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I might suggest that if the specific city or location in the city had a Main Street designation, which is a national designation, that, under commissioner discretion, that that location could potentially be accessible for funds under Main Street initiative.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Dillon.

REP. DILLON (92nd):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

Through you. And just in concluding, one of the pressing issues that we're looking at is the problems that those under 30 are facing, either because they're not being employed, or because they're saddled with student loans. Or if they have children, they're having -- having difficulty

feeding them.

It is really difficult in a bill of this scope, that required so much work on both sides of the aisle, to think of everything. But going forward, I think it's really important that we think about ways to bring in the under thirties for what -- in what -- every way possible. It's not a monolithic group, but it's -- it's a group that has disproportionately high unemployment, that cuts across racial categories, and frankly, maybe even across class. But -- but it definitely is a generation that needs our attention.

Otherwise, I want to thank you very much for the work that you've done. I'll be happy -- given that we're going to be going forward to ask for other things next session -- I'll be happy to vote for it. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Willis of the 64th.

REP. WILLIS (64th):

Thank you very much, sir.

I rise for the purpose of legislative intent.

First, I would like to say that I also rise in

support of this legislation; very excited about its impact, particularly on the workforce development piece for manufacturing here in Connecticut.

A certain section in Section 31 needs clarification. It is regarding our vocational and technical schools and community college. It says, in Item 2, the use of volunteers from the manufacturing industry for training and manufacturing skills at the regional colleges and regional vo-tech schools. I think it is important to say at this time that the volunteers would not be supplanting faculty or teachers in the classroom.

Volunteers are a valuable addition to supporting the qualified teachers in the classroom. And it is only meant for them to be as mentors and support staff for those professional certified teachers and professors.

So I thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, ma'am. I hope your voice gets better.

Representative Klarides of the 114th.

Representative Sawyer, who is not here --

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

81
October 26, 2011

okay. We'll come back to her.

Representative Kiner of the 59th.

REP. KINER (59th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I stand in strong support of this bill and would like to congratulate the leaders of the four caucuses and the administration in their efforts for moving the state of Connecticut forward. And I also thank Representative Berger for bringing this bill out today.

Mr. Speaker, I also stand for the purpose of legislative intent. I had a few questions, through you, to the proponent of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. KINER (59th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a follow-up to some of Representative Haddad's questions which are regarding the public-private partnership provisions, the language in this bill.

Will there be -- or let me rephrase that. Couldn't these projects take state resources away from other critical state programs?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Sir -- to Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

As Representative Haddad had -- had deferred through our esteemed chair of Labor, I will also defer to the esteemed Chair of Labor in the House, Representative Zalaski.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Kiner, would you please redirect your question to the chairman of Labor?

REP. KINER (59th):

Sure. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, couldn't these projects take state resources away from other critical state programs?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Zalaski.

REP. ZALASKI (81st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

These projects are intended to be self-sufficient projects, and at least -- or at least very close to it. The definitions of a

public-private partnership, starting on line 4686, make it clear that it ensures that the State will never have to pay more than 25 percent of the cost of the project.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Kiner.

REP. KINER (59th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, what does the chairman mean?

Through you, what does "the cost of the project" mean?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Zalaski.

REP. ZALASKI (81st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, I guess the simplest way to answer that is, it's the net expenses of the project. We hope that the project will be fully self-sufficient. But, as I stated previously, we're guaranteed that, at least, it will never cost the state more than 25 percent. So we say that 75 percent is self-sufficient in the project.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Kiner.

REP. KINER (59th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And one more question regarding the public-private partnership. So, through you, to Representative Zalaski.

Through you, are the public-private partnerships supposed to be viewed as a vehicle to move public jobs to the private sector?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Zalaski.

REP. ZALASKI (81st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It has had that impact in some states and cities that haven't been as careful as we have in drafting this bill. Our bill is intended not to move jobs from one employee to another, but to create new jobs and thereby spur our economy.

Moving jobs from one employer to another doesn't really create jobs. It just -- and it doesn't really help the economy either. That's why this bill makes it clear that the Governor can approve only projects that create jobs and spur

growth. On line 4730, it's quoted as -- to that effect.

And that's why the bill subjects any partnership agreement involving operating and maintaining a facility to the strict provisions of our Clean Contracting Act.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Kiner.

REP. KINER (59th):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Williams of the 68th.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon.

Mr. Speaker, just rising briefly in support of this bill, and we'll give Representative Berger a little bit of a break. I know he's had a lot of questions so far from both sides of the aisle. But I just want to thank everybody who has worked on this bill and this initiative from all four caucuses and from the Governor's office.

You know, we're not all excited about the way that we got here. We're not all excited about the fact that we've had the most stagnant growth in the country and that we haven't created one new net jobs since 1989 here in the State. We recognize, I think, that it took us a long time to get into this problem and it's certainly going to take us some time to get out of it.

And, you know, thinking about the way the got here today, the last night of the session the Governor said we have to come back into special session and talk about jobs. That day ultimately wound up being today, in October.

And we all sort of agreed that -- that we're going to continue to have those fights, as we have in the past, about taxes and regulations and things like paid sick leave, but that today was at least a day that we could hit some base hits, and we could all agree on something. And so, hopefully, we're sending a message to the voters of Connecticut, to businesses, et cetera, that you know, unlike certain other political environments, there, at least, are areas that we can find agreement on here in the State of Connecticut.

It doesn't mean that we're happy with everything -- each and every one of us in this Chamber is happy with everything that's in this bill. It certainly doesn't mean that, you know, we violated our principles in any way. But it means that we're going to hit some base hits and we found some common denominators.

Specifically, Mr. Speaker, ladies and gentlemen, you know, we, on this side of the aisle, have been talking about the business entity tax for some time, and very happy that we're at least reducing that and making some progress on sending a message to small businesses that, you know, we're not going to hit you every chance we get. We're going to give you a little bit of a break on the business entity tax.

I know Representative Berger has worked diligently with the Waterbury delegation on brownfields in the past, and I think that there's some positive developments in the area of brownfields.

You know, as we traveled the state -- I know Representative Berger mentioned the travels that we've all made throughout the state on our jobs

tours. We've talked about licensing, and heard from companies over and over again about the arduous process of occupational licensing. There's no reason applications should sit on state employees' desks for months and months and months and months waiting to be acted upon. I think we're taking a positive step in that direction as well.

You know, we thought for a long time that the angel investment tax credit should be changed and the threshold should be lowered, and we're doing that here in this bill today as well. So I think we're making some positive steps in the right direction. We're making Connecticut a little bit more friendly to businesses.

We have so much more that we have to do in the future, though, folks. And we've had these debates over and over again. We have to lower the cost of energy here in the state. We have amongst the highest energy rates in the country. That's killing manufacturers. We have to do that. We have to make some tough decisions with regard to our State budget. We have to reduce spending. We have to reduce taxes. We have to change our tax system. That is killing businesses.

We've heard it all over the State of Connecticut in the last six to eight months on our jobs tours, talking to business owners about how taxes are killing their businesses.

We've got to take a really hard look at the regulations that we're passing. We had a nine hour debate, I think, on paid sick leave earlier, towards the end of our 2011 session. And we've heard since then, since that debate, about how bad the idea of paid sick leave will be in terms of job creation.

So we're making a few little steps here today, and I'm proud to be a part of that, and I'm proud that we've all been able to negotiate and come to this conclusion. But we're not doing anything dramatic. And I don't think anybody is pretending that we're doing anything dramatic here. But we can't go back to our constituents and say, we changed Connecticut. Today was the day that we changed Connecticut in terms of our regulatory environment.

We can go back to them and say we did a little -- a few little things here. They're all positive. We agreed, and it wasn't partisan. But

let's not fool ourselves. We need a lot more help in terms of our regulatory environment going forward.

And I hope that we recognize that unless and until we change that, we're going to continue to be in the same situation, job creation wise, as we have been for the last 20 years.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Sawyer of the 55th.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

When you look at the breadth of Connecticut, we have a real mixture of the types of businesses. From the districts that you and I represent, we can talk about farming, to the point where we've visited the egg farms in the State of Connecticut. And by egg farms, I talk about egg farms that extended from one side of this room to the other and then twice as far from that and you didn't see the other, filled with livestock, because of efforts on the part of some Legislators that said we want that type of business in Connecticut, high

science, health science, nutritional science, that was going to help feed the state of Connecticut.

So when we look at the efforts today, put forward in this bill, we have in here, for the first time in a long time, another pro-farm situation. Where there is money put into to look at -- for the first time it's great to hear -- expanding farming situations where there is land. And we're going to be able to take that land back into farming, land that has remained fallow for a while. That's exceptional. That is not something that perhaps you think of when you think of jobs. But feeding the state of Connecticut does mean jobs all the way down the line.

We also look at this, and one of the things that I found most exciting, that I think most of you probably raised an eyebrow and said it's about time, is we're going to attack the computer portal that gets people into the State of Connecticut. We're going to go after it and we're going to streamline it so people can actually find it far more friendly as they get into the information and technology portal.

We want to make it easier for the businesses

to work with the State. And they're going to put a million dollars in bonding to be able to clean that up. With the companies we have in this state, Mr. Speaker, we should be able to fix that and make it one of the top in the country.

One of the other pieces that we find most interesting in this is those of us that have been elbow to elbow with our neighbors who have the small businesses, who have the dry cleaners, who have the small businesses that are ready to expand and they've been held back because they cannot get the money, but you know, the state funding that they would like to apply for has always had too high of a threshold.

Some of these business don't want a hundred thousand dollars. They only need \$25,000. They only need \$38,000 to be able to do the expansion that they need that can bring in 10, 20 employees. And what we've done in this particular bill is made that much more accessible, reducing the angel investment threshold from hundred thousand dollars down to 25. And that will allow so many more businesses to participate and be able to expand the jobs.

I'd like to thank everyone that worked so hard on this in a bipartisan way. There was give and take on both sides. And Mr. Speaker, I see this as the beginning. I see this as the stepping stone for what we're going to start in February.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative McCrory of the 7th.

REP. McCRORY (7th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Just a quick question to my colleague, and a comment first. And somewhere in that comment, there is probably going to be question.

I'm noticing -- I'm looking at the section of the bill, the -- the brownfield legislation, and it seems as though it is following the federal initiative, brownfield initiative, which basically went into disenfranchised communities. It was sort of like the marshal plan for disenfranchised communities throughout the state of Connecticut.

And the federal plan was to put those individuals who have been chronically unemployed, underemployed, or who have not been able to find

work, back to work in those communities, i.e., a marshal plan for urban communities. And I'm noticing that the legislation that we have in front of us is quite similar to the federal initiative.

So I guess my question or comment would be, as I read the legislation, it's targeting areas where there's an unemployment rate of higher than 9 percent, is targeting communities with a population of over 80,000 people. It will have the infrastructure and transportation in economically viable areas.

I guess my question or comment to my colleague is, is this the opportunity the State of Connecticut has taken upon itself to actually put people in those communities back to work?

That's my first question. Thank you.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you. Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the good Representative.

That is, in fact, an affirmative, a strong affirmative, yes, that -- that this will help to do

that. It will also, through you, to expand on that, help in the workforce training component for those individuals to actually be able to do remediation work and to gain encumbered training to be able step themselves up and have a job.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.
REP. MCCRORY (7th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, another comment --

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative McCrory.

REP. MCCRORY (7th):

Oh, I'm sorry. I'm glad you mentioned the workforce training. The conversations I've been having for -- on my constituents is they have been getting a great deal of training through workforce investment boards and that nature, however they have not been successful in finding employment, although they have been having the training, and they have the qualifications, they have skills.

So, I guess, again, if we're going to look at putting people back to work in those communities, therefore, we have to make it mandate that we are actually looking to employ those people in that communities. Because what -- the worst thing I would like to see is we come in here with a plan

to -- to improve the infrastructure of the communities, but yet, the people in those communities are not working.

So again, through you, Mr. Speaker, is there anything in this legislation that actually says that we are targeting those people who live in those communities, we're going to do something about those people who live in those communities to put them back to work? Because if we don't, if we just let it open to everyone, then what we have is what we continue to have.

So I guess, to me, again, through you, Mr. Speaker, is I'm looking for something to say that we are targeting those individuals who have been chronically unemployed, who have been unemployed, chronically unemployed, who live in those communities, this is an opportunity for employment for them.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker that is affirmative. Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative McCrory, are you finished then?

REP. McCRORY (7th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I'm glad we got that out there for legislation intent. The last piece of (inaudible) question I will ask, we talked about this earlier, is the revolving loan, the revolving loan fund.

Will those companies, i.e., whether they are nonprofit or quasi-private public organization be able to access these capitals so they can put the money into the small -- small businesses and communities throughout the state of Connecticut.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly nothing will change in that regards. That the loans will be disseminated through quasi-governmentals and nonprofits, because they are the individuals that will know, within their own communities, the locations and needs within those individual communities outside of the

umbrella of DECD.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative McCrory.

REP. McCRORY (7th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And finally, my question -- my last comment will be, so what we learn today is this an opportunity that we have with this piece of legislation, specifically the brownfield initiative, is to put people to work.

My last question is, who's going to monitor this process and make sure those people in that communities are going to be doing the work?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker. The Department of Economic and Community Development, through its office of brownfield remediation and development, OBRD, will monitor both this program, First Five for brownfield and existing municipal grant programs for brownfield remediation.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

99
October 26, 2011

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative McCrory.

REP. MCCRORY (7th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I guess the State of Connecticut is off to a great start in employing people and bringing jobs to -- to our wonderful state. And I look forward, as we move forward, in this piece of legislation this session.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Coutu of the 47th.

REP. COUTU (47th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'm glad to be here today to discuss the creation of jobs. As you know, I've always stressed that government does not create jobs. We provide an environment for companies to prosper and hire new employees.

And as we look at the State of Connecticut, we've had a great opportunity to meet many businesses in the past few weeks and months. We actually had 50, 60 businesses come to Hartford. And I'll always remember the baker who just said,

get out of my way. I don't need government. I just need government to take their foot off of my throat. He was very aggressive and very frustrated with the concept that government knows best how to run his bakery, or that maybe we know best how to create jobs.

And, as you know, Mr. Speaker, we raised close to \$2 billion in annual new taxes this year at the state and local levels. And now we are not going to do something to spend, looks like the newest estimate, \$700 million through the course of this piece of legislation with interest, \$1.1 billion.

So, I guess, for the 50 60 businessmen who came here and said just about everything but spend more money and raise our taxes, today I'm going to speak for them.

I also had the opportunity to go travel around my district and talk to other business owners. And the message that resonated was along the same lines. They also brought up things like unemployment tax, the new surcharge that's really hurting their business. Or the fact that many people, unemployment; they don't like the process of how it's appealed, and those who get granted

unemployment for 99 weeks. I know that's not addressed in here. But there is quite a few things that I must compliment our leadership for addressing.

One, the business entity tax. I think that is extremely important for small businesses, people that have one, two employees, up to ten, 15 employees to know at the beginning of the year they will not get a Christmas gift, which is a \$200 -- \$250 invoice from the State of Connecticut, as their New Year's Day gift. It will now be every other year. And we all remember that piece of legislation started where it would be a temporary tax. But unfortunately, it looks like it will continue, but at least it will be every other year.

I think tax credits for job creation, this is, in most parts, a tax break. I think it's good. And I know some of this has started with the Commerce Committee, so I commend their leadership with that. Streamline the permit process, I believe we started this last year with Governor Rell -- legislation -- but this is taking it to another level.

I think this is critical for the future of our

state to streamline the process. We all know, time and time again, businesses around the State tell us, DEP, DSS, multiple agencies, it's not working, and they're waiting six months.

And with that, through you, Mr. Speaker, I have a question for Representative Berger.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. COUTU (47th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Relating to streamline the permit process, on here, and in our meeting with many business owners we had one gentleman with buses complain the process. I've also received a lot of calls from taxi companies, and they're going through pretty much the same problems relating to the -- the process to get their employees licensed. And I just was curious, would this also benefit them?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker, to the good

Representative, it is -- it is the intent, through DECD, to help with that process, and it is currently the intent of an ongoing program through DOT, the Department of Transportation, to expedite the process that the good Representative has cited in his example.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Coutu.

REP. COUTU (47th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank you for that answer. Because I know I've had multiple taxicab companies contact me and have much concern over hiring new employees and the process it takes to get them, basically, to complete the application and get them to drive and provide services. And that's, in my view, an area where we can instantly have hundreds of new jobs in the State of Connecticut.

And the best thing about streamlining the permit process, for the most part, this is going to cost Connecticut taxpayers nothing. We may hire somebody, 500,000 to help us with LEAN management and other creative principles, but the bottom line

is that a solution that I think we need to focus on the future.

When we come in here and we say it's a jobs package and jobs creation package, in my view, it ends up becoming a spending package. When we're looking at \$1.1 billion overall, today it could be up to a billion and a half dollars. I don't think anybody expected we're going to create jobs by spending a billion and a half dollars today, but that's what it's come to.

I also like the area of brownfields. I think that's always important for many of our communities, including the city of Norwich and the town of Sprague. So I appreciate the initiative to push forward and repair some of the old manufacturing facilities and the brownfields that they have, to create -- or at least facilitate an environment to create jobs.

One that really stands out to me, and that I was extremely impressed with, is Connecticut Innovation's. I think just like the soldiers, sailors marine fund, these are funds that a quasi-government agency has basically complete ownership of, and it lasts for decades. And it

seems the multiplier effect is huge. We don't have to generate any more money or give them any more money, but they find ways to get entrepreneurs to take action to be creative, create jobs, and the money doesn't disappear. It stays in the fund. And through loans, they generate more jobs and more entrepreneurship. So I'm extremely supportive of that.

The one area which I have extreme caution with is the extension of any program, First Five. I think we're now First Five plus two. Because if you add Jackson labs, if you add busway to somewhere, and a few other things, we -- the First Five, to me, is a nice marketing pitch, but I don't understand how we can give authority for another \$300 million and really have reassurance, one, that the businesses will be coming from out of state, because that was somewhat the original concept behind it. And what we're witnessing is, at the end of the day, that's not what's happening.

We have a mix of great companies in Connecticut who are getting 50, 30, 40 million, and we have other companies outside Connecticut, one or two out of the five, that are coming here because

they're getting some incentive. And my overall concern with that philosophy is, when you raise billions of new taxes on companies like Yardney, Cargill, and dozens of other companies across the State of Connecticut, including Pfizer, that are leaving to Massachusetts, Rhode Island, New York City, the question is why are we raising taxes on our employers, our companies in Connecticut, and then giving it to five, ten, 15 companies that basically say, to stay in business in Connecticut, we need a lot of money. Or to come to Connecticut, like Jackson Laboratory, we need 300 million, after interest, 500 million. I don't get it.

So, for that reason, I can't support this piece of legislation. I just think, fundamentally, we have to come up with ways to stop spending taxpayers' money. And to do that, there's other solutions, like streamlining the permit process. But I don't know if we should be spending \$1.1 billion today to, quote, unquote, create jobs. Because at the end of the day, government does not create jobs, businesses do, and people do.

So thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Walker, of the 93rd District,
you have the floor, ma'am.

REP. WALKER (93rd):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a few questions to the good
gentleman from Waterbury, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, ma'am.

REP. WALKER (93rd):

Representative Berger, in this bill, there are
a number of new initiatives that are going on that
I think are going to be done by Department of
Economic and Community Development.

Can you explain to me a little bit, just a
little bit, Small Business Express Program and the
Step-up Program? Who will be overseeing that
program?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Those through the Small Business Express

Program will be authorized through DECD. Workforce development and job training components could potentially be under the -- under the cognizance of the Department of Labor.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Thank the good gentleman for his -- his answer.

On the subsidized training and the employment program and the Step Program, am I correct to understand that that will be managed by the Department of Labor?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

The Step Program will be through the Department of Labor. The small business will also include the Department of Labor.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93rd):

I thank the good gentleman for his answer.

On the job expansion credit program, who will be overseeing that program?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Job expansion tax credits would be funneled through DECD, the commissioner of DECD.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93rd):

Thank you.

And through you, Mr. Speaker, the manufacturing and reinvestment accounts that are going to be established, who will be overseeing that?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

There will be no change in the Manufacturers Assistance Act. That is -- that is funneled through DECD in -- under an existing program. This is an expansion.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93rd):

I thank the good gentleman for his answer.

And I guess I heard, also, through the other people that spoke today, the brownfields will be overseen by the Department of Economic -- DECD.

Is that correct, sir?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes. Through the office of brownfield remediation and development.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93rd):

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

111
October 26, 2011

Yes. And the DECD portal, can you just give me an idea of who will be managing that and overseeing that?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the good Representative from New Haven. That will be -- the business portal will be -- will be monitored and initiated by DECD in conjunction with the Secretary of State's office, would be -- which could be a initial point of entry for that business.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93rd):

Thank you. And I thank the good gentleman for his answers on those.

I think the -- the thing that I'm really interested in is the expansion of the agency of the Department of Economic Development -- community development, because it is going -- it's growing by leaps and bounds in this -- this particular piece

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

112
October 26, 2011

of legislation.

And, I guess, my question -- my next question is, through you, Mr. Speaker, does the good gentleman know how many people are -- work in the Department of Economic and Community Development?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. I -- I don't have the exact number for the good Representative, but they apparently are up to the challenge that's going to be ahead of them.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93rd):

Thank you. I guess it was kind of unfair. I should have just stated, since I do know as the Appropriations chair, I do know that there are about 88 people right now that are working in the Department of Economic and Community Development, which makes me very concerned because we have a lot of initiatives here and a lot of things that we're going to be expanding in this agency.

The agency has many, many things that -- that are very important and are really focused. And I think the State of Connecticut is -- if we have the manpower to do it, can really, really improve and grow. But my concern is, if we are interested in all of these aspects of this bill, how are we going to do it, in all honesty, if we have such a small staff? And are we really planning on doing all of these items in this bill so that we do it to the best of our desire? That's where -- one of my questions.

I have another question to the good gentleman from Waterbury. Also, DECD has some recommendations for the vo-tech rule in the workforce. Can you explain to me a little bit about what that package is or what that component is in the bill, sir?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker. There is a component in there to -- to establish a program similar to Asnuntuck in our vo-tech system. We need to -- it is the desire, certainly, of DECD and

the commissioner, in the language incorporated within the bill, to mirror that program, to also have some synergy between our educational process in the vo-tech system and the reach out to the community of manufacturers, either metal stampers, tool and die, precision manufacturers, and how we educate within the vo-tech system. And that may include the teaching of classes and/or machinery to be included in that ramped up educational vo-tech process.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93rd):

Thank you.

I thank the gentleman for his answer. I think that is one of the most important parts of this whole bill. I had the opportunity, just last week, to go out with the Governor to one of the businesses in New Haven. And one of the things that the owner said, in his manufacturing plant, is that if you could just get more people with skills. And the thing that was very interesting was that he said just have them pass geometry. Just have them

pass a few math courses, and I'll hire them right now.

And so I think that the idea of focusing on a lot of our community and vo-tech programs should be a major focus in -- in this bill. But I guess the question that I also ask in this whole bill, we only have 88 people in this Department of Economic Development, community development in their agency. And here, we have several programs that seem to be mirroring programs that are already in existence in our Department of Labor.

So, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the proponent of the bill, I'd like to know, are we going to be doing duplicate programs in Department of Labor and Department of Community and Economic Development that are going to be dealing with the same basis?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I do not certainly believe it's the intent of duplication. I think the body of the language of the bill, through you, Mr. Speaker, to the

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

116
October 26, 2011

Representative, tries to dwell on efficiency and effectiveness within department and agencies.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93rd):

I thank -- thank the good gentleman for that answer. That was a good answer. I'm sure the intent is not to ever duplicate. But yet, as I go through here, I see some duplication of -- of components of the agencies. And I am very concerned about that because we do already have these things existing. We do not need to recreate them in other agencies. We need to stay true to the course of what we define our agencies to be. So when we do go forward with this, I hope that all of us are very mindful of watching and making sure that that is not going to happen.

I -- I struggle with the bill, and I know people have talked about this already. But coming from my neighborhood that has 14 percent unemployment in many neighborhoods, sometimes higher than that, I need to see where am I going to go to be able to go back to my district and say

that this is going to help them.

I looked through many of the sections of the bill, and I looked at some of the -- the things that we are talking about helping the businesses. I agree we must help the businesses. And I agree that doing some of the things that we talk about in the bill are going to do that. But I don't see anything that's directly addressing our unemployment.

I see the Step Program. But when I looked at the Step Program, and I looked at some of the guidelines of the Step Program, one of the things is the maximum amount a person can be paid under the Step Program is \$20 an hour. Now, I understand that, you know, as many have said here, that we're not here to buy jobs or pay for jobs. Government is here to assist businesses. But if we are going to go about trying to help subsidize employment for people that are in the middle-class neighborhoods that are unemployed, who have been 99 -- who've reached that maximum of unemployment, we've got to make sure that we are addressing them.

And looking at \$20 an hour jobs, I understand many people say that's a great job, but it is below

the median income in the State of Connecticut. And many of the families in the neighborhoods, like Manchester and some of the suburbs around Hartford, are struggling with that right now. I'm not just talking about my neighborhood. I'm talking about many other neighborhoods where people were engineers, or other positions that required a much higher -- called for a much higher per hour rate. So when we look at these step programs -- and it's only six months.

So, I guess, my question to the proponent of the bill, have we done other subsidized programs in the State of Connecticut, and how have we fared in those programs?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Certainly, I can answer in the context of what we have before us here today. I am not familiar with the Department of Labor programs. I am, however, somewhat familiar with workforce development training programs that encumber worker

trainings which have been very effective under existing programs outside of the structure of what is entailed in the bill before us today. That they have been successful in -- in, certainly, training the -- the chronic unemployed, the unemployed, our veterans and disabled.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Walker.

REP. WALKER (93rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the good gentleman for -- for his answer. And I -- I understand that this is this -- the bill before us calls for this, but we are heading down that road. And I do know that this -- the format that we have before us was sort of duplicated from the Mississippi model that provided this.

And Lord knows, we need to address how do we help the people that are unemployed and have been -- reached their maximum? But the question I have is, will this work, how are we going to make sure it works, and what are we going to do, at what point, when we find out it's not working? Are we

going to say, well, we tried it and we walked away?

Where are the stop gaps? And then who is

monitoring it?

So, I guess, I want to say that I want to support this bill in every way, shape or fashion. But I want to support a bill that I know is going to help, not just some people in Farmington or some people in Avon, but I want to get a bill that's going to address the unemployment and the low opportunities for employment in all neighborhoods of Connecticut.

We can't just advocate for one location; we have to advocate for all. Because when one neighborhood goes down, it affects all of us. It's not just my neighborhood. It's not just his neighborhood. It's all of our neighborhoods. And when we look at this bill, it seems that we are focusing on one basic industry or two, two basic industries, and we are also focusing on corporations much more than we are for the people that are working and the people that come to support us at the election time.

So I ask my friends to look at this carefully and say what are we doing and are we truly

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

121
October 26, 2011

addressing unemployment in the State of Connecticut
with this bill?

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, madam.

Representative Berger of the 73rd.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

For the purposes of an amendment, Mr. Speaker,
I rise.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker. The Clerk is in
possession of Amendment LCO Number 8973. I ask
that he call and I be allowed to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Will the Clerk please call the Amendment 8973.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 8973, House "A," offered by
Representatives Donovan, Senator Williams,
Representative Cafero, Senator McKinney.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

The representative seeks leave of the Chamber

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

122
October 26, 2011

to summarize the amendment. Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection?

Hearing none, Representative Berger, you may proceed with summarization.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

The amendment will deal with Section 17, which is the section that deals with natural disaster. The clarifying amendment will add -- will add language that states that each municipality may also exempt certain single-family residential structures from obtaining coastal site plan review that would normally be required for such reconstruction.

The second portion of the amendment, LCO Number 873, will make a maximum grant to municipalities in the amount of \$500,000.

I move its passage.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

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

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

123
October 26, 2011

Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Cafero.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I know this is a bipartisan bill and this amendment is a bipartisan amendment. It was done because of time. The original draft had some errors in it, as the chairman indicated, and this hopes to correct those. It's been fully vetted by all caucuses and agreed to.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Will anybody else remark on the amendment?

Any further remarks on the amendment?

Hearing none, I will try your minds. All those in favor, please signify by saying, aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

All those opposed, nay.

The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

Will you remark further on the bill as

amended? Will you remark further?

Representative Mushinsky of the 85th.

REP. MUSHINSKY (85th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill, 6811, is a group effort, and a lot of job creation ideas are packed into this one bill. I do note that it does include several recommendations of several program review and investigation reports over the past several years. For example, better use of state aid for replacing inefficient furnaces and boilers is in there, workforce development programs at community colleges and regional vo-tech schools, and continuing to align academic degrees and workforce needs. And this helps everybody from the deli owner who cannot find a worker that can do math, to a -- to the steel plant that needs industrial engineers and can't fill those positions.

PRI has recommended business assistance package be accessible through a user-friendly electronic portal in our E-government report. We also recommended improving the speed and predictability of permits that involve more than one agency. Those seem to be the ones that have

the most delay. Expanded use of angel investment tax credits and consolidated tax credits to target job creation more carefully.

So I thank Governor Malloy and the bipartisan leadership in the Legislature for including all these concepts in the bill and Representative Berger, as well, for supporting them. And on a personal level, I'm happy that the \$250 business entity tax won't be collected again and it will be good for two years. This was a personal request from many small businesses in my town, and I'm happy to support this bipartisan bill.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Betts of the 78th.

REP. BETTS (78th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise to support this bill for many reasons. And one of the things I'm most pleased about is that it was done in a very bipartisan fashion. And that was what I really came here, when I was elected in January, to hope to accomplish, is to try and set a new mindset in which people would

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

126
October 26, 2011

work together to accomplish something. And
clearly, this document does just that.

If I could, through you, Mr. Speaker, I just
have a question or two for the proponent of the
bill, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. BETTS (78th):

And I correct in understanding that there's
going to be \$10 million set aside for two years to
expand manufacturing technology for three community
colleges, and \$10 million for three vo-tech
schools?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78th):

Thank you very much.

And through you, Mr. Speaker, do we know what

the criteria is going to be -- excuse me -- do we know what the criteria is going to be in the selection of those three colleges and three vo-tech schools?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

The thought pattern is, again, to -- to mirror the vo-tech off of Asnuntuck and the process that they evolved through in the manufacturing, linking the manufacturing community with the on-hands teaching of manufacturing within the vo-tech system.

There will also be a process of application for the community colleges to apply for -- for entry into the program, to be able to mirror that model linking manufacturers and the manufacturing community, both in innovative manufacturing, tool and die, and stamping, et cetera, to incorporate their knowledge and expertise into the working group with -- located within the community college and setting curriculum agenda and equipment needs

and wants for the educational benefit of those students.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78th):

Thank you very much for that answer.

And I -- the last question is, do we have any kind of a sense of a timetable as to when this is going to be selected for these colleges and vo-tech schools?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It's certainly the intent of the legislation, upon passage, in both -- both the House and the Senate, and once it is signed into law, to begin the process of establishing that process for those community vo-techs and community colleges, to both apply, and then to achieve the goals enumerated within the concept of the bill and through the Asnuntuck model.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Betts.

REP. BETTS (78th):

Thank you very much. And I certainly appreciate the chairman's work on this. I know many of us have gone to visit our manufacturers and companies throughout the state. Central Connecticut is certainly well known for its manufacturing. And I think manufacturing has a real opportunity to come back very, very strong. And it would be nice to restore that reputation in Connecticut.

Certainly, speaking on behalf of my district in Bristol and Plymouth and Terryville, we really hope that there would be serious consideration given to Tunxis Community College and Bristol Technical Education Center, because we do have a lot of manufacturers that work with them, and it would be a very quick and easy smooth transition and fit.

I also would like to just congratulate everybody on helping the small businesses dealing with the business entity tax. We've all heard how

much of a difference that makes to everybody, and I'm very pleased to see this take place in this legislation.

But, again, I want to congratulate the Governor and everybody for working together. I hope we can continue to do that in other bills, because that's really what the public needs and expects from us.

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Kirkley-Bey of the 5th.

REP. KIRKLEY-BEY (5th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I would like to ask a couple of questions of the Legislator from Waterbury, the fine gentlemen. I'd like to ask him if he knows if the minority quotas on construction and the purchasing of goods will be adhered to in this project.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Within the context of the bill, and of a

future bill, which we're going to hear in reference to Jackson Labs, the negotiation of -- of the contracts, the workforce pool, and the potential for a set-aside is all a negotiable portion within the final contract phase within the entities that may interact with that contract, either through what we do here today, or what we are going to do shortly later on in the evening.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Kirkley-Bey.

REP. KIRKLEY-BEY (5th):

The reason that I ask is when we built Adrian's Landing, we did a 10 million carveout for nonunion minority contractors. And I was hoping that something akin to that would be done for this because there are a lot of nonunion minority contractors. And when you say that they'll be using the funnel, are you talking about the construction job funnels and the workforce boards, the five workforce boards that are in the state?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It is certainly the intent to look at all of the programs that are currently available so we can return those that are unemployed, and certainly within our inner cities, to the employment rolls, either through incumbent worker training or through new worker initiatives implemented in what we do here today.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Kirkley-Bey.

REP. KIRKLEY-BEY (5th):

The individuals that have gone through the construction jobs funnel are already certified for given trades and they have their union cards. So that's why I was offering that suggestion.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Gonzales of the 3rd.

REP. GONZALEZ (3rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of this bill, but with a lot of concern. There is no question that Connecticut

needs more investment to create jobs. This bill has a number of ways in which the Connecticut economy can improve, yet it does.

But what concerns me is that this bill does not do enough for creating job in the places that we need it the most, our urban centers, our city, the very places where the highest unemployment rates in the states.

Just this past week, we saw one more study where the city of Hartford is number one in the country for Latino unemployment. I believe it's 26 percent. Our capital city has a Latino rate of unemployment higher than anywhere else in the country. What is this bill doing to creating jobs in places like Hartford, New Haven, Waterbury? Not enough.

What is this bill doing for the small business owners in our urban areas? Not enough. And what about the fact that many of this small business cannot afford health insurance for themselves, nevermind for new employees. What does this bill do for them? Nothing.

Mr. Speaker, Connecticut has not seen the growth in jobs for 20 years. We need to start

somewhere to reverse that trend or to create jobs. What is -- that is why I'll be voting for this bill. This is a bill that puts you in a corner -- and express my French -- damned if you do, damned if you don't.

But I, as well as many of my colleagues, will be watching and holding this administration accountable for the creation of -- in our cities.

And I also got a question for the proponent of the bill. I would like to know how many jobs are expected to achieve with this legislation?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed.

Oh, Representative Berger, I'm sorry.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I don't have a quantitative number of the exact target of -- of employees in this particular bill. However, in the bill that's soon to come before us, there is some REMI model calculations on unemployment for the bill later on.

Through you, Mr. Speaker. Certainly, what's predicated in this bill is a lot of new initiatives that are maybe untested and that expand upon

existing programs. So it's certainly the intent to dig into -- certainly our 9 percent or 8.9 percent unemployment by what we do here today, both in our urban centers and in our suburbs.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Gonzales.

REP. GONZALEZ (3rd):

Thank you.

Today, earlier I asked this question about what is going -- is going to happen, and what this bill is going to bring to our community. Because I believe that my constituents, my neighborhood, they don't benefit over this.

And I see a lot of people from this room, you know, rolling their eyes. Well, I want to be very clear. I am elected by a Latino district. I believe that I have, maybe, 65, maybe, 67 percent. I respond to them. So that's what I'm here for, to ask questions. And I feel like sometimes you can ask those questions because it's -- maybe some people they get upset because -- ask questions about what this is going to do for the Latinos in my community. Well, as long as I'm here, I'm going

to keep asking questions.

Now, another -- another questions -- another question that I have for the proponent of the bill, who is going to monitor this -- this legislation, and who is going to be connecting this job with the people?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker. To the good Representative from Hartford and, certainly, I would probably need to answer that in a general sense. But we have the commissioner of DECD and, obviously, deputy commissioners, we have the Department of Labor, we have the Department of Energy, Environment and Protection, DEEP, and the commissioner and subordinates and deputy commissioners there, and certainly the Legislature.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Gonzales.

REP. GONZALEZ (3rd):

Thank you, again. And, again, I'll be voting for this, even though that I do have a lot of

concerns. But again, we're going to be watching and holding this administration accountable for jobs in our city.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Perone of the 137th.

REP. PERONE (137th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. I just want to extend my support for this bill. I think this is not only a long time in coming, and a product of a lot of discussions and a lot of research, but it's also, to my -- to my mind, an important step in the right direction for the -- the entire Legislature, in -- in the sense that there was so much combined work, both sides of the aisle, to make this happen that it's an exciting step.

But I do want to address, just briefly, the -- how I can imagine this -- this bill improving our -- our state's economy. When we've got such a diverse workforce that we have, invariably, you have a division of labor. The, you know, the auto mechanic needs -- needs to buy food. The dry cleaners need other services for their -- for their

own existence.

And, I think, when you create activity like this in an economy like ours, that is not only half -- half dependent on, you know, what happens on a national level, but really dependent on what's -- how -- how creative we can be, I think that this -- this bill makes a real impact. Because we are really trying to create not only a more innovative economy but -- by improving our -- our brownfield and are permitting regulations, we're trying to promote growth. We're trying to promote economic activity that has -- that -- that radiates across many different sectors in our economy.

So it is with that that I'm just very proud to support this bill. And I would also like to, again, just take my hats off to, not only Representative Berger, but also the Governor for pushing this through.

Thank you very much.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Holder-Winfield of the 94th.

REP. HOLDER-WINFIELD (94th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I'm going to vote for this bill. I think probably all of us will. I have a couple of questions and some concerns to register. So I think this bill is a good bill. But I also know that Connecticut is a state with the demographics that are changing and that, to Representative Gonzales' point, we need to be very considerate of the fact that the Latino population is ever expanding, and in short order, will be a major part of our workforce.

Having said that, we know that unemployment in our community is in a place where we don't want it to be. We know that education in that community is not where we want it to be. And if we're going to talk about fiscal responsibility, creating jobs, and all of the things that we talk about here, that community should be a part of it.

And this bill does some stuff that we would like to see there, but I don't think it goes far enough. I think the efforts are efforts that one should applaud, but again, I don't think they go far enough.

I want to ask a couple of questions about the

Step Program, and say one -- one other thing about the efforts to deal with this demographic shift. I think that, at the point where we deal with that shift, and deal with the fact that this unemployment rate that we talk about of 9 percent, is -- at least in the Hispanic and black communities in Connecticut -- what we would think of as a good day, when we deal with that issue, then we will do something that is truly of substance.

My question about the Step Program is, if I'm looking at it, I don't know, and maybe this was answered earlier, but if you could just indulge me, why one of the provisions is that the small business have no more than 50 full-time employees at least 50 percent. If that could be answered, I would appreciate it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

And I'm assuming this is to Representative Berger?

REP. HOLDER-WINFIELD (94th):

Absolutely.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Okay. Representative Berger.

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

141
October 26, 2011

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

The thought pattern on the 50 employees and less was the target of the idea of small business, which 50 or fewer employees in the State -- businesses make up 85 to 89 percent of the businesses in the State of Connecticut. It was a target that would reach our biggest field.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Holder-Winfield.

REP. HOLDER-WINFIELD (94th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I guess I'll just ask this back. If we changed that number to include more people, wouldn't we also include the 50 and below?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Yes. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

The idea is 50 employees or fewer.

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Holder-Winfield.

REP. HOLDER-WINFIELD (94th):

Okay. Mr. Speaker. I'll move on.

The part of the bill where we talk about the number of months of employment and the decrease in the subsidy, the end of the number of months is six. First, why did we come up with the number six for the number of months?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

In mirroring similar programs that were successful, and through negotiation through the various caucuses, the determination was to cover the first six months of his or her employment under the program that will be administered by DOL.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Holder-Winfield.

REP. HOLDER-WINFIELD (94th):

Yes. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And, through you, Mr. Speaker. And in those successful programs, did they have a similar decrease in the funding, through you, over the

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

143
October 26, 2011

course of time, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I believe that that is correct, yes.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Holder-Winfield.

REP. HOLDER-WINFIELD (94th):

And again, through you, Mr. Speaker.

And as the funding decreased, I'm assuming then, since they were successful, that retention remained -- remained constant?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It's the intent, certainly, what we do here today in this legislation to have a permanent employment status beyond six or 12 months for those individuals that may enter into this and will be financed under the first six months.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Holder-Winfield.

REP. HOLDER-WINFIELD (94th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

Just to clarify, because I'm not sure my question was understood, at least how I intended to ask it. So, at the end of -- at the end of last month, for instance, if you look on the summary of the bill where it talks about six months, and it says it's 25 percent state subsidy, I assume that's maximum. So, if we're talking about a maximum, initially, of a hundred percent being \$20, if we're talking 25 percent, you're talking about \$5 subsidy.

My question is, when you get to a place where you're doing a \$5 subsidy, is there -- do all of the people who are in successful programs remain in the program? Not -- not subsequent to that. I understand that we would want to have employment continue beyond that, but I'm just talking about within the parameters of the program.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Berger.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes.

rgd/mb/md/gdm/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

145
October 26, 2011

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Holder-Winfield.

REP. HOLDER-WINFIELD (94th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Ackert of the 8th District.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Just a couple of comments. I'd like to also thank our leadership and for Representative Berger on the presentation today.

As a small-business owner, I support sensible investing in our businesses, and I believe that's what this bill does, or starts to do. I believe it fosters a positive business climate in thinking that we're thinking about businesses rather than taxing them and mandating them and applying additional fees. But I also want us to remain focused on this commitment, now and going into February.

As I met with businesses, they weren't looking to have a loan or a grant or a handout. What they were looking to get is customers. People that had

the dollars to use their services, to build a new home, or to start up a business.

So, I think we need to keep that in mind, as we go forward with legislation, because consumer confidence will build business confidence. If consumers feel as though they have discretionary funds to start a business, to hire people, to buy their regular goods, and not be concerned that we will impose an additional fee, tax or mandate, then I think that that will go a long way in -- in supporting this legislation today.

So I want to leave it that I am in support of this, and I look forward to further efforts on our behalf to build that confidence in consumer and in businesses.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you. Thank you, sir.

Representative Janowski of the 56th.

Representative -- Minority Leader Cafero of the 142nd.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Ladies and gentlemen of the Chamber, I want to

apologize in advance for my voice. I suffer from allergies and my voice is a little strained right now so it might sound a little funny. In fact, my doctor said you've got to not talk.

Go ahead. You could clap. Because it ain't going to happen, that's what I told him.

One brief shining moment, or maybe a new chapter in the way we do business in this Chamber, and that's what I think this bill represents. You know, we all, after being called into session by the Governor, knew we had a job to do. We knew what the issues were that were facing us.

We saw our neighbors and our relatives and our friends hurting out there, without jobs, with businesses that were not expanding, or near closure. And we listened, many people have indicated.

The Governor did his jobs tour. Senate Republicans did their tour. Democrats did their tour. We spoke to our folk. We had a small-business forum here. And we heard what they said. And let's face it. We know that there are two political parties here and there's different philosophies, all well meaning, but different.

There are some that believe that government can help more and more. And the more government we have, the more we can help. There's some that believe that government helps too much, and that maybe we should stay out of some things we don't belong in. But I think together we believe that what we need to do is put partisan politics aside and get together and help some people.

Now, we believe with all our hearts, like what is now a cliché, that government does not create jobs, that people do. But there is a role for government to change the environment to encourage and stimulate folks to create jobs.

In one of the Q and As that we heard earlier, I heard a question saying, will this bill put people back to work? Will the action that government, this Legislature, takes put people back to work? Unfortunately, no.

We can't hire and create jobs ourselves. But we can try our best to create an environment that encourages people to do so. And what were some of the things that we heard while we were out there? And we all heard them, whether it was an official tour, or just getting a cup of coffee at the local

deli.

You've heard people say, first of all, you've got to change the culture in Connecticut. When we, as business, interact with the state government, please change the culture. We don't want to have an adversarial relationship with the State. We want to be partners with the State. So instead of saying, no, you can't do that. No, you can't do that. You will not get your permit. You'll have to wait for your license. We're not giving you this. You're in violation of that. Can you say, how can we help? How can we overcome obstacles together? That's what we heard.

We heard from a lot of small businesses saying, listen, I understand the allure and the attraction and the sexiness of going for big, big companies. That has to happen. But don't forget us. Don't forget us. We represent 80 percent of the job creators. Yeah, we're small mom-and-pops. Maybe we have four people or five people, but there's thousands of us.

And if you could incent us, or create an environment where each of us could just hire one more person, we're talking about thousands and

thousands of jobs.

We heard them say, you know, we're in a dilemma, certainly, in these tough economic times. I heard from manufacturers who said, you know, you hear so much talk about high-tech manufacturing. And they said, I don't want any of you to believe that there's some simple, basic, old-fashioned manufacturing that's going around in the State and it's good, decent work. We pay good, decent wages, and there's a lot more of them than you think. But right now, we have to train people to, maybe, make the widget or the tool and die maker, spring maker, or whatever. And if we pay that person while we're training them, they're not being productive, and we can't afford to do that.

So it's this vicious cycle. So if you're going to help us, help us a little bit. Maybe you could give us a jump start and help us pay our employer -- employee while we're training him or her, so that when that's over we could create that job and hire that person immediately and they can hit the ground running. That's what we need.

If we go to apply for a permit or a license, for God sakes, don't make us wait three and four

and five months. If it was quicker, we could create more jobs. They also said, especially the manufacturing, can you do something about the image out there, the image for young people who believe that they're only goal when they go to public school is to prepare for college.

And as you and I both know, there's a lot of people out there that just don't care to go to college. Maybe they want a trade. Maybe they want to get into manufacturing. Maybe they want to be a plumber or an electrician and earn a good, decent living. But we don't even market that. We don't encourage it enough, they said.

Talk to our young people in this fifth and sixth grade, change their mindset about manufacturing. Bolster our technical schools and our community colleges so that we can show to the world there is another alternative then just going to get a college degree. Those were the things we heard.

Now, in this bill, we do a lot of things. Is it the silver bullet? Does in and of itself reinvent Connecticut? No. It doesn't. It does not. But today, on October 26, 2011, for this one

day at least, four caucuses of the legislative branch, two parties, two chambers, two branches of government with the executive branch and our Governor got together for a series of weeks, put in hundreds and hundreds of hours, sleeves rolled up, pads out, ideas flying across the table, and we came up with what's before you. It's not a perfect bill, but it's a start. And I can't emphasize enough that it is a start.

Now, at the beginning, I also said that the two different parties have different philosophies. And with regard to this side of the aisle, we believe that there's a lot more than is contained in this bill that will help or encourage growth of business and creation of jobs in the State of Connecticut.

Certainly, our tax structure is one thing we believe that could be a hindrance, an obstacle and a destroyer of jobs. Our overregulation. And we have fought in the past, as you all know, and we vow to fight in the future, to change those things.

But today, today we put that aside to say what can we do together, in a small way, that's going to make the little piece of the world, the State of

Connecticut, the place we live, a little better?

Ladies and gentlemen, almost as important as the substance of the bill was the process by which this bill is before us. I touched upon it earlier in my remarks, but I can't emphasize it enough. When people put aside partisan rhetoric, when they roll up their sleeves and have a common goal, you can do something good. You can do something good.

When I looked and -- and stood meetings with my colleagues, the Speaker of the House, the Majority Leader, President Pro Tem of the Senate, the Majority Leader of the Senate, the Governor and his staff, my colleague, Senator McKinney, who is a Republican Leader of the Senate, and saw a very, very energetic exchange of ideas -- yeah. There was some yelling and screaming, and some people had to swallow things they didn't like, and other people had to swallow things, but that's compromise.

It's a mess sometimes, but it can be a beautiful mess. Because at the end, the public knows that we all work together to do something good, and that's what's before us.

Wouldn't it be wonderful if this was a start

of a new chapter of the way we dealt with each other, the way we governed, the way we responded to our constituencies with regard to the way we handle problems? Wouldn't it be a wonderful thing?

Needless to say, I am a supportive of this bill. I'm proud of this bill. I'm proud of the process that took place to create this bill. But here's our biggest challenge, both substantively and procedurally. Our biggest challenge is will our effort with regard to creating jobs just be this one brief shining moment or will it be a commitment on the part of all of us, as we move forward, to help the people we represent in the state we live in and love, be a little better?

And from the process perspective, will this bipartisan effort, the meetings, the exchange of ideas, the respect, the listening to each other, the give and take, will it be one brief shining moment or will it be a new day as the way we deal with each other in the future? The only people that can answer that question are in this room.

So with regard to this bill, it is cause to be proud. We did something good. We got a lot more to do. The Legislature takes action by passing the

initiatives in this bill. And as the Governor will be the first to admit, it then falls on him and the executive branch to execute. And all of us here and throughout the State are counting on that to happen.

So let's not overstate what we're doing today, but certainly let's not understate what we're doing today. And let's make sure what we did today is not one brief shining moment.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

(Speaker Donovan in the Chair.)

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Brendan Sharkey.

REP. SHARKEY (88th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

You know, I think a little bit of context is probably in order. We've had a very busy year this year. It was only, what -- now, ten months or so ago when we started our session, our regular session at the beginning of this year, and the state was facing a three and a half billion dollar

budget deficit that we had to face.

And after spending the better part of the winter and spring putting together a budget that some liked and some didn't, the bottom line was we created a balanced budget. And, knock wood, so far that budget is holding together.

When we completed that debate over the budget, I made a comment here on this floor that I felt that we were turning a corner. What I meant was that we were turning a corner in terms of trying to get ourselves beyond the immediate crisis that was facing our State, a fiscal crisis, in terms of trying to put ourselves back in balance as a government.

And as I say, we might -- some of us here in this room, on either side of the aisle, may have disagreed with certain aspects of how that plan was done, but the reality was we did create that balanced budget, and we did turn that corner.

And so, our -- at least for the time being, and hopefully for the future, our fiscal house is back in order. We turned that corner. And while we were doing that, we all knew that the other job that we had to complete, the job that was facing us

around that first corner was job creation. We knew because we were hearing it from our constituents, our constituents who are out of work, our constituents who own small businesses, our constituents who asked all those questions of us that the Minority Leader referred to. We all heard those things.

We heard the need for making Connecticut a better place to do business, a friendlier place to do business, a place where people can find jobs, where we were coordinating our services, our educational resources to match what our companies in our state need.

We talked about streamlining regulations. We talk about providing incentives for businesses to hire the unemployed, our veterans, and others who are chronically under or unemployed. We heard all those. And at -- when we adjourned sine die, the Governor announced to us something that we already knew, frankly, which is that we needed to come back in this special session and deal with this jobs issue.

Now, I think the Minority Leader also very eloquently described the process that we went

through to get here, a bipartisan process, led by the Governor, and contributed to by everyone in this room and our leadership, both here in the House and in the Senate, with the help of our staffs and with the Governor and his staff and his commissioners. And the result is a bill that addresses, not everything, as others have said, but a lot of the things, the many things, that our constituents have been begging us to do.

And the most important thing that our constituents have asked us to do is to get it, to get the fact that we are in a crisis and that our constituents are in crisis because they need jobs. Our small businesses need to grow. Our State needs to grow.

And I feel that this bill is that shining moment that the Minority Leader referred to. And I also think that it represents another turn of the corner. Because, I believe, that this bill and the way it was accomplished represents a change in the way Connecticut does business.

Job creation in this State is a bipartisan issue. We all know that. That is represented in this bill. But also, Connecticut has to make

itself ready and open for the things that will create the jobs that we need. We need to be open for business. We need to be sympathetic about those who are under and unemployed. We need to coordinate our resources and focus our attention on how best to accomplish the goal. I think we've done that today. And I'm very optimistic that, with the passage of this bill, we will have turned that second corner that will put our State back on the path of economic prosperity.

I urge your support. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Will staff and guests please come to well of the House. Members take their seats. The machine will be open.

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.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

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

If all members have voted the machine will be

locked and the Clerk will please take a tally.

Will the Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 6801 as amended by House "A."

Total number voting 148

Necessary for passage 75

Those voting Yea 147

Those voting Nay 1

Those absent and not voting 3

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The bill as amended is passed,

Representative Sharkey.

REP. SHARKEY (88th):

Mr. Speaker, I move for the suspension of our
rules for the immediate transmittal of the bill we
just completed.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The motion is on transmittal -- immediate
transmittal to the Senate. Is there any objection?
Hearing none, the bill is so ordered.

Representative Sharkey.

REP. SHARKEY (88th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, at this time, this side of the

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

186
October 26, 2011

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Madam President, having adopted Senate Agenda Number 3, would ask the Clerk to call now the single item appearing on the bill, on that agenda, under business from the House, Emergency Certified House Bill 6801.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Madam President, calling from Senate Agenda Number 3, business from the House, Emergency Certified Bill House Bill Number 6801, AN ACT PROMOTING ECONOMIC GROWTH AND JOB CREATION IN THE STATE, as amended by House Amendment Schedule A, which is LCO Number 8973.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

Good evening, sir.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Good evening, Madam President.

I move the Senate Bill 68 -- I can't read it -- 6801, the Emergency Certified Bill in

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

187
October 26, 2011

concurrence with the House.

THE CHAIR:

Acting on approval of the bill, will you
remark further?

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Yes, I well. Thank you, Madam President.

And I'm going to have some rather -- some
rather extensive remarks on this bill. But first
of all, I want to thank some people who aren't in
this room and some people who are.

First of all, the Governor and his staff, and
particularly the Commissioner of Economic
Development who has been -- they have been both --
been a driving force in trying to change the
economic climate of the State of Connecticut and to
develop this bill in response to the felt needs of
the -- of the State, as he discovered in traveling
around the State for visiting hundreds of
communities and hundreds of programs with the -- in
many cases with members of this Chamber and members
of the House. Also yourself, Madam Lieutenant
Governor, you were there at -- at many of -- many
of these events and many of these factory visits
and places of employment.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

188
October 26, 2011

It was -- he really showed leadership in doing this, and I thank him for that. And I thank his staff for working with the staff of the House and the staffs of the House, the House minority staff, the House majority staff, and the Senate majority staff, and the Senate minority staff and the leaders.

This is a bipartisan bill. This -- this bill, I believe every section. And it is an extensive bill with multiple sections. It's over 77 pages long. It's -- it has -- it is -- it is the most comprehensive and transformative economic development bill that I have seen in my 19 years in the Legislature, next year going on 20, and as 16 years as chairman of the -- the Commerce Committee.

And, again, the wonderful thing about this bill, it is based on the needs of the State, as expressed to the Governor and to his staff, and to yourself, as he went around the state and listened. So it's a -- it's very instructive. Politicians do listen. The Governor did listen. The specifics of this bill are a reflection of what he heard. And let's -- let's take a look at what's in the bill.

There are -- the bill focuses on initiatives

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

189

October 26, 2011

designed to create a climate in Connecticut that is ripe for maintaining, attracting and creating jobs. This bipartisan effort identifies five key -- key -- five key areas.

The first is small business growth. We are investing over \$180 million over two years in small business growth; the regulatory environment, we've heard this repeatedly, and the Governor heard this, and we've heard it in our committees, streamlining, expediting and permitting -- of the permitting process and creating new public-private partnerships; innovation, establishing new start-up companies with loans, investments and grants; workforce development, aligning our state's educational programs to jobs that are in demand, jobs that are needed through training and curriculum design and through provision of various pieces of equipment that are needed to do that; and sharpening our economic development tools, making assistance simple and available.

Okay. Let's look at them a little more specifically. Small business create jobs. We know that. How do we help? By expanding the job creation tax credit. This bill consolidates and

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

190
October 26, 2011

increases existing tax credits, \$500 per month from the current \$200 for new hires, and targets -- you can get up to \$900 a month in tax credits for hiring the unemployed, disabled and veterans. It creates a tiered system also for -- for companies. Less than 50, your first hire, you're eligible. From 50 -- a shop that has 50 to a hundred, you have to have five employees to -- new employees to become eligible. Over a hundred, you need ten. So we're really, clearly, we're helping small business here. Creating a small business express package for businesses under 50 employees at \$50 million a year. And there are pieces to this, a revolving loan fund at \$20 million a year, a job creation incentive program at \$10 million a year, a job creation matching grant program for \$10 million a year, and to streamline the application process to expedite assistance.

The commissioner told me that she -- the bill says that it will be 30 days to get cash in hand to small businesses that come in and ask for help. The commissioner said this will be a one-page application, and she would like to see this done in five days. If we could do this anywhere under 30

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

191
October 26, 2011

days, we'd be in -- this would be a tremendous improvement in how the state has operated in the past and how we've helped companies, particularly small companies.

Small companies don't have the wherewithal, like large companies, to send a team of lawyers to fill out these applications. So we want a simple, expedited process.

We're going to cut the business entity tax in half. Payments will be now for two years, not one. Manufacturing Assistance Act, we're going to set aside \$20 million in the next -- this fiscal year and \$40 million in the next fiscal year to aid small businesses.

We're going to streamline and expedite permitting. To -- agencies are going to eliminate or consolidate burdensome regulations. We're going to conduct a LEAN analysis at DAS, DECD, DOT, DEEP to improve government efficiency.

Now, I think everybody -- I'm not sure everybody knows what LEAN is. I'll take one -- a couple of seconds to explain that. LEAN is usually used on the shop floor to make things move more efficiently, to find better processes. But it's

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

192
October 26, 2011

not just shops, it's businesses, all kinds of businesses. It can be a financial service business. It can be an accounting business. It's a way of moving your work most efficiently to get the maximum productivity, leading to efficiency.

Now, if we could do that within these agencies, Department of Administrative Services, Department of Economic and Community Development, Department of Transportation and Department of Energy and Environment -- Environmental Protection, these are the places that have been, you know -- we've heard are the -- are the agencies that people have had difficulty with, and businesses have had difficulty with in dealing with them and having a slow response.

I know myself of a business that took a year and a half with DEEP, the former Environmental Protection Agency -- DEP, that took a year and a half before they were -- their -- their permit was even looked at. Ridiculous. This will change.

Looking at a pre-permitting pilot program to identify three 25 properties to pre-permit and market them for development so they are ready to go as some -- a business comes in, expresses an

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

193
October 26, 2011

interest, they can get it. They can go right on there. All the permits are ready. They can build, creating a shovel-ready situation.

You know, something else that DEEP is going to do, it's going to look at a tiered -- it's going to investigate a tiered system for permitting. That those businesses that apply, or those situations that have the greatest potential harm to the environment, will be at the bottom of the tier because they're going to take more time. But those that have less potential harm will move right to the top, and we could possibly move those faster. And they're going to investigate that over the next few months to see whether that's something that they're going to bring back to the General Assembly back in January.

We have a Step-Up Program, through the Department of Labor, which is a subsidized training and employment program at \$10 million a year. Employers will be paid to train and hire unemployed over a six-month period.

And -- and I, you know, I went back -- I was saying about the job creation tax credits, those are significant tax credits. Those tax credits

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

194
October 26, 2011

and -- up to \$500 a month, that's \$6,000 a year for -- for an unemployed person. Disabled or a veteran, that's \$900 a month. You can do the math on that. That's -- that is -- those are very solid amounts of money, so if a small businessmen is thinking about possibly investing and expanding, that will really help, and particularly because there is federal legislation on this too that can be added together, probably getting up to 15 to 17 thousand dollars in total tax credits.

So -- but the subsidized training and employment program, employers will be paid to train, higher unemployed over a six-month period, and these, again, are very, very rich tax credits, dollars going directly -- not tax credits -- dollars go directly to -- to the small manufacturers, particularly, up to \$2,500 per month for the first -- dropping on a monthly basis, to a total of \$1,600 per month, for a -- for a grand total of around 9 or 10 thousand dollars. That is, again, a significant piece of change that a small business can use to help expand their business and to train -- to train their employees.

What did we hear? What did you hear? You

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

195
October 26, 2011

heard people aren't ready for the jobs. We have jobs. We have -- that -- that are open and people aren't ready. Now, with this tax credit, it will help defray some of that cost of doing some of that on-the-job training so they -- so they can be hired, so they can add new lines for employment. Let's continue.

A second -- a major area is regulations, getting rid of regulations that are outdated, unmanageable. We make it easier.

Brownfields -- \$20 million to identify or remediate and market five state-owned brownfields so those are ready to go, and to review all brownfields programs and streamline and consolidate the programs.

Permitting -- On the permitting side, we've already done some permitting, cut through the local regulations, now -- that -- for those people who are hurt during the Hurricane Irene. So those -- the -- the law, as we pass today, will help to cut through those local regulations and help those people who were hurt during Hurricane Irene that -- not -- considering, essentially, what local planning and zoning regulations exist and other

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

196
October 26, 2011

regulations exist. Going to cut right through those regulations.

DEC commissioner has added to the State Traffic Commission and the STC -- will have a shot clock. If you're familiar with the term, in basketball, you've only -- you've got a shot clock. There's a college -- there's a college shot clock and a pro shot clock, 24 seconds. The shot clock here will be 60 days.

When STC gets -- the state traffic commission has an application that it needs for -- to establish a business and a change in the traffic flow, STC will either have to approve it in 60 days or reject it in 60 days, or it will be deemed approved, so they have to move their -- they have to move to -- in response.

The captive insurance unit permits new types of captive insurance companies to locate in our state, creating new jobs and new revenue. This industry will be overseen by a new industry funded unit at the Department of Insurance. And I'm sure Senator Crisco may want to comment on that.

We're going to improve the IT portal, the information technology portal, to ease business

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

197
October 26, 2011

interaction within the State. It's going to cost a million dollars, not cheap. But we are working with the Secretary of State's office and work -- and we're also aligned with CREC. This will reflect a state branding that we've also approved last spring, the branding for the state that will be reflected in the state portal. We've been talking about this for years, to have that one point of entry. This is going to be it.

Spur innovation and entrepreneurship; we're going to be creative. In -- in the last debate, I heard the Senate President talk about us being a creative state. That is true. And we are one of the most creative states in the country. We've been dropping, actually, in the number of patents issued. There's -- there's been a negative trend over the last four or five years. Well, we hope to reverse that and we hope to create a lot of small, new businesses. How? By investing in Connecticut Innovations, \$25 million a year for five years. Connecticut Innovations, the investment arm of our state who invest -- invest in high-technology companies that really help us grow new companies in the state.

We're going to build innovation centers in key cities and connect entrepreneurs with mentors, talent, support, ideas, services and capital. We're going to create statewide resources, an IP factory, an intellectual property factory, where we take ideas that are on the shelf and bring them to -- bring them to fruition by taking ideas and trying to see whether those ideas can be capitalized, and we -- whether we can turn those ideas into new businesses.

The proof of concept center and a mentor network, helping all those early-stage businesses get off the ground to survive and make them part of Connecticut's future. I -- businesses that we can't even predict what they're going to be. But CI is in the high-technology business and that's where we've put our money, some bioscience, some IT, some physical science, all kinds of businesses.

Also, in doing that, we're going to be able to match funds for SBIR grants, Small Business Innovation Research grants. Those dollars can be used for that. And by doing that, we will end up getting more SBIR funds from the federal government. Because what they're looking for --

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

199
October 26, 2011

when the federal government is making decisions about where do we put our dollars, do we give them to Connecticut or do we get to Minnesota? Minnesota matches SBIR funds. Now we'll be able to match Minnesota. We'll be able to match other states, so -- so when -- if they give us a million dollars, or if they make an SBIR grant to a company in Connecticut, we can match -- we can match that, and help boost that company and create the jobs here, not out-of-state.

And we're going to launch and support the Start-Up Connecticut Program, which the Governor has been touting, and it's a great program.

Angel investments, we've -- again, to get more dollars in early-stage investments. Two changes in -- in this. These are Connecticut companies, Connecticut companies. They must invest in a Connecticut company. Angel investors, early stage investments -- and what we hope to do is increase the number of investors in high-tech and emerging technology by lowering the threshold, from a minimum \$100,000 investment to a \$25,000 investment. And I dare -- I daresay, some folks in this circle may want to become angel investors.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

200
October 26, 2011

You find the right company, you might have some fun. You might make some money.

We're also increasing -- excuse me -- a boiler furnace replacement program, \$5 million. Focus on nonprofit community providers, housing authorities so we can make our -- ourselves more efficient, and particularly save the costs for oil and gas, particularly oil in -- for housing authorities and non-private providers.

A fourth area, matching talents to jobs. I already mentioned a little bit of some of the DOL programs, but we really need to do this. We need to develop our workforce to match what jobs are available to what -- what people are being trained to do and the skills that they bring to the -- to the workforce.

We are asking higher education to develop and enhance educational offerings to match employer needs, and training programs with setting up a task force to develop training programs for manufacturing needs. For marketing, we're asking boards of education to make sure that their middle school students are aware of vo-tech programs. We keep hearing constantly about how kids don't want

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

201
October 26, 2011

to go to vo-tech schools, but -- but they can make 60, 70, 80 thousand dollars a year in the right -- in the right occupation if they go to a vo-tech school.

Parents need some education. We'll start that in the middle schools. And we're asking the middle schools -- we're mandating the middle schools to -- to talk about that to their students.

We're going to establish a manufacturing technology program at three community colleges based on the Asnuntuck model. Asnuntuck is also going to get \$1.1 million a year for the next two years to -- to improve their -- their program in John -- in Senator Kissel's backyard. And three other community colleges are also going to get significant dollars, \$17.8 million, \$8.9 million a year divided among three schools, both years, to -- to do what they need to do to purchase machinery and to help develop their programs based on the Asnuntuck model because they have a tremendous program up there, and Martha McLeod has done a great job. And her predecessor did a great job in developing that program.

Other tools for success we're going to

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

202
October 26, 2011

provide -- as somebody -- somebody said in another way, we're going to sharpen the tools in our toolbox. We're going to assess all tax credit programs for changes in the 2012 legislative session. We're going to look at that and say are our tax credit programs working? What should we be looking at? Is there duplication, like we've discovered there are ready is some.

We're going to authorize the First Five Program, which we just saw yesterday being used down at NBC, and that's included in the MAA request, but we have to -- we're going to go from first five, it will become the first ten, so it will be a total of 15.

Farmland restoration and -- and wine permits, wine festival permits, we're going to -- we're doubling the number of wine permits that are allowed for -- for Connecticut farm wineries. And we're going to start a farmland restoration program and help a farmland restoration program that will help farmers in the state to rebuild the soil and rebuild the farming. And I'm -- I'm hoping that people up in Ellington, in my district, will hear that because I don't think we've done too much for

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

203
October 26, 2011

farmers in the past.

We're going to allow the airport authority to designate new developments zones. This is a big step in concurrence with DECD.

The Fix-It-First Bridges Program. We're going to put thousands of people to work fixing our bridges that are in dire need of -- the 50 worst bridges in the state, or \$50 million worth of -- going towards fixing our bridges in the state. And the worst -- and the worst bridges that are on it, they are in a queue, they're ready to be fixed. They're shovel ready. The plans are done. But we need to put some money out there. We're going to fix those bridges, take -- make them safer, repair them so they'll last 30 or 40 more years, or maybe 50 more years, because that's how long some of these have been -- since they've been repaired, and putting people to work. So we're investing in infrastructure in the long-term with a short-term expenditure of funds.

We're going to replenish the Manufacturing Assistance Act in a major way for all of the programs that the Manufacturing Assistance Act helps with, including small business with -- for

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

204
October 26, 2011

\$340 million, with \$60 million going for small business development, 20 million in the first year, the current year we're in right now, and 40 million going into next year.

And we're going to expand the Manufacturers Reinvestment Act, an act that is -- we are the only state in the country to have an act like this -- from allowing 50 to 100 manufacturers -- go into the program and we're going to allow investments to increase -- excuse me -- set aside dollars from 50 to a hundred thousand dollars.

Now, if you're not familiar with the Manufacturers Reinvestment Act, it's sort of like having a 401(k). You put the money aside and it's not taxable. It's in a tax deferred account. So if you're a business, if you're a manufacturer, and you make some money, you can put it aside and hold those dollars until you're ready to, say, purchase a piece of equipment. And those dollars won't be taxed until you take them out of that account. And when they are -- when they are taxed, they'll be taxed at half the rate of the corporate tax that we currently have. So it's a real incentive to put aside some dollars to -- to build for the future.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

205

October 26, 2011

And finally, the Main Street Commercial Centers Improvement Initiative, we're going to be helping towns with fewer than 30,000 residents. We're putting \$5 million aside for that to help our downtown areas and our small -- and our small -- smaller communities.

Somebody said that this will give the economy a kick in the butt in Connecticut. That wasn't exactly the words that he said, but the point is this is a tremendous program. We are going to, I think, you know, along with other things that we've done, in terms of sending signals to the rest of the country and to the world, Connecticut is open for business. We're going to help companies. We're helping them in the areas that they specified, that they asked for help.

We're going to provide opportunities for growth. And with growth of the economy comes growth for jobs, helping our citizens, helping our families, and do the things that they want to do in Connecticut, to enjoy their lives, to have some security, to live in their homes and not have to be worried about not being able to pay the mortgage and the expenses, to bring home the food and put it

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

206
October 26, 2011

on the table. To do the things that we all know are necessary for our families and for our communities.

So, Madam President, that concludes my introductory remarks. I'll be willing to take questions. I'm sure others have comments and questions in the circle.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator LeBeau.

Senator Crisco.

SENATOR CRISCO:

Thank you, Madam President.

I'd like to commend my colleague, Senator LeBeau, for his leadership, and also for the other members who were involved in this magnificent piece of legislation.

As he mentioned, I would like to direct my remarks on the part of the bill that pertains to the captive insurance market, and especially commend Governor Malloy and Commissioner Leonardi for their vision and leadership.

While this particular section may not excite too many people in the circle, I'd like to tell you

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

207
October 26, 2011

about why we are doing this. In 2008, we passed legislation that enabled (inaudible) to start in the State of Connecticut. They were (inaudible) the time. This bill -- this part of the bill expands that litigation -- that legislation.

Basically, what we're trying to achieve, we are the number one insurance state in the country, 70,000 jobs plus. What this does is make us the complete number one insurance state in the country and makes us competitive with Vermont, I believe, who is the leader, the leader in the country on captive insurance sector.

It is just amazing that we were able to accomplish this. We expand it. And for the first time, while it may not produce hundreds and hundreds of jobs, it will produce jobs. And especially, it will generate an awful lot of revenue, hopefully. So we are a player now. And we are not only the number one insurance state in the country, but we are an enhanced number one insurance state in the country.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

208
October 26, 2011

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ:

Thank you, Madam President.

I feel like I've walked into the factory floor of the snap-on tool factory. This is an incredible, incredible set of tools here. I don't think anybody in Connecticut has seen anything quite like this before. And it will undoubtedly give us the tools that we need going forward to start to get the economy going, getting jobs going -- back immediately, literally, tomorrow morning.

People will read this bill. They will make their plans and they will make decisions that will positively affect the two most important things that we face right, which is getting jobs back in place, getting people back into the right jobs, and getting the economy going.

The Governor, the Lieutenant Governor, the commissioner of the DECD, Senator LeBeau, Representative Berger, and others, have been instrumental in putting together an incredible jobs package here. I agree with the Senator. I haven't seen anything like this before in my 17 or 18 years of reviewing these types of bills coming before the

General Assembly. And this one is very, very exciting because it will work and it will -- it will work starting on day one, as I just mentioned.

It's proof in the pudding that when you include the other side of the aisle, things can happen a lot quicker. They could get the blessing of the entire General Assembly a lot quicker. And lo and behold, you may actually find that you get some decent ideas from the other side as well.

I, for one, very, very much appreciate the fact that you're taking care of small business here. We oftentimes focus in economic development here in Connecticut on larger companies, larger employers, to the detriment of smaller businesses. We've all been on jobs tours.

I know, Madam President, you visited at least 60 or 70 companies on numerous occasions, and we all did the same. And the complaints and the frustrations and the desperation, in many cases, that we saw and heard about in many of these different smaller companies, I think, is being met directly by exactly what's in this bill.

One of the biggest complaints was permitting. That's being hit on the head as if it were a nail.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

210
October 26, 2011

The State Traffic Commission, which is notoriously methodical, we'll say, about making decisions, the commissioner has even volunteered to go sit on that -- on that commission and try to expedite things so that we get a quick turnaround.

I think everybody in the private sector, whether it's environmental concerns or traffic concerns, wants to do the right thing. They want to abide by the regulations, but they don't want to wait a year and half to get permission to do what they're seeking.

The additional investment capital in this program is significant. For example, the \$25 million going to CI, Connecticut Innovations, for five years, each year 25 million, for a total of 125 million, that is significant capital. And we shouldn't ignore that. That's going to cause all sorts of exciting things to happen.

Workforce development, that scenario that we have been reasonably good on, now we're going to be excellent in. There's been a mismatch over the last decade or so between the emerging workforce and what the needs of employers are. Now, it's going to be much more of a match. Going forward,

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

211
October 26, 2011

the job creation tax credits make infinite sense. And probably one of the more exciting aspects of this plan is that you have film studio tax credits that make a lot of things possible, like our NBC Sports situation down in Stamford, Connecticut that we were just talking about before.

I know we will see dividends very quickly because this is something that small businesspeople are following very, very closely. And I'm sure that medium-sized and larger companies are doing the exact same thing. I think that it's going to -- I think it's going to resonate. I think this may also be something that sets a bar for other -- other states in the country when they read about this tomorrow morning in the newspaper. And I, for one, am very happy about that, happy to be associated with it.

But having said that, I can't sit down yet. I will be in favor of this bill without mentioning that it does come with a big price tag. And I will make the argument, as I have for three years, very briefly here tonight, that our very best economic development policy is one that involves something very simple, and that's just creating the best

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

212
October 26, 2011

business environment that we can possibly do, meaning three very fundamental things, low tax rates, a reasonable regulatory environment, where you have a speedy process to get your permits approved or not approved. I think people will work with all of the different agencies to come up to code or come up to the regulations, as long as they get -- as long as they get the feedback that they're asking for, and a lower overall cost structure for the state. Three fundamental simple things that we should be working on.

And I'd throw in another one. The fourth is that decision makers in business are much more intelligent nowadays about state issues, particularly finances than ever before. It is imperative that we have a balance sheet and a spending rate or rate of increase -- or hopefully decrease one of these days -- that is in line with a government that is affordable for the existing tax base or anybody who is considering coming to the State of Connecticut because they will ultimately be on the hook for picking up those liabilities going forward.

I believe with all my heart and all of my mind

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

213
October 26, 2011

this is the long-term strategy that we should be engaging in. This is a step in the right direction because we are facing the worst economic circumstances that we'll ever face for the rest of our lives, probably multiple lifetimes to come.

So this is a step in the right direction. It's expensive. It will deliver the -- the kind of return on investment and the kind of dividends that we're looking for, but longer-term. We need to be even better by making this the best darn state in the entire country to do business in.

Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

Good evening. I'd like to echo my remarks with Senator Frantz in -- in the regard that it is a very exciting day, and -- and I do agree with that and I appreciate that. And I've been looking forward to today for quite a bit as well.

But if you look at the call of the agenda today and it says that this is the most significant

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

214
October 26, 2011

economic downturn since the Great Depression. The State is currently experiencing an unemployment rate of 9 percent -- or over 9 percent. But we are called in to craft practical solutions to make it easier to do business with the state, drive innovation and entrepreneurship, support small business growth, strengthen, streamline and enhance existing economic development tools.

It kind of -- it kind of reminds -- we all have these little roads in our -- in our districts where you talk to residents and they would say, you know, that's a real bad corner over there and that's a real bad curve. There is an accident there every day. Someone goes off the road almost weekly. And then it's going to take for someone to get killed, God forbid, before we change the road.

Well, too many times we're reactionary and we wait for that tragic incident or that tragic thing to happen before we make that change in the road. Finally, we found the change, and this is it here. We should be doing this, not on October 26th, but from day one. We should be creating an atmosphere that is business friendly, that provides a climate for businesses to grow.

Madam President, I've said many times that I'm a small business owner and I employ people in my community. You know, that business entity tax, we -- I -- since I got elected in 2008, we've been talking about this business entity tax, that is antibusiness, that it just sends the wrong message to businesses because we pay \$250 a year just for turning the key in the door.

Yes, thank you. I appreciate the fact that we have changed that and now we'll be paying that every two years. Quite honestly, we shouldn't be paying that at all.

The Small Business Express Program, I think that's a very good idea. We have this First Five initiative that we've picked winners and losers. Well, this is kind of like a first 500. Maybe we can get some small businesses to get to -- to -- to really expand and grow, and take a chance, and create jobs, and expand to their payrolls.

How many times that I've talked to businesses in my district that are small businesses? I mean, they make up 80 percent, I believe, of our economy. They are the driver of our economy, not five companies, 500, 5,000, whatever it takes. That's

what drives our economy. That's who hires. Those are the people who employ locally. Those are the people who give to their local Boys and Girls Club's and to their little leagues, and volunteer day in and day out. Those are the people who just want to, you know, have a -- have a good life for their children, educate them, send them to college, pay their mortgage, and give back to the community.

Job expansion tax credits, certainly we've been talking about this since 2008. I remember Senator DeBicella, one of the first things he offered when -- when I got here, I remember, was talking about job creation tax credits.

The Manufacturing Reinvestment Account, it's a very good idea. Let's give money to manufacturers to expand or redo their equipment, you know, reinvigorate their own lines. Maybe update their equipment, if you will.

The angel investor tax credits is another good one. I think we should give more opportunity for people to invest in -- in start-up companies.

And then a matter close to my heart, the airport development zones, Madam President, something I've been talking about for a good long

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

217
October 26, 2011

period of time, and I'm very excited that this is in this bill. We have an opportunity, just like we created at the Bradley Airport, to expand and take advantage of the proximity of our airports in the State of Connecticut, and that's something that I've been fighting for a while.

So, yes, I am excited today. I'm very happy today. I look forward to the growth that we possibly see with these type of proposals, but let's not stop here. Let's not make this a one-day thing. Let's make this the policy for the State of Connecticut going forward. When we come back in February, let's have long memories. Let's remember what we did here today. Let's create these opportunities again. Let's create an atmosphere that is business friendly, and I guarantee you people will be back to work.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Kane.

Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER:

Thank you, Madam President.

This is a wonderful way for us to conclude our

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

218
October 26, 2011

business today in the Special Session with the bill that is so supported by everyone on both sides of the aisle, and is also a wonderful first step in our returning Connecticut to its former top position in business and innovation, and a great place to live and grow a business. So I am hopeful that this is just the beginning, not the conclusion. And this bill has a lot to offer.

It's obvious that everyone has been listening to the business sector, and so much of what we all heard is now in this bill. But I did want to point out a couple of areas of -- of interest of mine, particularly in workforce development and education and in transportation.

In fact, that was mentioned recently by our ranking member of -- of commerce, even before I get into that, that there is a time cost to money. And in Connecticut, it has been very difficult for the business sector when they've had to interact with state agencies because the delay simply, in many cases, has allowed certain opportunities to fail because it took so long and investors would walk away from the deal. So the fact that we're concentrating on that and speeding up the process

is excellent.

The workforce development area, particularly in the area of current training programs and reviewing them, certainly in the area of vo-tech, I think that that's very important. In the past, we spent over 300 million -- 350 million dollars on various job training programs, never to really be looked at with a critical eye to see what we should keep and what we should not keep, and maybe upgrade to current technology. So I think that is a wonderful area, as well as reevaluating what the current training needs are for the new economy that we have.

I was particularly struck by the area of investment in precision manufacturing which really has been a real standard of Connecticut's great expertise that is still ongoing if you look at some of the century-old companies that are still in practice today, and also, the area of focus on vo-tech. And we've heard that from the business sector, of all places.

It's the business sectors that have really told us that we should refocus on vo-tech schools, and particularly having our regional boards of

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

220
October 26, 2011

education to inform the middle school and high school kids there is that option. That we do have some excellent vocational, technical and technological educational training schools that would be option for our students. In addition, really having them focus on collaboration with the business community.

Beyond that, we also heard about the areas of concentration in our transportation agencies, the area of expanding our airport business enterprise zones, which is very necessary in opening the door for future collaborations there.

And, in particular, I wanted to point out the bridge program, which I think a lot of folks that may not have been around in those early days when Connecticut was catapulted to the national spotlight, when the Mianus Bridge collapsed in Greenwich and individuals died. And that shone a spotlight on our crumbling infrastructure, both in bridges and tunnels, and really forced a lot of other states to rethink and look at that area. And I'm really pleased to see that that is in this bill as well.

All and all, this is a wonderful effort. I

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

221
October 26, 2011

hope it is the beginning of real change and a trend moving upwards for Connecticut. And, of course, hopefully, everyone will embrace this in a very bipartisan, positive vote tonight.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, and good evening, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, sir.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

It's really amazing what an hour -- a difference can be in an hour, where some of us were struggling with the last bill before us, and -- and yet, many of us can stand today, at this moment, in a bipartisan support of some good ideas.

Certainly, the legislative process -- this bill includes things that I'm not terribly excited about, but there are many good things. And I just wanted to sort of shed light a bit on the difference between a true bipartisan legislative process, like we've seen with this bill before us

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

222
October 26, 2011

now, and the previous bill, which I think was not bipartisan by any shape or form.

When you look at the Jackson Lab proposal, where the state government is essentially going to be laying out \$738,000 per employee to recruit this organization, we look at a very successful family-owned, private company in Danbury and Ridgefield known as Boehringer Ingelheim, a pharmaceutical company, which came to Connecticut 25 years ago and today has 2,800 employees and has invested 1 billion -- that's a b -- \$1 billion of private money into those two communities and hired now 2800 employees that are earning above average salaries.

Now that success story, I believe, was with targeted, limited state support. In fact, as I tried to look through my files, I saw -- I could only find about \$8 million of state government support of that organization, 8 million for a billion-dollar investment. So that investment was \$2,857 per job, by using state taxpayer dollars, versus 738,000 plus per job in the Jackson Labs. What a difference. So that's my point with the bill before us.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

223
October 26, 2011

We have before us state proposals that are competitive in nature, requiring businesses to step up and show us what they can do, and let us help them along the way. That's a good thing, not picking a particular organization, not picking a particular industry, not picking a particular company, but allowing those companies to compete just like they do in the open market.

And that's the big difference between what we had an hour ago before us, which I am -- voted no for. I don't like it at all because I think it was a -- a rushed to judgment with an awful lot of taxpayer money.

But I like what's before us today because the Governor, the legislative leaders on both side of the aisle, sat down at a table and talked about what it is that we can do quickly to jump-start job creation in Connecticut.

This is quick. These are quick opportunities to do that. Jackson Labs, I -- I think, is far from that. So credit where credit is due. Thank you to the leadership, to the administration for coming together with some good ideas. Amazing how often it's been talked about -- the permitting

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

224
October 26, 2011

process is such a headache in the State of Connecticut and this is being addressed, at least on paper. We -- we look forward to that process being streamlined.

Certainly, the elimination of the business entity tax on an annual basis, that's reduced paperwork and reduced a tax to small business. And certainly, the -- requiring the permit ombudsman to take a more proactive role for streamlining the process of government, those are all very good things. That's what we hear about when we're on the street with our businesses and our constituents saying that government is in the way, and government in Connecticut has to step aside and allow small businesses to get going again. But they can do that with our -- with our help and as long as we don't put up further barriers along the way.

I'm especially intrigued by the idea of us establishing and expanding the manufacturing programs. And thank you to Senator Kissel for advocating so hard on that for our vocational schools. Danbury has been a home to many high-tech manufacturing companies for a century. And we are

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

225

October 26, 2011

hopeful that that high-tech enhancement to our vocational schools will find its way to Western Connecticut, where we are desperate to have available well-trained employees to work in these high-tech companies.

I do have, Madam President, a couple of questions for the proponent of the bill and would ask if Senator LeBeau could clarify a couple of things for me.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau, will you prepare yourself?

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

Senator LeBeau, thank you for work on this. I -- You may recall, back on June 4th the two of us had a conversation -- I think it was a Saturday afternoon -- and we were discussing the Connecticut Development Authority and its creation.

And the concern I had back then on June 4th, when the Development Authority was created, was what is the impact of the new -- I'm sorry -- the Connecticut Airport Authority, what is the impact of the Connecticut Airport Authority on

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

226
October 26, 2011

municipal-owned airports, like Danbury Airport?

And so we had a good Q and A on that. You clarified a number of things for me and -- and I was grateful for your help in shedding light on the fact that the Connecticut Airport Authority was created to enhance and help state-owned airports to thrive in this economy.

The sense that I got out of our discussion, though, was that the Connecticut Airport Authority was never developed or created in any way to minimize the importance of the municipal airports. In fact, the sense that I got from our discussion at that time was that it really should and will be a level playing field, so to speak, between state and municipal-owned airports.

However, the bill before us includes language of allowing the Connecticut Airport Authority to take the good idea of a airport development zone, which was created exclusively for Bradley Airport, and allow the Connecticut Airport Authority to expand that concept to other airports in Connecticut. But it's my understanding that that option of an airport development zone is not being made available to the municipal airports. And I

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

227
October 26, 2011

wonder if you could clarify that for me.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Thank you, Madam President.

I think your observation is correct. That is not being made available to municipal airports. However, as we spoke off the record earlier, that process that was in that bill last year allows municipal airports to come under the CAA, the Connecticut Airport Authority.

So if they wanted to avail themselves, potentially, of a benefit that we're calling, like, a development zone, then they would have to join the CAA. And in doing so, I would believe, lose some of -- lose some or all of their autonomy as municipal airports. In other words, they have to become a state airport.

(Senator Coleman of the 2nd in a Chair.)

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

228
October 26, 2011

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President. Glad to see you there this evening.

THE CHAIR:

It's good to see you.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Senator LeBeau.

And so that, I guess, is the point that is most alarming because I think it's a different situation today than it was on June 4th, in that I always thought that the Connecticut Airport Authority was a good idea, but I still remain concerned that municipal airports are being treated differently.

And in this case, I would like to ask for support of the concept of equalizing the playing field and making the airport development zones available to municipal airports as well. Because it's of my opinion -- and I'll ask for yours in a moment -- that if six airports in the State of Connecticut are granted special development zone status, then that is giving them a competitive edge over a municipal airport in the State of Connecticut.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

229
October 26, 2011

Through you, Mr. President, to Senator LeBeau, do you believe that the existence of an airport development zone does that?

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau, if you care to respond.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Yes, I would, Mr. President. Good to see you.

THE CHAIR:

Good to see you.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

You look great up there, as opposed to right here.

The -- it's kind of a rhetorical question and -- because I think you know the answer is -- is yes, that there's an advantage to being -- to having a development zone than not having one. But I would like to point out that the bill does not provide a development zone for any of these other airports. And the process for obtaining or becoming -- having it in a development zone is quite rigorous, including the CAA, the commissioner of DECD, kind of going back and forth between them, to finally making a recommendation.

And also, there are firewalls, in essence,

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

230
October 26, 2011

between the airports so they don't overlap, potentially, in hurting each other in their development activities. And I -- and I think that's particularly true. We're really, I mean, I helped to create the CAA and the Bradley development zone to really -- my prime objective was to help Bradley, which stands by itself, in a class by itself, as a -- as a world-class airport and as the -- the flagship of our airports in the state.

So let me anticipate the next question because you actually were hinting at it. That, going forward, would I -- you know, would I support -- are you going to ask that? Going forward -- let me go -- let me go back to you, Mr. President.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Thank you, Senator LeBeau, for anticipating my next question correctly. Would you support the concept of municipal airports being allowed to

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

231
October 26, 2011

apply for an airport development zone without becoming under the umbrella of the Connecticut Airport Authority?

Through you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:.

Thank you, Mr. President.

I am not going to take a position on that at this point, senator. I would, however, propose to you that I would listen to arguments as to why that should occur. And -- and perhaps in the next session, to look at that question, either since we're going to be having a lot of follow-up activity on this bill, that I'd be willing to look at that in the Commerce Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Thank you, Senator LeBeau, for entertaining that idea. I'm very grateful for that opportunity to have further discussion. I -- I -- I'm very much in favor of the concept. I'm supporting this

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

232
October 26, 2011

bill. I do want to be sure that we are not creating undue -- a noncompetitive situation between airports.

One key point, I think, to consider for a municipal airport is the value of the airport. And so, in the case of Danbury, where our airport is strategically located at the intersection of Interstate 84 and Route 7, that is a tremendous asset to the city of Danbury and it wouldn't be logical for us to turn over the development rights of that facility to the state, as that is a taxpayer-funded -- local taxpayer-funded asset.

So I would like to see and -- and hope that I can engage my colleagues here in the circle in the concept of allowing the local municipal airports to take the benefit of -- of what we're doing today.

Madam President, thank you for this opportunity, and thank you to all for the hard work that's been done on this bill today. I look forward to the small businesses in the State of Connecticut rolling up their sleeves and finding ways within this legislation to create new jobs in Connecticut.

Thank you, Madam President.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

233
October 26, 2011

(The President in the Chair.)

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Oh. Senator Bye, please.

SENATOR BYE:

Thank you, Madam President.

Good evening. You've switched back so quickly. It's a revolving door there.

THE CHAIR:

It sure is.

SENATOR BYE:

Madam President, just as chair of the Higher Education Committee, I have a couple of clarifying questions for the chairman of the Commerce Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Prepare yourself, Senator LeBeau.

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE:

Good evening, Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Good evening, Senator.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

234
October 26, 2011

SENATOR BYE:

Just for the purposes of legislative intent, in the part of the bill that has to do with public university funding and how it can be used for commercialization and (inaudible) transfer, can that be used to meet the match requirements of the Small Business Express Program the way it's outlined in the bill?

SENATOR LeBEAU:

I believe so.

SENATOR BYE:

Okay. Well, I just -- I just want to be clear that I believe that was the purpose. That that can be used for that purpose. So for purposes of legislative intent, you know, people -- people are going to interpret as they will, but I believe that was the intent, that it could be used as a match.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

And I -- I agree with you. I think it was the intent.

SENATOR BYE:

Okay. Thank you. And there's one other part of the bill that deals with using volunteers in the manufacturing industry --

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

235
October 26, 2011

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Uh-huh.

SENATOR BYE:

-- and the regional vocational technical high schools and in the community college programs around manufacturing and -- that that would enhance the educational experience, and there was going to be a study of this. I just want to be clear that that's meant to supplement versus supplant current teachers in those programs.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Well, my own personal answer to that would be that -- that I would hope it would be a supplement, as rather -- rather than supplanting. However, since this is just a study at this point, I -- I think that that doesn't answer the question to say whether it is one of the other, because it is a study of how that might work or how we can expand the use, and a better use of people with those skills in the vo-tech schools and in the community college system.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

236
October 26, 2011

I -- I think that it -- it's a little -- I want -- I don't want to say it can't be one or the other, but that would be my preference also.

Can I -- can I go further on that question, Madam President, just to answer?

THE CHAIR:

Please continue, sir.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

You know, this is one of the really crucial questions to deal with because we're -- we're providing some dollars here for machinery. But I have heard, in my own travels visiting MCC and other -- other community colleges, that may not be the problem is -- of having machinery, but it may be a problem of having a curriculum, a certification program and the adequate staff who know the machinery, the seven axis cutting machine versus the three axis cutting machine. And so that is crucial to getting the right person who -- who knows the -- has the skills to teach that.

So -- and I think that's what we're looking for, is to find a way to get those people into the schools to actually teach the young people -- or not so young people -- and we're talking about the

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

237
October 26, 2011

community colleges to get those skills so we can raise them up, fill those spots that we know we have available, and help our economy.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE:

Thank you, Madam President.

I -- I really appreciate those answers, Senator LeBeau. I know you know a lot about this -- this industry and the training, and -- and we do need a properly trained workers. So thank you for your answers.

Through you, Madam President, just one more comment that like to make about the bill before us.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR BYE:

I just -- I just want to say how grateful I am to members of the circle for their support of the expanding the manufacturing program at Asnuntuck Community College. As chair of Higher Education, I've had had several occasions to visit that program, and Senator Kissel knows it well. And

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

238

October 26, 2011

it's great to take something that's working combined with -- Madam President, you and I were at a manufacturer. We spent a good bit of time talking to them this week and they explained the workforce issues and having the appropriately trained employees. Their problem isn't orders. Their problem is workforce.

And this program is such a model, and Frank Gullini and his faculty have built an amazing program that's a national model, and we haven't been able to expand it in Connecticut so to use this package to take that and expand it to other parts of the state that are in need.

I'd also like to say, as chair of that committee, that I hope we have a very, very thoughtful process about where those community colleges are, where this is cited, because we want communities that need manufacturers, need machinists, need different kinds of workers, in this vital sector.

So I hope it's sort of a competitive where colleges will need to make the case about why they are the right place for this program. But this is a historic day and it's so great to have bipartisan

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

239
October 26, 2011

support in this bill. And I thank my colleagues for supporting the manufacturing program at Asnuntuck to be expanded because it works.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much, Madam President. Good evening.

Senator Bye's remarks are a perfect segue to -- to what I want to say. I have a couple of opening statements and then some questions. But, at the outset, I want to associate myself with the remarks of Senator Bye.

We all stand here by voting in favor of this bill, in some small measures, in singing our praises regarding Asnuntuck's manufacturing technology center. Asnuntuck Community College is a wonderful institution of higher education serving students of all age groups, people changing careers, people getting out of high school, and it is really preeminent as a partner with businesses and our communities throughout north central

Connecticut. And Martha McLeod, and as Senator Bye indicated, Frank Gullini deserve an awful lot of credit.

That being said, before I get onto any questions or any other general comments, I wanted to thank profusely Senator McKinney, my leader, as well as others in the circle, who recognize that, while we are endeavoring to replicate Asnuntuck's program at other community college and other institutions of higher education, that it is completely befitting, and something that I have worked hard for over the last several weeks, as all parties were negotiating this bill, don't forget the gold standard, the preeminent program.

And in this bill, there's additional funding for Asnuntuck. And there were some discussions that said, well, if Asnuntuck's program is the gold standard, it's up and running, do we need additional funding for Asnuntuck? And the answer is absolutely, positively, yes. Because one of the things this bill is all about is getting people into good jobs as soon as possible.

We have the mechanisms. We have the employers waiting for the graduates. The groundwork is

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

241
October 26, 2011

there, and the additional \$1.1 million for the -- for the next year and the year after that is desperately needed to expand upon the groundwork that has already been laid.

So, thank you to Senator LeBeau, Senator McKinney, everybody who helped that particular aspect of this bill forward. And I wanted to say that at the outset.

Second, this is one of the few bills, quite unfortunately, where there has been an active effort on behalf of the Governor's office to work collaboratively with the minority party. I mean, that's just the unfortunate reality of this -- this last year. I'd like to believe that that is going to change.

There's a respect element to this that even if you don't embrace the ideas of the people in the minority, that you should at least invite them to the table, at least listen to their concerns, their ideas, their suggestions.

Having served in the minority now for nine out of my last ten terms, I'm okay with the fact that if somebody sees an idea that I have and they want to turn it into a Democratic idea and -- and we'll

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

242
October 26, 2011

share the credit with that, that's fine. There's no -- I don't have any intellectual property right to a good idea for state government. But I do believe that when one party somewhat treats the other side of the aisle with what could be perceived, rightly or wrongly, with disrespect, that it creates a bad environment for good things to happen.

I see today as the first step towards a whole brand new tomorrow as far as this administration and both parties in the Legislature. And I think that's important. I really do. We're going to disagree. We're going to fight like cats and dogs over issues. That's okay. That's what the Legislature is all about. But the doors have got to remain open. There are some things where the executive branch is going to be more expeditious, it's going to have its way, and that's the separation of powers.

But I am so glad -- I am so glad that Governor Malloy invited everybody to the table for this particular bill. And I believe that it sets the right tone. I listened to Joe Brannon, Executive Director of the Connecticut Business and Industry

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

243
October 26, 2011

Association, speak about this bill and he said, yeah, it's not the be all and end all, but it's a great first step. And we hope it's the first step along a whole new avenue for the State of Connecticut and its government. And, I think, with the spirit of cooperation, it can be just that.

So with those initial comments aside, I do have some mechanical questions for Senator LeBeau.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau, prepare yourself.

Senator Kissel, please proceed.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you, Madam President.

My -- my first question is, before I go trumpeting the cutting in half of the business entity tax -- because I do have some -- some constituents in my district that really hate this -- it looks to me that this gets phased in over a rather long period of time. So when would my small businesspeople that maybe have one or two employees, LLCs that are paying this \$250, when would they see that they would have to pay a reduced amount of money, or when would the second

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

244
October 26, 2011

year kick in?

Through you, Madam President.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Well, thank you, Madam President.

Can I ask for a brief moment? Because this -- because it is complicated the way legislation is written, and I'm going to try to get a little help on this. I don't -- I don't want to be incorrect.

THE CHAIR:

Do you want -- do you want to stand at ease?

SENATOR LeBEAU:

If I could -- at ease for a moment, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

SENATOR LeBEAU:

In trying to interpret --

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will come back to order.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Thank you, Madam President.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

245
October 26, 2011

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Thank you very much, Madam President, and my apologies.

THE CHAIR:

No problem.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

And my interpretation of the bill is that you really won't feel the impact of this until the year 2014. That, essentially, because people pay their taxes on April 15th for this year, they'll pay the entity tax. And then, 2000 -- April 15, 2013, for 2012 tax year -- then April 15, 2015 for the 2013 and 2014 tax years, so that that is when they'll get the break, because they will be paying for two years at that time as opposed to one year.

So it's really a -- because, as you know, we don't have a lot of money available. The budget is balanced on a very thin, thin thread. And if we could have done this, Senator, immediately, I think we would have. But by doing it this way, we've established in law that we are getting rid of the tax by reducing it, and we're not affecting the

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

246
October 26, 2011

biennial budget at this time.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much.

And as I read the -- the bill, that was my reading too, such that -- my -- I guess, my critique -- and again, I appreciate all the great work that everybody poured into this bill -- would be, at least regarding the business entity tax, which, you know, for a large business, it's not a big deal, but for the small businesses.

And as Senator Kane really articulately and eloquently pointed out, it's a real statement to these individuals that -- are we open for business or are we not? You put your key in the door and here's your bill.

I guess my concern is, is that given the largest tax increase in the State's history, and the fact that there is a projected budget surplus in the next year or so of \$400 million, I think that there might have been funds available to speed

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

247

October 26, 2011

this up. Because, as I read it, they're going to be paying the same amount in April 15th of 2012, and April 15th of 2013, and only thereafter does the benefits start to kick in on a biennial basis.

So I appreciate the effort in that direction. Believe me, we've been fighting this year in and year out. But, at least as far as that particular item goes, it's hard for me to go back to my constituents and say that that was a really huge change because it could change in two years. We -- we don't know.

The other, sort of, major question I have as to the mechanics of the bill is this. I had already stated my -- my great thanks to my leadership, Senator McKinney, and -- and everyone who helped push for expanding the manufacturers assistance. That's 2.2 million over two years for Asnuntuck Community College, a very important program in my district. There's other great things in here that I really like.

As far as bridge maintenance, I hope that none of these bridges are actually in any kind of position where they pose a public threat. I would think that we wouldn't need a special bill to get

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

248
October 26, 2011

them to the top of the list. But if this is increasing our trend of maintenance, I think that's a good thing.

I think changing the -- the burners in the furnace and that program, the \$5 million program to help not-for-profits, I see that as a -- as a change, and I know that has sort of evolved in this program. I think having a fund of money for lots and lots of small businesses, these are all great initiatives. So I -- I completely am on the same page with you, Senator LeBeau. Had the pleasure of serving with you on the Commerce Committee and I know how passionately you feel about these things.

But, in looking at the fiscal note, most, if not all of these initiatives, are funded by general obligation bonds. Is that correct?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Through you, Madam President.

That is correct, Senator.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

249
October 26, 2011

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much.

And so, even though we pass this bill this evening and it gets signed into law by the Governor, when I go back and -- for example, I talked to President MacLeod at Asnuntuck Community College, and she says when could we possibly expect this infusion of another \$1.1 million for our flagship program regarding manufacturing technology education?

The way I look at this is then the Governor has to take some of these and start beginning to put them on the bonding agenda for the next bonding meetings. And is there -- has there been any representations that everything in this package is going to be on the next bonding agenda, or how are we going to decide that? Because I'm ready to write the letter to the Governor regarding the Asnuntuck money tomorrow, if that's the way I have to go.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

250

October 26, 2011

Through you, Madam President.

Right away. That's w-r-i-t-e away.

Senator, I would say, clearly, there's a strong intent -- like, for instance on the Asnuntuck money. Let's talk about that. Many of these, the programs have dollars in the first year and dollars in the second year, so I expect that the Governor is going to put a lot of this -- a lot of these dollars up very soon. I think it's a rational expectation. I don't think it's, you know, beyond belief that he would do that.

The Asnuntuck money, particularly, you were looking at \$1.1 million a year for two years. And it basically says that it shall be \$1.1 million for the current year. So I expect the Governor -- I mean, he'll be -- not -- we've kind of mandated that he put it on the bond agenda for this year. So I think that that will occur. I mean he wants to get -- the Governor, and I'm sure the Lieutenant Governor would concur, although I'm not sure she can from her position right now -- I mean, the reason we have all of it -- we're doing all of these things is to have an immediate impact on jobs, the sooner the better.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

251
October 26, 2011

And -- and I think that -- that in almost all of these cases where there's dollars for this year and next year, and in almost all of these programs there's dollar that are put aside for this year and next year. He's going to want to move those programs as soon as possible.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much.

And -- and, in part, not to be supremely parochial, but let's continue to use Asnuntuck as -- as for the basis of an example. With Asnuntuck, the faster the money goes into the program and they can ramp up, they are operating on a school year. So the school year is going to end at the end of the calendar year and then there's another semester thereafter.

And so when this bill says, \$1.1 million in the first year and \$1.1 million in the second year, does it mean this calendar year, or does the Governor actually have the latitude to go all the way out to the end of June, because what this really means is this fiscal year? And I'm not

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

252
October 26, 2011

clear on that.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Thank you, Madam President.

And, through you, I would agree, he certainly has the latitude. On the other hand, I'm sure that he's going to want to get those dollars in circulation, and I'm sure he's going to want to get the program up and expand it at Asnuntuck and the other vo-tech schools -- excuse me, community colleges and vo-tech schools as soon as possible.

So my guess is he's going to -- he's on the bond agenda pretty quickly and be working with administration at Asnuntuck and then the other community colleges to say, okay, what is it exactly we need? And -- but -- 'cause we want to have that first. We don't want to go out and purchase machinery that is not going to be useful.

So I think there's -- there's going to be some give and take between the Governor's office and the schools in order to adequately assess what is the -- what exactly do we need. And, you know,

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

253

October 26, 2011

it's interesting. Again, going back to Asnuntuck, one of the great things Asnuntuck has is this board -- this community board that gives input and will tell -- and I think the president and the head of that department there, the head of the program, will probably have a pretty good idea what they need, but I'm sure they're going to want to run that by the board too. And I think and I'm hoping that other community colleges -- it's not in the bill and that doesn't mandate it -- but I'm hoping that other community colleges will set up similar boards to Asnuntuck to -- to have that kind of input from their manufacturing communities.

And one of the things that was -- I wanted to mention earlier but I didn't because -- now we're going on a bit, so I will. You know, we have different manufacturing -- different types of manufacturing in the state. You know, if you -- if you're looking at the East Hartford area, which is my -- my hometown -- but the East Hartford, Manchester, East Windsor, South Windsor, out even down to East Hampton, and even to some degree down to Norwich, and in getting into the eastern part of the state, essentially, a lot of subcontractors for

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

254
October 26, 2011

Pratt & Whitney, and defense -- and defense related, high-technology parts for engines, the highest technology possible, with ten thousands of an inch tolerances, some codings that are super secret, a variety of -- of things like that.

Now, that's -- that's one kind of manufacturing. Then you've got, in the Waterbury area, you've got machine tool -- the production of machine tools. Different kind of manufacturing. And down in lower Naugatuck Valley, more sheet metal and -- and springs and screw work.

So you got -- you have to assess what is needed, because you have to look at what you're, in a sense, constituency for manufacturing jobs is. And I think that's really important. And I'm hoping that that will be the kind of process that every school will go through in assessing what they need for the manufacturing of equipment.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much. And I really appreciate those responses from Senator LeBeau, Senator Bye, again, the hard work by Senator McKinney and

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

255

October 26, 2011

Senator Fasano and those negotiations over the past several weeks.

And I know that Frank Gullini and Martha McLeod and the advisory committee at Asnuntuck, if they haven't already created a list of priorities regarding this, certainly will spring into action. I know that Senator LeBeau and -- and yourself, Madam President, can't commit to the next bonding agenda, but clearly the representations that this initiative, amongst all of these, is -- is a high priority because it will lead directly to, not only the education component, but the jobs are out there waiting. The businesses are saying just send us the educated people. We've got the jobs up and ready to go. These are high-paying jobs. People starting off at 50, 60 thousand dollars a year. That's exactly the shot in the arm this -- this State needs. And so I will continue to champion this going forward.

And with that, I am just happy to be here this evening in a bipartisan spirit. Sometimes my caucus jokes, when I talk about kumbaya moments -- but if there's ever been a kumbaya moment in the last year or so, this is it.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

256
October 26, 2011

So thank you very much, Madam President.

Happy to support the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Senator -- Senator Prague.

SENATOR PRAGUE:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, like the rest of the members of this circle, I am very pleased to see this kind of a bill before us. These incentives have been sorely overdue for a long time. Nothing like this has been done to incentivize jobs in this State. I do have two issues, just for legislative intent, that I want to put on the record.

At the hearing that we had, Madam President, there were a couple of people who have been in state government for several years, came to the hearing and specifically said the -- the public-private partnerships, in the past, have had several mistakes and many of them. And it was critically important to have state oversight.

Even though the bill addresses that the State's investment will be 25 percent, it still is critically important to have state oversight. And

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

257
October 26, 2011

I would just like to state that for the record. I know that these projects will come back to the Appropriations Committee, and that will also be discussed at that time, but I think it's important to bring that issue to the attention of the circle.

And one more thing about prequalification of contractors. The Labor Committee had a big issue with that last year. And now Commissioner DeFronzo was looking at that very closely in order to get contractors who do quality work. And if they have poor performance reports on their record from other projects, that's an issue in them being prequalified. So just for the record, I want to say how important it is to have prequalified contractors do the job that they are going to be hired to do.

Thank you very much, Madam President. I'm particularly pleased. In all my years in this Chamber, I can say that today has been one of the most exciting and, I think, one of the most productive for the people of this state.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Prague.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

258

October 26, 2011

Senator Welch.

SENATOR WELCH:

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support of this bill, but I do so with some reservations. And the first reservation is this. I, like Senator Frantz, Senator Kane, believe that the best thing we can do to get this economy going is to reduce spending, is to cut taxes, is to get a better handle on the regulations that this building puts forth and one that hasn't been mentioned yet, tort reform. But that's not the universe I find myself in. And so, with that, I can look to this bill and find a lot of good things in here.

The second reservation I have is the overall cost of this. But I can approach the overall cost, with the understanding that I have, that this 500 million or 700 million in bonding is not additional bonding, Madam President, but the Governor has no intention of going beyond the 1.2 to 1.4 annual bonding commitment.

So, essentially, we're talking about shifting bonding resources to make these a priority over the next few years. And I think that is a good thing, Madam President. And with that said, there are a

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

259

October 26, 2011

number of good things in here, especially those that benefit the small businesses and small manufacturers.

I've talked to a number of them myself. And the three things that I hear, resounding from all, is that they need capital, they need training, and they need government stability, and this bill does a lot to, at least, address the capital and training. Because there are a lot of great manufacturers in this State that produce specialty metal products that you can't produce with the same quality in China, or at the same cost. But you can do it here and you might be able to potentially do it in another state.

And so what this bill does is it goes a long way to get rid of some of those competitive advantages that might incentivize a manufacturer to go to a South Carolina or a Tennessee and hopefully encourage them to stay here.

So with that, Madam President, I do rise in support of this. I thank everybody for their hard work. I would put in a plug for Tunxis Community College, at this point in time, which is in a region where you see a lot of clusters of small

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

260
October 26, 2011

manufacturers. , And it would be a great place to replicate the model that we have at Asnuntuck.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO:

Thank you, Madam President.

I have to admit, listening to the mutual feelings of expression that have been passed back and forth tonight, it reminds me of 45 years ago when I was a teenager and I broke up with my girlfriend forever and two hours later was making up with her.

I rise in support of the bill, but I do have -- I do have a question, if I may, to the proponent, Senator LeBeau.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

Please proceed, Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO:

If you can recover from laughing, Senator.

I just have a question regarding the First

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

261

October 26, 2011

Five Program, the extension of it. I remember when we voted on it back in June, I had some concerns or reservations because it wasn't clear to me what limits might be within the program. And I mean, I can see the amount of bonding money that's been put forth, but of course the first deal announced by the Governor into the First Five Program was the 50, the 60 or 70 million-dollar deal with CIGNA.

Are there any limits imposed under the First Five Program on any particular deal, as far as its size?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Well, let me talk about some of the -- thank you, Senator.

And, through you, Madam President.

The -- there are some limits, and let's talk about what this First Five Program entails. The -- you have to create at least 200 new jobs within 24 months after the commissioner approves assessments, or you could invest at least \$25 million and create those same 200 jobs over a period of five years.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

262
October 26, 2011

So -- and there's preferences within the bill for projects that attract out-of-state or international manufacturers. It's not a -- it's a stated preference, as opposed to saying you can't do it with others, but clearly, if we can get the manufacturers and, essentially, wealth creators in the state, that's -- that's a win-win for everybody.

Does that answer your question, Senator?

SENATOR SUZIO:

It gives me an idea. I mean, again, I was surprised by the --

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Through you, Madam President.

SENATOR SUZIO:

Oh, I'm sorry.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO:

Again, I was taken aback by the very first deal out of the box. It was a CIGNA deal, which was \$50 million plus deal, and I was just wondering if, again, there is any dollars limit per

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

263
October 26, 2011

transaction that's imposed within this program or whether it's open-ended with no limit and we could potentially see a \$300 million deal, like we saw with Jackson Labs.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

I have to go back, through you, Madam President, I have to go back in my memory on this, and I'm -- I'm really not sure, Senator. It seems to me that there still is a limit in terms of the dollar figure, it's just a higher limit in terms of the dollar figure that the Governor has to come back to the Legislature.

I mean, it used to be \$10 million, but I think we wiped that out with the First Five Program, but I did think we imposed a -- a higher limit for -- for the Governor to have to come back to us. I mean, certainly he didn't -- he did not use the First Five Program for the -- for the discussion we had earlier today with Jackson Labs.

So I'm -- I'm not sure exactly what that number is or how that is structured.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

264
October 26, 2011

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO:

Thank you. And, through you, Madam President. I would be satisfied if, perhaps, the Senator could, in the next few days, get me that dollar amount. I don't want to delay the discussion and the vote tonight for that information unless he happens to have it right now.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

May I ask for a brief moment, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will reconvene.

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Thank you. Thank you, Madam President.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

265
October 26, 2011

To give a little bit more explication of that, Senator, the -- there are limits under -- one of the things about the First Five is you're able to draw upon dollars from a variety of different programs. Within those programs, there are limits in terms of total number of dollars. There is no one to the limit for any particular program --

SENATOR SUZIO:

Uh-huh.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

-- you know, in terms of toto and how many dollars in toto, but there are -- there are certain limits under MAA. There are certain limits under other job creation programs, et cetera, so there are, in a sense, some practical limits on exactly what that dollar figure would come out to be. I have -- I do not know what it would be.

SENATOR SUZIO:

Okay. Through you, Madam --

THE CHAIR:

Senator Suzio.

SENATOR SUZIO:

Through you, Madam President.

Thank you, Senator. That's all the questions

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

266
October 26, 2011

that I have.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Thank you.

SENATOR SUZIO:

I will be voting in support of the bill tonight. There's things in it that I like. I like the precision manufacturing program, which I think addresses the mismatch in terms of skills and the training of coming -- of students coming out of programs to make them prepared for a job in manufacturing. I like the -- the expedited loan program, the small business loan program.

However, I have to admit that I am disappointed in some ways because I think we could have done some more things that would have been even more productive at little or no cost to the State. For example, the Angel Investor Program, I love the idea that we're lowering the threshold. I think that's good, but I would have expanded the program to any company in Connecticut, not just high-tech companies.

A job is a job. Today we're in a terrible situation economically. There's people who are unemployed, who are not necessarily qualified to

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

267

October 26, 2011

work in high tech, but they could work, let's say, in a machine tool shop, perhaps, and that wouldn't qualify under this program.

So I think it's a mistake to limit it to just a few companies. I happened to go to the website for the Angel Investor Program, maybe a week or two ago. And I looked just to see how many companies were eligible, and I think I counted 33. I mean, there's 90,000 companies in Connecticut and only 33 are eligible for this program as things stand right now. I think it's a shame that we don't expand it because the issue is jobs, no matter whether they are high-tech or not. And I don't see why we should have a preference for high-tech when we want to just create jobs, period, given the desperate situation many people are in.

I would have liked to have seen us address reforms in the workmens' comp area and unemployment comp. I would have liked to have seen us address health care insurance in this sense. Small businesses are really oppressed in terms of health care insurance costs in the state because they can't circumvent the state law, like big businesses can, by doing self funding, and they can go under

the federal law, and municipalities do that as well.

So small businesses are stuck buying health care insurance that is issued subject to the mandates of the State of Connecticut. And the state of Connecticut has an extraordinarily high number of mandates. I think we're the second or third highest number of mandated coverages in the entire country, which drives up the cost of health care insurance. And -- and this is a big issue for small business.

And at the same time, by the way, it's an issue where we'd like to get more coverage for people, but some -- some small businesses can't afford it, as things stand right now. So if we were to authorize small businesses to be allowed to offer a basic health care plan, a no-frills health care plan, for example, it might not be ideal, but it's better than nothing. It's a health care plan that would take care of some people's needs. It would dramatically lower the cost of health care insurance for small businesses in Connecticut, and it could expand, potentially, the people who are participating in it.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

269
October 26, 2011

So I hope that next -- next year, when we come into session again, given the spirit of bipartisanship and goodwill that we see you tonight, that something like that might be taken up.

I also just comment about -- there was a proposal I put in when we voted on the First Five Program back in June, where I talked about the -- authorizing the treasury to purchase up to a billion and a half dollars worth of SBA guaranteed loans. I spoke with Senator LeBeau about that outside the Chamber. And it's something I think deserves careful consideration, potentially, for next year.

We could make available -- we could use Connecticut pension fund money, a billion, a billion and a half dollars, and use it for Connecticut business. It would be fully -- a full faith and credit obligation of the U.S. government, so it would be a secure investment, and it would be using our pension fund money to help businesses in Connecticut and help them grow and survive and help them provide jobs in Connecticut.

So those are the initiatives I'd like to see

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

270

October 26, 2011

us open to. Now that we've got the ball rolling and we've got this great feeling of bipartisanship tonight, let's continue it into next year, and let's pick up some additional reforms because we are in a dire straits in Connecticut, and we've only touched the tip of the iceberg with this -- these reforms tonight.

Thank you very much, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

I rise in support of this bill as well. This is a very interesting exercise for the circle to have everybody registering that -- hopefully will register their votes the same way shortly.

I do want to thank the Governor and the leadership and all those people who worked so hard on this bill, on both sides of the aisle, with the understanding that we have a unique opportunity here to continue to move Connecticut in the right direction to improve the job situation here. It's certainly heartwarming to know that we can all work

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

271
October 26, 2011

together and -- and create what we hope will be
a -- a great product.

I do want to comment on a couple of things.
The -- the fact that the education commissioner
will have an opportunity to award Connecticut
career certificates to high school and post
secondary school students in a new category of --
by creating a separate group for internships, I
think will be very valuable, as young people are
out there trying to find jobs and proving that they
are certified to -- to hold them. And so I
appreciate that.

I also am delighted to see that there is now
going to be a renewed effort in all of us working
with and understanding the role of the vocational
technical schools in the state. So many of us
worked in the last legislative session to improve
the standing of the vo-tech schools. And I think
the recognition of the vo-tech schools in this bill
is very important because we have -- we are proving
that we are listening to our manufacturers who are
saying please help us find well-trained, new
employees because we do have -- hopefully will have
opportunities to expand our businesses. But just

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

272
October 26, 2011

as importantly, there are employers that see their workforce aging and people retiring and they don't have employees to replace them.

I do want to ask one question to Senator LeBeau, if I may.

THE CHAIR:

Senator LeBeau.

Please proceed, ma'am.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank -- thank you, Madam President.

In the section under the -- the step grants for small manufacturers, there's a great role that, obviously, our Department of Labor will play in reviewing and approving manufacturers' descriptions of proposed training needs, et cetera. And I was wondering, through -- through you, Madam President, to Senator LeBeau, was there any discussion or will there be a role for the workforce investment boards throughout the state who know so well the training needs of people in their -- their districts and the companies that they've had relationships with so that those workforce investment boards can continue to do the -- the great work that they do?

THE CHAIR:

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

273
October 26, 2011

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Thank you, Madam President.

Through you, I would say, specifically, I don't remember a discussion on -- on that item in the workforce investment boards and the work that they do. Clearly, the -- we're not affecting by doing this so -- in a negative way. They certainly have their voices and we haven't diminished that, and they can step forward and -- and I'm hoping that people will listen to them as they move -- move forward through these step grants.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you.

Through you, Madam President, I appreciate that response. I do know that they are eager to play a role in working to establish a better workforce in the state. So many of them have programs to assist displaced workers or dislocated workers, and this is -- hopefully, their inclusion in this bill, through the Department of Labor, will give them that opportunity to continue to train workers and, as I said, make a stronger workforce.

So, with that, thank you very much, Madam

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

274
October 26, 2011

President, and I appreciate the opportunity to lend my support.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Stillman.

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you, Madam President.

I rise in opposition to the jobs bill before us and it mainly falls on -- on the cost, Madam President. In -- shortly under nine hours, this General Assembly will have approved the spending of close to a billion dollars, and I believe it's a billion dollars that we don't have. And by this authorization, we would have firmed up our position as the number one State in the country with the highest capital debt. And, again, I don't think that's something that we should be proud of.

Going through the bill, we heard most of this is a general obligation bonding, \$700 million. That's on the -- the state's credit card. It will cost us closed \$1.1 billion to pay it back. And we see that in fiscal year '12, there's a negative impact on the General Fund in revenues of \$9.3 billion.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

275
October 26, 2011

We're certainly running close to watching the monthly analysis from the Comptroller's office and OFA as we make sure our -- our state budget is balanced. I think that's going to have a severe impact on those predictions.

I just want to go through a couple of sections of the bill, if I may. Sections 1 through 3, we talk about how we're creating jobs. Well, the very first section of the bill talks about creating two jobs and those are state employees jobs at a cost of \$150,000 plus benefits. They are for staffers to implement a program.

And then there's a quantifier in the language that says, however, if the program is successful and there are more applications that we receive, we may have to hire more additional staffing. I thought we were just going through the summer saying we have to streamline state government. This is an expansion of state government.

Under the Bond Commission, the new program which authorizes \$20 million for the Step Program, we say that we're allowed -- you're allowed to hire an outside contractors to administer the program of \$800,000. For the life of me, I don't know why we

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

276
October 26, 2011

couldn't find the personnel to do that in house for a lot cheaper.

There's a section later on in the bill which talks about privatization, which I'll get to, but here's a prime example of the cost close to a million dollars for something I believe we could have handled in-house.

Section 6 talks about another study by the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection. When we did the large bill, the big energy bill during the session, there was a lot of discussion with the administration saying please don't ask us to do another study. You don't have to do that in Legislation. Just ask us. We'll get it done. But here, we've decided to put it in legislation to do another study, and this has to be done by February 1st, just in a few short months.

And then there's a section that talks about New York's build now and New York is shovel ready. So the sound is somewhat familiar, develop recommendations. So I, kind of, went online. I had some time to search and I found a report of the permitting task force to Governor Rell, dated April, 2010, authorized under Executive Order

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

277
October 26, 2011

Number 39, which basically has the same similar recommendations as to what we should do in the State of Connecticut that we're asking another one of our agencies to go and investigate to see if we can implement. So I think we have to do our homework before we start asking agencies to do things, because I think it's already done.

Section 10 requires OPM to consult for services but then there's the catch phrase "within available appropriations." Well, we all know what that means. That means, guess what, there's no cost to it because we won't do it if it -- if there's no money but it sounds good, so let's put it in there because, maybe, that will help push the bill along. As long as it's within available appropriations, nobody can complain, because there's no cost. But there's going to be a cost to it if we have to do it.

Section 11 requires DEEP, the DOT, the DECD to make recommendations to certain of our standing committees. And what they're asking them to do is to look at the revision, the repeal of any agency or program or statute relating to such agency where it's determined to be obsolete or in need of

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

278

October 26, 2011

revision, for making the operation or procedures of the program -- provision more efficient. There is no anticipated fiscal impact. How can there not be any fiscal impact to an agency if we found that the provision is obsolete? Or if we found that the provision is in need of revision, why are we visiting these things if there is no fiscal impact to the state? If it's not going to be cheaper for us, why are we doing this?

But we're saying do this, on one hand, because we believe there may be some situations where we can streamline and we can save money. But in the same sentence, we're saying there's no anticipated impact.

We heard earlier that the business entity tax -- well, that's nice to go back to talk to our constituents and say, guess what, we cut it in half. They've got to wait three years for that. I mean, for my small businesses, big deal. That's what they're going to tell me. Big deal. Thanks a lot.

I didn't need to go on a jobs tour to hear what my businesses say because I'm out of my communities every single day. I'm in the grocery

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

279
October 26, 2011

store. You -- every impact where you -- where you ask for service or you're buying something, people know that you're a legislator, and they're giving you the suggestions as to how to improve their business. And that is to get off their backs and get out of the way.

I would much rather have seen us spend \$1 billion in reducing mandates and taking the hit than adding monies, spending more money, to hopefully prop up our business community.

I don't know how the wine -- wine permit got into a jobs bill. We're saying, well, that sounds like a good lobbyist had -- had an in and said, hey, how about offering -- letting us have one more wine festival in the state of Connecticut? Everybody likes to have a good glass of wine. So -- so something that specific lands in a big jobs bill? There's only 16 wineries in the State of Connecticut. It's not going to create any jobs.

Section 24 through 27 talks about setting up a brownfield remediation. Well, we have a Superfund site in the state of Connecticut and that fund has 17 and a half million dollars in it, and there are 13 sites listed on that list that need to be

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

280
October 26, 2011

cleaned up. And we can't get those cleaned up. What makes you think that if we spent taxpayers money, \$20 million, that is going to have a better impact?

As a matter of fact, one of the communities that I represent, the town of -- in the town of Canton, Swift Chemical was the reason why they created the Superfund site. It is the number one site on the list. You can check that your computer. It's been on there for over 12 years, but we can't get it cleaned up yet, the number one listing. And there's 17 and a half million dollars sitting in the fund. The cost to cleanup is 4 million. Why haven't we taken any action on that? It's beyond me. But now we're asking taxpayers to fund another \$20 million in general obligation bonds, which is going to cost us more because we're charging it, basically, to pay back.

I agree that manufacturers have spoken about the lack of trained students coming out of the colleges that they can employ in their manufacturing firms when I visit my Chambers of Commerce. And maybe it is a good investment of \$17.8 million. But the result of that

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

281
October 26, 2011

\$17.8 million, there's an annual operating increase cost of \$800,000 every year at the regional training -- at the regional community colleges. I better not see a tuition increase request from these community colleges because of an increase in student enrollment because we're paying for it out of this bill.

The First Five program, there is one limitation, and it's what we've agreed to put on the bonding, on the general bonding, which is \$340 million. So my understanding is that DECD, with approval of the Governor, can award up to the \$340 million for one entity or it can go as little as \$1. That's the ultimate discretion on that.

As I said before, during the First Five Program the first time, the provision that removed, specifically, number three, exempts the projects from legislative approval, which the law requires for financial assistance and certain tax credits above specified amounts. I think that's wrong. This is the body, the legislative branch of government that appropriates the dollars spent at taxpayers' expense. And for us to have no legislative approval over these projects is not

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

282
October 26, 2011

right.

The airport zone expansion, well, I think it's a good idea. I noticed that the language states that if a municipality wants to be reimbursed, they have to apply to the comptroller's office by August 1st with the amount that they're requesting for a reimbursement and -- or the treasurer's office and the Treasurer has to pay them back by December 31st.

Most municipalities operate on a June 30 fiscal year. Most of their taxes are due by June 30th. So now they're going to wait six months into the next fiscal year to see if they get reimbursement because of the creation of the airport zone expansion.

The captive audience section, look, we're never going to compete with the Bahamas. When we passed that language several years ago, we said let's open the gate to see if anybody comes to our state, because we knew that the Bahamas is the capital of the captive insurance market. Nobody came. And I'm not so sure that what we're offering here today is going to bring them here. But what we're doing -- it's been three years, nobody came.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

283
October 26, 2011

We're adding another four and a half state employee positions plus benefits at a cost of over half a million dollars. Really? We just cannot afford it today.

The section that really concerns me -- and -- and I don't mean to make light of it when I say it's a trick or treat and the trick has been played on the taxpayers of the Connecticut -- is the privatization portion of the bill because it states that a cost-benefit analysis has to be done. I agree with that. If you want to privatize something, or take it away from what the public employees have to do, you have to send it to the State Contracting Agency Board -- the State Contracting Agency Board.

If the cost benefit analysis says, yes, it's cheaper for the taxpayers of Connecticut to privatize that particular service, then from there, it goes to a state contracting board. If that state contracting board agrees with the analysis and says, yes, it makes more sense financially to privatize that service, it goes out to bid.

But now we've allowed the collective bargaining agent that they can run to court and

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

284
October 26, 2011

file a motion in Hartford Superior Court, and that just put the brakes on that project, and added costs to that project. That's a good way to kill privatization in the State of Connecticut, even though it made sense by two independent boards looking at it.

Madam President, I ask we put away the credit card, we get out of the way of the businesses, we offer mandate reductions, we offer, through some of these proposals, an educated workforce, which I stand behind 100 percent. But we just cannot continue on the path of spending because people cannot afford it, especially when we set ourselves up with the loss to the General Fund. How are we going to replenish that amount of money when the Governor has said no more taxes?

And now we've found that agencies are unwilling to make cuts. It's going to have to come from somewhere. It's not itemized in this bill, therefore, Madam President, I cannot support it.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark further?

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

285
October 26, 2011

Senator Kelly.

SENATOR KELLY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Since we met last, in June, I had the opportunity to engage in a jobs tour myself, throughout my senatorial district, to meet with workers and employers in the towns of Monroe, Seymour, Shelton and Stratford. I also met individuals and families at various locations and shops to get their input on putting Connecticut back to work. I listened. And what I heard was clear and direct. People want jobs and they want them today, and they do not want any more partisan division.

So the message was pretty clear, direct and simple. The workers and employers want, basically, three things. First, they want government to get out of their way. They want them off -- the government off their back, and this bill begins that important process. It starts to streamline our government, with regards to permit processing, and starts to begin the process of creating a positive job environment.

Number two, both workers and employers want

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

286
October 26, 2011

more educational and skilled development. And I believe, that an investment in our vo-tech system and our community college system does just that. And number three, they want help for small job creators.

And, once again, I think this bill helps them to not only create the working capital to allow small businesses the opportunity to meet their payroll, but it also gives tax incentives and credits to employers who are going to hire people now.

So there are things in this bill that I don't like but, at the same time, there's things in this bill that I do like. And I do like that it represents the fact that we're going to begin the process of putting Connecticut back to work today, and also, and more importantly, that it's being done in a bipartisan manner where all views have come to the table, all views have been heard, and all views are represented.

For those reasons, I stand in support of this. Because when I was elected, back in November, I heard clearly from my constituents when I banged on their doors that job one, two and three were jobs,

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

287
October 26, 2011

jobs and jobs. So tonight, I'm going to cast the vote for jobs and putting people back to work so that we can create the Connecticut where we all want to live, work and raise a family.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Senator Slossberg.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Thank you, and good evening, Madam President.

It's nice to see you.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening. Same here.

SENATOR SLOSSBERG:

Well, I'm delighted to rise in support of this bill today. I think this signals a real change in the State of Connecticut. I didn't speak on the previous bill, and I won't now, but I am delighted to stand in support of that as well.

I think we're sending a very strong message to people within the state and to people outside of the state that we are serious about creating jobs in this state, and there's nothing that the people in our communities need more than the ability to go

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

288

October 26, 2011

and get a job and earn an honest living.

And I know as one of my friends said previously, the best social program is a job. And I'm delighted today that we are making steps in a bipartisan way to move forward on this.

I know from my constituents I hear most frequently about the need for our state to support small business, so I'm delighted to see a lot of initiatives that really will help our small businesses grow, that will level the playing field for them, that will help them find out what programs are -- are available in the state and make it easier for them to work with the state and for us to be a partner in the program.

I also have heard from my constituents and from -- from the businesses in my district, over and over and over again, about our regulations and permitting processes. So I'm delighted to see, also, that we are streamlining and expediting permitting processes.

And I'm thrilled to see LEAN actually, the LEAN system written into this legislation, and I know that Senator LeBeau spoke about it previously. This is something that many of our manufacturers

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

289

October 26, 2011

and their businesses have employed, this process of finding the most efficient way to do what they need to do. And I think it's an exciting first step for our state. I hope that it will expand to every agency in our state as we continue to move forward with that.

I would recognize that, you know, formally DEP was very involved in doing this and they were very successful, but it is a continuous quality improvement methodology. It's something that we are going to be continuously moving forward with. It's not a one time -- a one-time wonder. Once this is in our culture, in our government, we will see improvement from this for years to come, so to me that's very exciting.

I have a wonderful vo-tech school in my district, Platt Tech, and so I am delighted to see the recognition and the focus on our vo-tech schools. I think that they provide us a wonderful opportunity for our students to move forward to have great training.

One area that has not gotten a lot of discussion -- but one section of particular significance to the GAE Committee, if I could just

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

290
October 26, 2011

speaking about for a moment, and that is the public-private partnerships that is in this legislation.

This is really a major change, a policy change, for the state of Connecticut. It is an opportunity. The way that it is drafted, there are only five projects that would be available for this public-private partnership, but it's an opportunity to test out a new type, a new way of doing business, that will maximize our state dollars and leverage them with private dollars. And I think that's an exciting opportunity.

I will admit I do have some areas that I'd like to keep my eye on with regard to these public-private partnerships, in particular, the need for state oversight with regard to these partnerships and the agreements and the performance evaluations for contractors in making sure that the people that we're doing business with are, in fact, good actors and responsible participants in this process. But it's an exciting major change and I'm looking forward to seeing it roll out, and I'm delighted, again, to rise in support of this legislation.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

291
October 26, 2011

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, the reason we're here is obvious to all. We have been suffering and the people of the state of the Connecticut have been suffering through the worst economic recession any of us have ever seen.

Our people are hurting. Too many jobs have left the state and still more are leaving. We have too many people who are unemployed and those who are unemployed are having too hard of a time finding employment.

At the same time, Madam President, I think it's obvious to all of us that the public confidence in their elected officials is at an all-time low. There is real disgust with what's happening in government, the partisanship, especially, that we see down in Washington DC, and

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

292

October 26, 2011

sadly, that disgust is justified.

Madam President, like Governor Malloy, I, too, embarked on a jobs tour across our state. And I applaud the Governor for going out and meeting with people, listening to the men and women who work hard to make a living, and create jobs in the state of Connecticut. I met with dozens of businesses and employees in Bridgeport and Cheshire and Farmington and Wallingford and Waterford, all across the state of Connecticut.

And the message I heard was the same that Governor Malloy heard on his tour, and that we've all heard as we go through our daily lives meeting with our constituents. Taxes are too high in Connecticut. Our state has regulations that are too burdensome and too costly.

One business owner, Madam President, informed me that simply because of the act of his purchasing of a manufacturing company, the triggering of the Connecticut Transfer Act cost him up to \$500,000 in compliance fees and climbing, roughly 80,000 of which were justified with tank removals, and the like, that he knew he wanted to do and was willing to do, but over \$400,000 in costs and climbing.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

293

October 26, 2011

And he said to me could you imagine what I could do to expand my business and hire new employees if I had that \$400,000?

Our bureaucracy is too cumbersome, and businesses often wait months, if not years, to get applications approved rather than days and weeks. One business owner told me he waited over three years to get all of his permits approved. And too often, we know that job expansion, job creation, business development is thwarted and even stopped because of that cumbersome bureaucracy that we have in Connecticut.

I also heard that our state does not have enough workforce, especially in the area of skilled and precision manufacturing. One gentleman told me that he was looking to hire as many as 40 new people but couldn't find the qualified people to hire.

And small-business owners everywhere and everyone -- and this was the hard message to hear -- had felt that they had been forgotten. They watched as tens of millions of dollars of their -- their hard-earned tax dollars went to the CIGNAs and the ESPNs of the world. Without

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

294

October 26, 2011

questioning whether those were good or bad deals, they saw their money going there, and wanted to know where they were getting help from their government. Nobody thought, as a small-business owner, that their government was working for them.

The jobs bill before us begins to address many of these problems. And let me just add one point because there has been, in the press reports -- and they like to focus on the bottom line from our Office of Fiscal Analysis and the total cost of this package -- Governor Malloy, in all of the leadership meetings privately, and I believe he has said publicly, has made a commitment to keep our State bonding level between the 1.2 to 1.4 billion authorized in the budget.

This is not an additional 500 plus million in bonding. This is 500 million in bonding that will replace others, and he will be in charge of making those tough decisions. I think was Ronald Reagan who once said, you know, trust, but verify. I trust he will keep us within the 1.2 and 1.4 billion dollar limit, but we will continue to watch to verify that that happens. So we're not adding new debt, we're finding better ways to spend

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

295
October 26, 2011

our money. And that, at the end of the day, is good progress.

I want to be clear, Madam President, just at the outset, that I do think there is much more we need to do to make Connecticut competitive, but this is a good step in the right direction. And I want to thank Governor Malloy for understanding that bipartisanship was necessary for us, as a state, at this time.

Not only did we need to make progress to make Connecticut more competitive, and that we, as Republicans, had many good ideas to bring to the table as well to make that happen, but that we, as elected officials, needed to work together to put partisanship aside in order to instill confidence in the very people we represent.

Senator Williams and I have had discussions, difficult discussions at times, lots of disagreements, but we both understood, and I compliment him as well, as trying to find areas where we can find common ground and work together, not only to promote good policy, but to say to the people we represent we understand that you're hurting, and we can put our petty partisanship

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

296

October 26, 2011

aside to work together to make your life better. And that's what this jobs bill and this jobs package is about.

Madam President, our caucus came into this process focused on many things, but three principal things that we wanted to make sure we could accomplish. One was helping small business owners. They are the backbone of our economy. They are the creators of most of the new jobs that we have. And this package has a lot for that small business owner.

There's a hundred million dollars, over two years, in assistance for the small business express package. And as been mentioned before, that involves a revolving loan fund, matching grants, and job creation loan programs.

There's an increase in the job expansion tax credits. We've talked about that a lot. And at \$200 per employee a month, that program wasn't being used. Why? Because it wasn't enough to incent that small business owner to hire that new employee. At \$500 a month, many small-business owners said to me, they said to the Governor, they said to others, that is a threshold and a tipping

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

297
October 26, 2011

point where we can use that to go hire additional people for our business.

In addition, others brought to the table the idea of increasing that to \$900. If someone is currently unemployed or chronically unemployed, if someone is a veteran or disabled, that's critically important to those people who have been spending months and months on unemployment having a difficult time finding a job. Many of those people, not all of them, but some of those people will now get jobs because of the expansion of the job creation tax credit. And there's -- there's -- although the program is capped, \$20 million is a significant amount for that endeavor.

We did cut the business entity tax in half. I would have liked to have cut it all and I would have liked to have cut it now, not in a couple of years down the road, but it is progress. And we've made a commitment to make that, perhaps symbolic for some, significant to others, step to say to a small business owner, we understand that this is a nuisance tax and we're going to at least cut it in half.

We've also made changes to the Angel

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

298

October 26, 2011

Investor Program that many have worked on, on both sides of the aisle, in our caucus and in yours, Senator Maynard and others, to try to get that much-needed infusion of capital to those start-up businesses who, but for that capital, could grow and create tens, hundreds, who knows more jobs in the state of Connecticut.

As a caucus, we always -- we also wanted to make sure we helped our manufacturers. And I have to say, Madam President, of all the various different people I've met throughout my tenure in the state Senate, especially on the jobs tour, these small manufacturers are incredible businesses.

They tend to be family-owned businesses. They tend to be people who are on their second, third or fourth generation running a business started by a grandfather or grandparents. They tend to treat their employees as family, not employees. And the people who work for them tend to work for 20, 30, 4 -- 20, 30, 40 years, not two, three, four years. There's not a lot of turnover because they're taken care of and treated well.

Those manufacturers have been struggling. So

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

299
October 26, 2011

we're helping them by increasing and doing more for our vo-tech schools. We even have something in here which will hopefully get our middle schools, you know, kids in, you know, middle school to understand about manufacturing. And I think there will be more we can do next session, which I think as the Governor has indicated, we can focus on education.

And just in talking to the manufacturers, this is not your grandfather's manufacturing plant anymore. It's highly-skilled precision manufacturing that involves engineering, technology, physics, mathematics. It's great, cutting-edge stuff that we are doing here in Connecticut, and we need to be able to get our young kids to understand that this is a great job and future for them. So we don't have any manufacturers saying I want to hire 40 more people, but I can't find them. And I think we're making a start in that direction.

The \$5 million in the Step Program, which will go to manufacturers, is also a good addition and another perfect example of some of the bipartisan consensus. A Step Program, which the Senate

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

300
October 26, 2011

Democrats, especially Senator Looney, were instrumental in implementing and a consensus, I think, between Senator Looney and Representative Cafero, to make that program work for everyone is a positive step for us, an example of how well we work together.

And lastly, the -- the changes in increases in the Manufacturers Reinvestment Account is absolutely critical. So many manufacturers talked about the fact that they need to save their capital to purchase large equipment, equipment that costs hundreds of thousands, if not more. That they need to be more efficient to produce more products, to be able to sell more. And yet, because of our tax structure, oftentimes, they will take some of their pretax profits and buy smaller things so they have to pay less in taxes.

By giving them the ability to reserve a hundred thousand a year for five years, they will be able to save that money, take it out, pay some taxes on it, and use that to purchase large equipment that they need to run their business better. I think that is an incredible step for those manufacturers and our State of Connecticut.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

301
October 26, 2011

Lastly, Madam President, we wanted to focus on some of that burdensome regulation and a -- a often cumbersome permitting process we have. I think there's a lot more we need to do in that, but there are some positive things here. If you talk to people who develop projects, they will often tell you the two areas where they have the -- the longest waits and the most trouble are perhaps areas with environmental protection and the state traffic commission. With respect to the latter, we're making a positive step here. When an application is finalized before the state traffic commission, they have 60 days to review it and make a decision. And if they don't, if they can't get their work done on time, it's deemed granted. Having the commissioner of DECD on the state traffic commission is an additional positive step in that. I think we can do more with other agencies. But we've also said to our new -- and I always call it DEP, so I apologize to the commissioner -- but our new DEEP, that they need to come up with a tiered permitting system.

And I think Commissioner Esty said it best. It takes 18 months off an -- (inaudible) that

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

302
October 26, 2011

should take 18 days, let's focus on the important stuff. And he's right, and we will make progress.

We've also said to our licensing boards, we respect the work you do. We don't want to take your authority away. But if someone comes before you with all the qualifications that merits and warrants a license, you will get that within 30 days. They have to make a decision. Is not acceptable that someone qualified to work in the state of Connecticut may have to wait months and months simply because a board doesn't have a quorum to meet. And we've made positive changes on that.

One last thing I want to focus on, and I want to complement Senator Fasano and Commissioner Esty, and that is language here regarding what happens in a natural disaster, lessons that we learned from Irene, lessons that we hope we never have to learn again. But we saw so many of all of our constituents, whether they were homeowners or business owners, see their homes or businesses either damaged or destroyed.

This language allows them to get back to work immediately to repair their home, repair their business. They still have to comply with all of

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

303
October 26, 2011

the codes and requirements of the day, but they can do so without having to wait months and months for permitting.

And I want to thank Senator Fasano -- he's not in the Chamber -- for his hard work on that and also complement Commissioner Esty. One of the real successes of the state's response to Hurricane Irene, or Tropical Storm Irene, was the fact that DEP understood that people need to get their businesses built, their homes rebuilt, and said let's go ahead and let's do it, and make that process work quickly. And that commissioner is to be commended for that as well.

Madam President, some in the media and others, I guess, have suggested that today is a historic day. I certainly can't go that far, but this is a good day because we are making positive steps in the right direction. But I hope this isn't the only day we're here doing this. I agree with Senator Kane. I hope we'll continue to listen to the people and businesses that we represent and continue to work together to make Connecticut more competitive.

We need to focus on doing the possible.

That's what we've achieved here today, and we need to continue to focus on doing that, working together in the future.

A lot of people talk about we're here to create jobs. And fundamentally, I don't believe government creates jobs. I believe government can create an environment that can stifle job creation and job growth, or it can create one that creates a fair, competitive playing field, where people, through hard work and talent, can create jobs.

That's the playing field we need to continue to build here in Connecticut. We have more to do, but this is a very good first step that we're making. I'm proud that we're doing it together, in a bipartisan fashion, and I urge my colleagues to support it.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator McKinney.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, speaking in support of the bill, of course, at the end of the regular session,

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

305
October 26, 2011

Governor Malloy said that he would be calling a job session for the fall and hope that it would be a bipartisan effort. And, perhaps, against the odds, and certainly against what's happening elsewhere in the country, I think we're all very proud to say that that's exactly what happened. We have a bipartisan jobs bill that everyone worked on in good faith in all -- all four caucuses to produce the result that we have before us tonight.

One of the things -- I'd first like to offer particular thanks to -- to Senator McKinney and Senator Fasano and Representative Cafero and Representative Klarides. And one of the early meetings that we had in the -- in the Governor's office with the bipartisan leadership and the Governor and his staff, we -- Democratic leaders expressed some concern that, would we be in the position where there was a bipartisan bill that -- but -- perhaps Republicans would offer, while voting for the basic bill, offer other amendments on things that have been considered but not accepted in the bipartisan bill.

And we were assured that if it was truly a bipartisan process, and we had a bipartisan result,

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

306
October 26, 2011

they would not be trying to play a game of one-upsmanship by offering other amendments, but would -- would hold together the deal and we would have a bipartisan bill that everyone could agree on. And I think our thanks goes to them for -- for being certainly true to their word and working good faith on this all the way through and giving us, in many ways, a better bill than we could have had without -- without their input.

In particular, one -- one element of that, Senator McKinney mentioned in particular, was the subsidized training and employment program. There was some concern about not having anything in the bill that was going to be particularly targeted to areas of high unemployment and relatively low incomes. So we looked at the model of the bill from the State of Mississippi on their targeted bill to subsidize employment for small businesses who would be hiring workers so that they would be able to have the salary paid a hundred percent the first month, 75 percent for the next two months, than 50 percent, than 25 percent in month six, and that the idea that by then that the worker would be established and have proved his or her worth to the

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

307
October 26, 2011

company. And we connected that with the idea that Representative Cafero had championed about having, also, a program targeted to manufacturers, small manufacturers, where someone would not necessarily have to be unemployed immediately before going into the program, but could have been in a lower paying job looking to upgrade.

So we merged the two together and came up with the two-part subsidized training and employment program, which I think is a better provision because it meets a more broad and comprehensive array of -- of needs. And I think that's emblematic of what we did throughout the -- throughout the whole process, from the -- the Step-Up Program, to looking at other elements. I think the -- the fact that we're expanding Connecticut Innovations and -- and recognizing that that is the active research support arm of state government is an important commitment, expanding the First Five Program to -- to ten companies, so that we're making another -- another effort to -- to reach out to larger businesses that are going to create more jobs in addition to the targeting of small businesses in other parts of the bill.

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

308
October 26, 2011

Working on establishing the manufacturing technology programs at the -- at three community colleges and the three vo-tech schools, that is very important. As we all know that in many ways the Asnuntuck program is a model program for training people for entry-level jobs in precision manufacturing, we need to try to find ways to -- to replicate that program in other community colleges throughout the state.

The commitment to -- to clean up and market five state-owned brownfields for interested developers is another critical program because for years we've been talking about brownfield reclamation, brownfield cleanup, and a way to deal with the concern that we have about -- about uncontrolled development and sprawl. If we could really get a handle on the brownfields that are so often found in urban, older industrial areas, and if those properties could be cleaned up and then marketed to new industrial developers, we would not see the -- the uncontrolled spread of manufacturing into the pristine rural areas of the state that so often happens now because a business will be reluctant to buy into an area that they might be

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

309

October 26, 2011

buying into an environmental cleanup problem and instead will go into virgin land and -- and taking open space that should be preserved for -- for open space or recreational uses.

So a brownfields program is, in many ways, not only an economic development program but a land preservation program and a land-use planning program, and that is going to be important element of this bill as well.

So I think that, on so many fronts, this is going to be, I think, a -- a responsible, targeted and effective use of bonding funds. It is something that is going to meet the great economic need in our state because we do need to take an active approach to spurring job growth, business development training, education in all of the areas that have traditionally been and need to continue to be our strengths.

So again, Madam President, it is a critically important bill. I want to commend Senator LeBeau for his great comprehensive work in working on it and bring it out here tonight. The chairs of our fiscal committee, Senator Harp and Senator Daily who contributed so much, Senator Prague for her

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

310
October 26, 2011

work on -- on labor aspects of -- of the bill and their -- their counterparts in the House of Representatives as well.

And -- and again, in addition to mentioning the pleasure it was to work with our Republican counterparts throughout this whole process, and want to thank President Pro Tem for his usual great work in keeping -- keeping us on course and -- and following through and -- and finding ways to -- to deal with some of the thorny problems as they -- as they came up.

And to you, Madam President, thank you as well, because I know that you were part of the jobs tour all the way through and have been an invaluable source of information, a resource, as we've gone through the whole process.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Senator Williams.

SENATOR WILLIAMS:

Thank you, Madam President.

I rise to support this bill, also, to thank, first of all, you, Madam President, and to Governor

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

311
October 26, 2011

Malloy, for your charge to us here in the Legislature to come together as Democrats and Republicans, to work in a bipartisan way, to address the economic issues that are facing our state, to help create jobs, spur jobs, move this economy forward. And I'm very proud that we have done just what you and Governor Malloy asked us to do. We did roll up our sleeves. We worked together as Democrats and Republicans, as others have said. Didn't agree on everything all the time, that's democracy. But we did agree on a package that's here before us today that is going to help businesses, businessmen and women, small businesses, medium-size businesses, help move those businesses forward and, therefore, help our country.

And very briefly, this package is about small business growth, helping our small businesses to expand and create jobs in ways that have been significantly enumerated before, and I won't repeat it all. It's also about making government agencies more user-friendly by cutting red tape, reducing burdens for small businesses. It's about spurring innovation in Connecticut, investing in the

companies of tomorrow's economy by expanding the First Five concept.

So now we're going to continue on with another five significant businesses creating jobs, building innovation centers in key cities to help connect entrepreneurs with mentors, talent, support, ideas, to develop our workforce, matching the talents to the jobs that are out there. And that can include recruiting students for our vo-tech schools, our agricultural science and technical education programs, developing and enhancing educational offerings and training programs, matching those employers with employees who can meet those needs, and establishing manufacturing technology programs at three community colleges.

And our community colleges are especially nimble in this respect. And they're also close to the ground in our local communities, and they interact with local business folks, so they know the needs. They're ready to respond and create those courses, training programs, that can provide those employers with the trained workforce that they need.

And then, finally, investing in

infrastructure, laying the groundwork for economic growth tomorrow and in the future. So we're investing \$50 million in our transportation infrastructure, our bridge repair and replacement. So that helps creates jobs. It also helps keep us safe as we travel across the state.

We're going to create a Main Street investment program to help those small businesses, working with our towns to breathe new life into town centers and Main Streets. We know that those small businesses are so often the engines of economic development and job creation in the state, and we know they're fighting to survive in this economy. And we've seen other parts of the country move forward in helping to create the incentives for folks to come downtown, to increase the -- the infrastructure of Main Streets and create the attractions so that those small businesses see the foot traffic that they need to survive and, in turn, they help us create the livable communities that we and our families want to live in. So that moves us forward as well.

And then, finally, as Senator Looney and others mentioned, the brownfield initiative,

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

314
October 26, 2011

essentially a First Five program, to expedite and move forward the cleanup of brownfield areas and put them back into use back on the tax rolls, creating jobs, creating revenue.

So, Senator LeBeau, thank you for your efforts. Thank you to all the other Senators on both sides of the aisle, Senator McKinney, Senator Fasano, your Republican colleagues, and our Democratic and Republican colleagues in the House. We came together. We got this done. We're moving the state forward. And to you, Madam President, Nancy Wyman, our Lieutenant Governor, and to Governor Malloy, thank you for charging us with this task and making sure that we saw it through to fruition.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark? Will you remark?

If not, Mr. Clerk, will you call for a -- announce the roll call vote and the machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

315

October 26, 2011

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

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted? The machine will be closed and we'll have a -- Mr. Clerk, will you call the tally, please.

THE CLERK:

Madam President, the question is on the adoption of Emergency Certified Bill Number 6801.

Total Number voting	35
Necessary for adoption	18
Those voting Yea	34
Those voting Nay	1
Those absent and not voting	1

THE CHAIR:

The bill has been passed.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, would move for immediate transmittal to the Governor of Emergency Certified House Bill 6801.

THE CHAIR:

rgd/mb/gbr
SENATE

316
October 26, 2011

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

That concludes our business for today and this evening. And I will yield the floor to any members for announcements or points of personal privilege.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any announcements or points of personal privilege?

Seeing none -- Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Just for a journal notation.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, Senator Gomes was absent today due to illness and obviously missed the -- missed the votes today. As was noted earlier that -- in Senator Meyer's comments, we're praying for his recovery.

THE CHAIR:

So -- so ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY: