

PA 11-251

HB6295

House	2763-2773, 9328-9339	23
Public Safety	398, 399-400, 401-406, 409-410, 536, 537-538, 574-575, 709-710	18
Senate	6548, 6571-6572, 6593-6598, 6600-6601	<u>11</u>
		52

H – 1100

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2011**

**VOL.54
PART 9
2762 – 3112**

tmj/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

2
May 12, 2011

Amen.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Amen.

Thank you, Reverend.

Would Representative Dan Rovero of the 51st District come to the dais and lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance.

REP. ROVERO (51st):

(Inaudible.)

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Is there any business on the Clerk's desk?

THE CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. Communications from the Governor, Executive and Legislative nominations.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Refer to Executive and Legislative nominations.

Are there any announcements or introductions?

Any announcements or introductions?

If not, will the Clerk please call Calendar 190?

THE CLERK:

On page 40, Calendar 190, Substitute for House
Bill Number 6295, AN ACT CONCERNING POLICE OFFICERS
WHO ACCEPT EMPLOYMENT WITH ANOTHER POLICE DEPARTMENT,

tmj/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

3
May 12, 2011

favorable report by the Committee on Planning and
Development.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Steve Dargan, you have the floor,
sir.

REP. DARGAN (115th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, I move acceptance of the
Joint Committee favorable report and passage of the
bill.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

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

Will you remark?

REP. DARGAN (115th):

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

This bill deals with lateral transfers with law
enforcement people within our state if they go from
one community to another community. And it deals
specifically with the Cooper Standards, and the Cooper
Standards are more or less the physical components of
entry level training.

There's been some issues within our state whereby
if somebody in the law enforcement community either
was laid off and then reapplied to another community,

tmj/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

4
May 12, 2011

he or she would have to go through those standards again. It does not eliminate any of the responsibilities dealing with psychological tests or the polygraph test or any of the existing tests. Nor does it do anything for any municipality when they want to hire somebody.

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO 6138. May he please call and I be allowed to summarize?

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Will the Clerk please call LCO 6138, which will be designated House Amendment Schedule "A."

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 6138, House "A," offered by Representative Dargan.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize. Any objection to summarization?

Representative, you may proceed with summarization.

REP. DARGAN (115th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker.

tmj/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

5
May 12, 2011

This amendment just simply clarifies that definition of entry level or level requirements and I move its adoption.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question is on adoption. Remark further?
Remark further?

Representative Giegler.

REP. GIEGLER (138th):

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

A question, through you to the Chairman of the Public Safety Committee.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Please proceed, Madam.

REP. GIEGLER (138th):

Ah, thank you.

The amendment that is before us, is this addressing the concerns the chiefs of police have had regarding officers that either have been in the department for a number of years and are looking to transfer to another department or would it -- and also address those that may be retired that are seeking to get employment in another department where the concern was that background checks and drug testing should still be completed? Because something may have

tmj/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

6
May 12, 2011

occurred that they were forced out of their departments? Or they had action pending by their departments and they're moving to another one?

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Dargan.

REP. DARGAN (115th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. To my good ranking member, she couldn't have put it any better. We are not lowering the any of the standards whatsoever. It's just dealing -- there's been some issues within our state where we've had -- in Hartford for instance. They hired a New York City decorated veteran that had 40 plus years and there was issues with police officers and standards and training to have this individual run the Jim Ryan Mile and so we're just trying to clarify that. So if a local community does want to hire someone that we don't lower the requirements, but we're just dealing with the physical components of the entry level or that lateral transfer. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Giegler.

REP. GIEGLER (138th):

tmj/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

7
May 12, 2011

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate the answers of the Chair. And I accept this amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, a question or two through you to the proponent.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's my understanding in the hiring process now for a, I guess, what you may call a new recruit, the town actually hires the individual and then sends them to the academy. And I believe the town generally would be the entity paying for that training at the academy.

Does passage of this amendment in any way make it easier for that person once they're trained on one town's dime to move to another town and accept

tmj/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

8
May 12, 2011

employment in that second town? Through you, Mr.
Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Dargan.

REP. DARGAN (115th):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. That's a very good question because there was issues where we would call -- in years past, so called poaching, where that community that officer was hired within that community and left for a higher salary within a two year period. And what we had in prior law or in regulation is that if that does happen, that community would have to be compensated for the loss of that law enforcement official so that that community that put the monies up and out to hire that entry level recruit would not be hurt by that transfer. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And again, through you, so this amendment and subsequently the passage of the bill, I'm assuming, as amended, in no way affects that scenario you just described. Through you, Mr.
Speaker.

tmj/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

9
May 12, 2011

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Dargan.

REP. DARGAN (115th):

That is correct.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker and I thank the gentleman for his answer and I also encourage my colleagues to support the amendment. Thank you.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Would you care to remark further on the amendment. Care to remark further on the amendment?

If not let me try your minds, all those -- Representative Kokoruda?

REP. KOKORUDA (101st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise in support of this bill. This bill -- and it has been changed and adjusted and I think the Public Safety Committee worked very hard on it.

Um, small towns and cities are dealing with, you know, financial issues as we all know. And this is one way that they've been able to work through the

tmj/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

10
May 12, 2011

public safety issues by bringing on experienced police officers. And this bill is really going to help make that whole transaction so much better.

I know my police chief is -- supports it and is still very happy that there are -- there still is the other test and the polygraph and the background check. So he still has that, but we can move forward with experienced police officers.

I know we just finally in Madison filled our 28 police officers the other day. We were thrilled with an experienced police officer and the transition was very smooth.

So I do support this bill and I urge my colleagues to do the same. Thank you.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Thank you, Representative.

Would you care to remark further on the amendment? Would you care to remark further?

If not, let me try your minds.

All those in favor of the amendment, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

tmj/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

11
May 12, 2011

Opposed, nay.

The ayes have it, the amendment is adopted.

Remark further on the bill as amended. Remark further on the bill as amended?

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

THE CLERK:

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

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Have all the members voted? (Inaudible) all the members voted? The Clerk will please take a tally.

Clerk, please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 6295 as amended by House "A."

Total Number voting: 124

Necessary for passage: 63

Those voting Yea: 124

Those voting Nay: 0

Those absent or not voting: 27

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

tmj/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

12
May 12, 2011

The bill as amended is passed.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 395.

THE CLERK:

On page 24, Calendar 395, substitute for Senate
Bill Number 849, AN ACT CONCERNING THE LEGISLATIVE
COMMISSIONER'S RECOMMENDATIONS FOR TECHNICAL REVISIONS
AND MINOR CHANGES TO THE INSURANCE AND RELATED
STATUTES, favorable report of the Committee on
Insurance.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Robert Megna, you have the floor,
sir.

REP. MEGNA (97th):

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

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Good afternoon.

REP. MEGNA (97th):

Mr. Speaker, I move the committee's joint
favorable report and passage of the bill in
concurrence with the Senate.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question is acceptance of the Joint
Committee's favorable report and passage of the bill
in concurrence with the Senate.

H – 1119

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2011**

**VOL.54
PART 28
9295 – 9634**

pt/tj/lxe/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

33
June 8, 2011

Total Number Voting	137
Necessary for Passage	69
Those voting Yea	137
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	14

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The Bill is passed.

The Clerk please call Calendar 190.

THE CLERK:

On Page 47, Calendar 190, Substitute for House
Bill Number 6295 AN ACT CONCERNIGN POLICE OFFICERS WHO
ACCEPT EMPLOYMENT WITH ANOTHER POLICE DEPARTMENT, as
amended by House Amendment Schedule "A". Favorable
Report of the Committee on Planning and Development.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative James Albis, you have the floor,
sir.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, good afternoon. Mr.
Speaker, I move for acceptance of the Joint
Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill
in concurrence with the Senate.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question is on acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the Bill.

Will you remark?

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, the House has already passed the underlying Bill unanimously. The Senate amended the Bill and also passed it unanimously with the Amendment LCO Number 8559, which is in the Clerk's possession. I ask that the Clerk please call the Amendment and that I be given leave of the Chamber to summarize.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Will the Clerk please call LCO 8559, which has been previously designated Senate "A".

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 8559, Senate "A", offered by Senators Looney, Fasano, Roraback, Representatives Albis, Candelora.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The Representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize. Any objection? Hearing none, Representative, you may proceed.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

pt/tj/lxe/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

35
June 8, 2011

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. What this Amendment does is, it allows a person who is enrolled in the Municipal Employees Retirement System on long-term disability to have employment with a municipality for under 20 hours a week without having to give up their pension.

I move its adoption.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question is on adoption. Will you remark further? Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Mr. Speaker, some questions to the proponent, through you, please.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I believe I heard the gentleman say it would allow a person who doesn't customarily work 20 hours per week to qualify.

Is that correct? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, currently no member that's enrolled in the Municipal Employees Retirement System is allowed to work with a municipality once they are receiving their pensions.

This allows someone working under 20 hours per week to work with a municipality. Through you.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And again, through you, the language in lines 9 through 11 say, gainful employment shall not include a position in which a member customarily works less than 20 hours per week. Am I reading that correctly? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, you are reading that correctly. What the gainful employment means is that you may not have gainful employment with a municipality if you are receiving such pension. Through you.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

pt/tj/lxe/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

37
June 8, 2011

Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I didn't have a chance to look at the fiscal note. Could the gentleman tell me what that says? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Through you, if you give me one moment. Through you, Mr. Speaker, there will be a municipal, or a minimal cost to the municipality through the Municipal Employees Retirement Fund.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. However, it's not a state mandate. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Through you, correct.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Chapin.

pt/tj/lxe/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

38
June 8, 2011

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the proponent for his answers.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Mr. Speaker, a question through you to the proponent.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Please proceed.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Representative, how does this affect any contracts' existing language between unions and the police department?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, I do not believe it will affect agreements already made, and this has minimal impact throughout the state. There are only one or two instances where this occurs in the entire state, so there would be minimal impact. Through you.

pt/tj/lxe/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

39
June 8, 2011

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and through you, so this is specifically designated for just a couple of municipalities? I apologize. There was just enough noise in the Chamber I couldn't hear your answer.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, that is correct. There are very few instances where this does occur.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, sir. So, through you, Mr. Speaker, the exclusion of someone who is working less than 20 hours a week, how would that affect someone who has met the prerequisite number of years and they are coming back as a part-time employee? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

pt/tj/lxe/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

40
June 8, 2011

Through you, Mr. Speaker, this would allow somebody who met the requisite number of years to come back in a part-time capacity.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

And for legislative intent, so it does not affect their pension? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, that is the intent of this Amendment.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Carter.

REP. CARTER (2nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A few questions through you, to the proponent of the Amendment.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Please proceed.

pt/tj/lxe/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

41
June 8, 2011

REP. CARTER (2nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Through you, in Section 502, line 29 through 40, it looks like it also limits the amount of time somebody could work who is retired for a municipality 20 hours.

My question is, if somebody works, let's say 21 hours during a week, is there any mechanism to make sure that that individual gives back the money to the Retirement Fund? Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, currently you are not allowed to work at all for a municipality if you were receiving a pension. So this actually allows folks to work for under 20 hours a week, and if they do work over 20 hours a week, they will be asked to return that money from their pension. Through you.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Carter.

REP. CARTER (2nd):

Thank you very much, Mr. Speaker. And I guess then the legislative intent is to make that happen. I was just curious, because the way the Bill is written

pt/tj/lxe/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

42
June 8, 2011

it clearly states that if somebody works longer than 90 days I assume at full-time then they have to give the money back.

But it doesn't specify if somebody works over 20 hours in one week, what mechanism will happen to give that money back. Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, it's my understanding that it would be the same mechanism. Through you.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Carter.

REP. CARTER (2nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the proponent for the answers.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Thank you, Representative. Would you care to remark further on the Amendment? Care to remark further on the Amendment?

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

pt/tj/lxe/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

43
June 8, 2011

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Opposed, Nay. The Ayes have it. The Amendment
is adopted. Will you remark further on the Bill as
amended? Will you remark further on the Bill as
amended?

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

THE CLERK:

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

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

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Have all the Members voted? Have all the Members
voted? Please check the Roll Call board to make sure
your vote's been properly cast.

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

THE CLERK:

House Bill 6295 as amended by House "A" and
Senate "A" in concurrence with the
Senate.

pt/tj/lxe/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

44
June 8, 2011

Total Number Voting	138
Necessary for Passage	70
Those voting Yea	137
Those voting Nay	1
Those absent and not voting	13

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The Bill as amended is passed.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 488.

THE CLERK: .

On Page 44, Calendar 488, Substitute for Senate
Bill 152 AN ACT CONCERNING THE ESTABLISHMENT OF THE
CONNECTICUT UMBILICAL CORD BLOOD COLLECTION BOARD.

Favorable Report of the Committee on Finance, Revenue
and Bonding.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (38th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance of
the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of
the Bill in concurrence with the Senate.

SPEAKER DONOVAN:

The question is on acceptance and passage. Will
you remark?

REP. RITTER (38th):

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC
SAFETY AND
SECURITY**

**PART 2
319 - 658**

2011

Do have questions from committee members?
Hearing none, thank you very much.

Our next presenter is Chief Tom Flaherty,
director of POST.

THOMAS FLAHERTY: Good afternoon, Representative
Dargan, Senator Hartley, members of this
committee.

I'm the executive director of the Police Officer
Standards and Training Council in Meriden,
Connecticut. And I've been authorized by them to
speak in opposition to two proposed bills and to
suggest redundancy and unfunded costs in the
third.

HB 6295
HB 6113
HB 5341

Proposed Bill Number 418, AN ACT CONCERNING
RECERTIFICATION OF RETIRED POLICE OFFICERS, POST
currently certifies approximately 8,200 police
officers in the state. One-third of those every
year is eligible for recertification due to being
on a three-year cycle. To add, retired officers
who would pay the cost of their recertification
to our current workload would really result in an
impossible workload for our agency. We have one
individual who handles the entire recertification
efforts. It would also involve billing,
collections, auditing of payments stipulated by
the proposed legislation.

We -- we provide in-service training at our
academy and local police departments also provide
in-service training. Some of our classes are --
we're such a backlog that we provide an interview
and interrogation class. The waiting list to get
into that is quite long, and I don't believe we
can accommodate retired officers. If retired
officers wished to be recertified once they're
rehired by another law enforcement agency, they
can follow the established protocol and statutes

for recertification by, what we call, comparative or lateral certification.

Secondly, proposed Bill 6295, AN ACT CONCERNING LATERAL TRANSFERS OF POLICE OFFICERS. Our Council has -- has worked very hard on -- and very long to establish and maintain professional standards for law enforcement as has this legislature. Lateral certification is an officer who works for one police agency in Connecticut leaving that agency by virtue of a resignation or retirement and then being hired by a second agency.

Currently, lateral certification officers are required to meet the entry-level standards that have been established by the Council. There are some -- some critical standards that should not be waived as provided for in this bill. They're required now to undergo a lic -- driver license check with our motor vehicle department to make sure, one, they have a valid motor vehicle license; two, their right to operate is not suspended; and, three, they've not been convicted of driving under the influence, evasion of responsibility or some other violation that would preclude them from being a police officer.

A candidate for lateral certification has to be interviewed by a person or panel consisting of at least one currently certified police officer in the state of Connecticut. That's to ensure that the knowledge and the expertise of the experienced officer is concurrent with what's expected. A fingerprint examination is required with the FBI. That ensures, obviously, that the person has -- does not have a criminal record that might have occurred since he had been hired or she has been hired by the first agency. It's required to have a background investigation updated, once again, to check all those kinds of

things. A background investigation includes a polygraph examination, an updated psychological examination, and a substance abuse screen. All of those critical standards should continue to remain in place because otherwise the hiring authority would have absolutely conceivably no way to determine if an officer has engaged in misconduct either in a prior employment situation or off duty without those tools to develop that information.

We -- we all know that we've have seen in the media accounts of officers who have engaged in misconducts, some on duty and some off. It's led to discipline, dismissals or resignations. And these steps are critical to finding out information for the hiring authority if it's in existence.

And, lastly, Proposed Bill Number 6113, AN ACT CONCERNING MISSING PERSONS REPORTS. I'd like to suggest to this committee that many of the provisions of that proposed bill are redundant. They were included as a result of Public Act 07-151 where our Council was authorized and mandated by the legislature to develop a statewide policy in handling missing persons investigations.

The proposed legislation, before you, proposes sensitivity training for all police officers. We already provide sensitivity training at the academy and at our satellite academies, in cultural human diversity, human behavior, juvenile law, child abuse, people with special needs, sexual assault, conflict management, domestic violence, suicide management and prevention, interview techniques, immigration law, authority and discretion, and victim witness advocacy. In addition to that, there is a suggestion in this proposed bill that we provide

each of the 8,200 officers in the state with a disc, a CD, or DVD that they can carry on duty with them as a ready reference or an outline on how to conduct a missing person investigation. The cost of that alone is -- is astronomical in terms of our current resources and our technology. I have one IT person at the academy. She estimates that she could produce 100, 500 a week, that's virtually 20 hours -- 20 weeks of nonstop duplicating one disc pursuant to the proposal in this -- in this statute.

In terms of mandating DNA collection, DNA collection is done in routinely in serious criminal investigations, homicide investigations, and I would suggest that we defer that to the chief medical examiner and the medical facilities in this state because there may be an issue of privacy violation that perhaps would preclude that from happening.

HB 5341

Those are my brief comments, Mr. Chairman and Madam Chair. I've submitted written comments on these three proposed bills, and Chief Salvatore and I will be happy to answer any questions if you have any.

REP. DARGAN: Thank you.

Questions?

Senator Witkos, followed by Representative Rebimbas.

SENATOR WITKOS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Good afternoon, Chief.

THOMAS FLAHERTY: Hi, Senator.

SENATOR WITKOS: This is regarding House Bill 6295,

the lateral transfer of police officers. And in your testimony you stated that if we didn't have -- if we allow this bill to go forward, that there wouldn't be any mechanism in place to assure that the person that is currently a police officer looking to work for another police agency may have a criminal record, may ha -- not have a drivers license, and so forth, and so on. But there's nothing in the language that would prohibit an agency from doing their own investigation, a background investigation, on the individual that's looking to apply to their agency is there?

THOMAS FLAHERTY: No, there is not.

SENATOR WITKOS: And is there anything outside of the statutes that currently requires a police agency to follow the POST standards then some type of a test -- it doesn't decide -- determine what type of test it is and they have to meet the entry-level standards -- physical fitness standards established by the POST Council? Is there anything other than that, sir?

THOMAS FLAHERTY: No, sir. They are -- they're in the statute also -- the written examination, the physical fitness exam. There's a couple of other things that are not quite as critical to determining that information as these. They're all in the statutes currently as minimum entry-level standards. And they're applied consistently across the board to new hires, comparative certification and lateral. It's -- it's a process that everyone currently understands throughout the state.

SENATOR WITKOS: I guess my difficulty is with -- with your testimony is that if there is a current working police officer in the state of Connecticut and they're nearing retirement or

they want to leave their place of employment and they are offered another place of employment within the state of Connecticut that they have to continue to go through an entire testing process like a new recruit would when they're actually one of the persons that is entrusted and is currently certified in the State of Connecticut. Could you comment to that?

ANTHONY SALVATORE: If I may -- Chief Salvatore, chairman of the Police Officer Standards and Training Council.

What we're -- what we're proposing in Chief Flaherty's testimony is that -- that no longer be the case and that lateral transfers be treated the same as if hiring a police chief.

We're not opposing the concept of the bill. What we're proposing is that we keep in place the safeguards so that lateral transfers will be treated the same as hiring a police chief in an agency.

SENATOR WITKOS: And with that that testimony, would you require a lateral transfer to go to POST to be run through a physical agility assessment?

ANTHONY SALVATORE: That would be a case-by-case basis, similar to what we do in all lateral transfers and it depends on the situation, but, normally, most of our transfers do not require going back to POST. They may have -- they may be required to make up some additional classes or courses that they've missed, but normally the only time that we require it is just recently we had an individual that was out for 11 years that requested certification and that individual went back to POST for the entire training.

We did make some exceptions, as we're allowed to

under the statute, but that's the only one that I know of recently that we've done since -- since POST has been given more flexibility by this body over the years.

SENATOR WITKOS: That's not how I read the -- your testimony. What I read in the statute, you said that you gave an example of somebody that's been out for 11 years and from what my understanding of -- the way it works is that you are decertified after three years or if you've left employment. And this statute specifically speaks to certified officers. And I'm also concerned about the fact that it's done on a case-by-case basis and we should be treating everybody to the same standard and not on an individual basis and that just raises more concern.

ANTHONY SALVATORE: Senator, problem with treating everybody the same is not everybody that comes -- supposed to be certified is, in fact, the same. Lateral transfers are treated the same presently and for the most cases, as I said, would be treated the same as hiring a municipal police chief. So -- what we're -- I think we're -- we're saying the same thing.

SENATOR WITKOS: And I understand if have to do an assessment if there is a lateral transfer from out of state but if we currently have a certified Connecticut police officer that's looking to move to another agency, would you comment and if they would be required to do all these additional tests, please?

ANTHONY SALVATORE: They -- they would be required to -- to do what you've already said and that's no different that if we were hiring a police off -- police chief in-state coming from another agency.

SENATOR WITKOS: Is there something in the schedule

when -- that you would establish a certain time so municipalities could be expedient in their hiring process. I'm aware that POST offered a class several years ago to allow police officers to be certified in the Cooper standards which is the physical agility portions. Now you used to be able to sign off on folks that passed that agility as one of the requirements to meet the physical fitness standards. And now it's my understanding that they have to go to POST and POST only offers those certification certain times of the year or when it's convenient to their schedule and oftentimes that requires municipalities to wait if that's the only thing that's holding them up for hiring a lateral police officer. Is there something that we could do down at POST to expedite that or allow those who already certified in the Cooper standards to conduct that test, Chief?

THOMAS FLAHERTY: Yeah. Currently that's simply a function of resources, Senator. We have -- we have one person who does that training, the Cooper standards test. There are other options for departments that wish to go out commercially and have that done. But if they -- if a candidate is certif -- is precertified within 30 days of reporting to the academy -- it's a new hire -- then we accept that precertification even if they fail the Cooper standards on their first day. They have another 30 days to -- to get themselves in shape to pass that Cooper standards.

You're right. We did -- we did run classes for the Cooper standards certification instructors. We -- and we haven't done that in a couple years.

SENATOR WITKOS: And -- and I can agree with the new hires because they'll be spending quite a few weeks with you down -- down in Meriden. But I

was speaking specifically to the lateral transfer in which this bill speaks to.

THOMAS FLAHERTY: I think Chief Salvatore just testified that we'd -- we would -- in terms of this bill, probably, treat lateral transfers the same as we do a police chief appointee and that is that the Cooper standards are not required.

SENATOR WITKOS: Thank you very much.

Thank you, Mr. Chair.

REP. DARGAN: Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Good afternoon. Thank you for your testimony. Specifically I want to reference Bill 6113 having to do with the missing adult persons.

I believe in your testimony you had indicated that this is currently already being done; is that correct?

THOMAS FLAHERTY: What I testified to was that in 2007 which was issued in January 2008 -- we issued a statewide policy with guidelines on the investigation of missing persons to every law enforcement agency in the state pursuant to Public Act 07-151. That was sent out for law enforcement agencies. If they did not have an existing policy, they were urged to adopt that. If they had an existing policy that did not include all the provisions of our model policy, they were urged to adopt whatever provisions they needed to and so that has been out in the -- in the law enforcement field since January 2008.

The sensitivity training is something that we're already doing at the academy in a whole bunch of

THOMAS FLAHERTY: We can, yes.

REP. REBIMBAS: -- as well. And I would have to agree with you. That was one of the things that I also wanted to see maybe modified in the bill in the sense of not providing with every individual officer a disc. I think in today's, you know, advancements of technology -- I think that by the department having it and something that is being downloaded on the laptops that are readily already available in the patrolman's car, obviously, would be a wonderful thing and not have that costly need of providing each individual a disc but, again, just downloading the information so that they have it readily available at the scene when they're conducting either their intake or investigation or whatever the case may be.

So, once again, I'll look forward to the follow-up information that you'll be providing us with and thank you for your testimony today.

THOMAS FLAHERTY: Thank you. You're welcome.

REP. DARGAN: Thank you. Chief, just to -- a brief question dealing with the Cooper standards. There -- there's been some incidents in the state -- former police chief in Hartford that had over 30 years of service in a city in New York or the current chief in New Haven that came from Chicago that there was some criticism from their chief-elected officials dealing with the recertification with POST at that time that, you know, some individual that had those years of service had to be like Jim Ryan and run the mile in four minutes. But I know that we've crossed some of those issues that have come forward. Do you see any other clarifications that the legislature needs to do so it'll be a little less

HB 6295

seamless?

THOMAS FLAHERTY: No, I don't -- I don't, Representative Dargan. I think that we've -- we've dealt with that issue on the Cooper standards for police chief candidates. Anyone who comes into the business in a -- in a nonfirst line responder position -- some departments hire commanders, for instance, instead of a, you know, rather than a mid level management. They're not required to do the Cooper by Council regulations. I think we've dealt with that issue.

I think it's critical that we maintain the ability for police chiefs to delve into this background investigation information even though the candidate may be coming from another agency. We -- we have situations that both Chief Salvatore and I are aware of where an officer in one department had engaged in some sort of misconduct that that agency was not even aware of and doesn't become apparent until that candidate applies to another department and they go through this selection process.

REP. DARGAN: Thank you for that. Just some questions in referencing what we've been working on for a few years, 6113 dealing with missing persons again. I know that there's a bill us this year that a few legislators on the committee, myself, my co chair, Representative Rebimbas and Vickie Nardello has working on this year. We also have a number of testimony that you might not be around to listen to the Smolinski family, to Vickie Nardello, to other members of the Smolinski family, Michelle Cruz from the State Victim Advocate along with testimony from Survivors of Homicide about this -- about the current bill. And I know that this came about because of the Smolinski family and what happened to their son in -- in Waterbury. And over the

and their ability to provide public safety for the residents, businesses, and visitors and, respectfully, ask that you hold your vote.

As an individual who has worked numerous construction permit sites with many a story to tell, I welcome your questions and I thank you.

REP. DARGAN: Thank you very much for your testimony.

Is there any questions at all?

Thank you very much.

The next presenter in Anthony Zona, Connecticut Council Police.

JEFFREY MATCHETT: Representative Dargan, Senator Hartley, I'm Jeffrey Matchett, executive director of AFSCME Council 15. And President Zona, from our executive board was unable to be here to provide the testimony.

SB418
HB6110
HB6295
HB6268

REP. DARGAN: And Patrick, too?

JEFFREY MATCHETT: And Patrick Gainer, as well. You've received their written testimony, and I'm just going to speak very briefly on that and answer any questions that you may have.

REP. DARGAN: And that individual next to you is who?

THOMAS CAROZZA: Thomas Carroza, lobbyist for Council 15.

JEFFREY MATCHETT: Senator, I'll start with Senate Bill 895. Ladies and gentlemen of the committee, thank you very much for providing us this opportunity.

We're here in favor of Senate Bill 895, AN ACT

INCREASING THE PENALTY FOR ENGAGING OFFICERS IN VEHICULAR PURSUITS. Currently, it's a misdemeanor. We're asking that it be raised to a Class D felony. We think that this bill would provide safety for -- not only the general public and pedestrians, motorists but as well as police officers.

Right now, the bill, as it's there, I'm (inaudible) bill be law as it stands. There's no jail time provided for engaging a police officer in pursuit as it stands. So we're supportive of this bill in upping the penalties to a felony.

The next bill that you have before you that we're in support of is Senate Bill 418, AN ACT CONCERNING RE-CERTIFICATION OF RETIRED POLICE OFFICERS. We feel that, at no cost to the municipalities, that the police officer retired from he would be able to keep up his certification at his own cost in the event that a year or so from his time of retirement he wants to continue employment with another municipality.

It would save municipalities the cost of sending someone back to the academy or re-certifying them themselves and get a very qualified employee capable of performing the job in communities with those specific skills that are unique to law enforcement officials.

The next bill that we are in support of is 6110, which is the house bill. This bill is regarding lateral transfers of police officers. Currently, POST requires that any police officers transferring from one department to another go through the rehiring process, essentially.

HB6295

We're asking that the lateral transfer process be the same as it if you were the chief of police or administrator, or so forth, the same

requirements. Not have to jump through the hoops that -- you're already certified so let's just move you from one department to another in the event.

I'm sorry. I want to make a correction on that bill. It's 6295, not 6110.

The next bill is 6268. You've heard a lot of support from Hartford. You've heard support from AFSCME Council 4, the corrections officers, with regards to the mandatory minimum sentencing, and we're also in favor of that same bill. There were some statistics that were provided today are staggering and we do do a -- let me precipitate that with I was a police officer for 20 years, prior to becoming the executive director of Council 15, so I know firsthand the dangers that we face on a daily basis as police officers. And with no bite to the penalties, there's no deterrent. A mandatory two-year sentence for these criminals would make our communities safer and give our police officers a better opportunity to do their jobs safely.

And, lastly, is 6110. We heard earlier from Representative Aman that he would like section 2 removed from that particular bill and we're in support of that as well. We think that this will make a good bill better. They're also in support -- the chiefs were also in support of this bill and the removal of that section that makes a municipality a requirement. We support it, and I'll answer any questions.

REP. DARGAN: Thank you.

Questions from any committee member?

Questions?

SENATE BILL 418
HOUSE BILL 6110
HOUSE BILL 6268
HOUSE BILL 6295

TESTIMONY OF JEFFREY MATCHETT
EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR

CONNECTICUT COUNCIL OF POLICE UNIONS
AFSCME, COUNCIL 15

BEFORE THE PUBLIC SAFETY AND SECURITY COMMITTEE OF
THE CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

FEBRUARY 15, 2011

Ladies and Gentlemen of the Committee, my name is Jeffrey Matchett and I am Executive Director with AFSCME Council 15, a labor union representing the interests of more than 4000 police officers in 62 municipal communities throughout Connecticut.

I am here today to speak in favor of the following bills before this Committee:

418 – AN ACT CONCERNING RECERTIFICATION OF RETIRED POLICE OFFICERS. – This bill would allow retired police officers to retain their police certifications, provided that they meet the requirements for re-certification, and pay the cost of re-certification. Currently, re-certification requires a sponsoring police agency. However, this bill will allow police officers to retain certification without a sponsoring agency, provided they have retired from a Connecticut department. It makes sense because it will provide retirees with the opportunity to return to police work at a department which may seek a seasoned veteran officer, and which does not choose to pay the cost of training a recruit, which can cost \$50,000 per officer. It will make our communities safer, and give employment opportunities to many of our police officers who remain capable of performing the job in communities which could use their skills and experience.

6295 – AN ACT CONCERNING LATERAL TRANSFERS OF POLICE OFFICERS. – This bill is similar to SB 418 in that it makes movement of trained and certified police officers between departments more available. Currently, POST requires that officers who seek to move laterally to an entry-level position, pass all of the entry-level requirements for new recruits, including satisfaction of the physical fitness standards, and passage of a polygraph and psychological exam. This despite the fact that these officers have a POST certification at the time they seek the transfer, and the fact that officers who are certified, have no requirement to pass a physical fitness, psychological, or polygraph exam in order to maintain certification. This bill will allow more movement among police departments and give municipalities the ability to employ

experienced and seasoned police officers within their police departments without being forced to incur the \$50,000 cost of sending a recruit through the academy process. It makes good sense for police officers, and it makes good sense for municipalities.

6268 – AN ACT IMPOSING A MANDATORY MINIMUM SENTENCE FOR ASSAULT OF PUBLIC SAFETY, EMERGENCY MEDICAL OR PUBLIC TRANSIT PERSONNEL. We support this bill because each day our police officers are sent into the community to enforce the laws and keep our communities safe. And oftentimes, those individuals who make our communities unsafe, take the liberty of assaulting police officers without the threat of severe consequences for doing so. We ask our police officers to do a difficult job which is frequently made more difficult by criminals who have no fear of penalties for assaulting a police officer. A mandatory two-year minimum sentence for these criminals will make our communities safer, and give our police officers a better opportunity to do their jobs safely.

We are opposed to the following bill:

6110 – AN ACT REQUIRING DOUBLED FINES FOR CERTAIN VIOLATIONS IN MUNICIPAL CONSTRUCTION ZONES AND PROHIBITING MUNICIPALITIES FROM REQUIRING POLICE SUPERVISION OF CONSTRUCTION ZONES.

The bill proposes at Section 2 that “No municipality shall require that a police officer supervise traffic at a construction zone on a municipal road, as defined in section 13a-110a of the general statutes.” We are opposed to this provision because it puts the public safety at risk. Police departments are charged with the authority of ensuring the public safety and maintaining the public peace. Police departments are uniquely qualified for assessing and determining when and where police officers may be needed to ensure that the public remains safe at all times. Frequently work zones are places where police officers, trained in traffic direction, and cloaked with the authority to enforce the law and maintain the peace, are needed to ensure the orderly flow of traffic and maintain the safety of those individuals who are placed in harm’s way at work sites. By taking the authority to maintain the public safety at these work sites away from police departments or municipalities, safety at these sites will be placed in the hands of private vendors who are driven by profit motives rather than motives of ensuring public safety. This bill promotes bad policy and places the public safety at risk. We cannot support it, and neither should this committee.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**PUBLIC
SAFETY AND
SECURITY**

**PART 3
659 – 992**

2011



State of Connecticut
Police Officer Standards and Training Council
Connecticut Police Academy



Proposed Bill No. 6295

An Act Concerning Lateral Transfers of Police Officers

As Executive Director of the Police Officer Standards and Training Council and a representative of the Council's Legislative Committee, I have been authorized to speak in opposition to this Bill.

Sec. 7-294e-1 of the Regulations of State Agencies defines "Lateral certification" as the certification of a currently certified police officer to a new position as a police officer with a different law enforcement unit within the state.

Sec 7-294e-2. Eligibility for Lateral Certification or Comparative Certification – requires that "A candidate for lateral certification to a position as a police officer in any law enforcement unit within the state shall meet all council entry level requirements."

Over a long period of time, the Council has established entry level standards to ensure that police officer applicants comply with the entry level standards whether those applicants are new police recruits, lateral applicants from another in state agency or applicants from an out of state agency or from an in state agency who is exempt from certification requirements. These standards have been adopted to permit hiring of candidates who are expected to perform with honesty, integrity and in the best interests of their employing agencies.

Should this bill be enacted exempting standards for lateral certification candidates, the hiring authorities would be precluded from developing accurate information about whether or not a candidate should be offered employment in the law enforcement field.

These standards have been applied to lateral certification candidates to ensure that police officers who transfer have not engaged in illegal or unethical conduct, which may be unknown to their previous employer, before employment at a new agency.

I will point out the critical selection standards that develop information absolutely required for a hiring decision in a police agency.

1. An applicant must have a valid license to operate a motor vehicle from this state or another and his or her right to operate a motor vehicle is not suspended. Without this standard, hiring agencies would not have this information available.
2. An applicant must have been interviewed by a Personal Interview Panel including one or more Connecticut POST certified law enforcement officers. If this entry level standard did not apply, a hiring agency might be subjected to the impact of a political decision and/or might not be able to determine the knowledge, expertise and experience of the lateral candidate.



CALEA Internationally Accredited Public Safety Training Academy

285 Preston Avenue • Meriden, Connecticut 06450-4891

An Equal Opportunity and Affirmative Action Employer

3. A fingerprint examination submitted to the F.B.I. This ensures that a candidate for instance has not been arrested in another jurisdiction but unknown to the hiring authority.
4. A candidate must undergo a criminal records check in order to reveal if that candidate has a criminal record under federal or state law for a felony, Class A or Class B Misdemeanor or any misdemeanor crime involving domestic violence or who has committed any act which constitutes perjury or false statement. The impact of not doing this is apparent.
5. A candidate must be the subject of a background investigation that includes the completion of a personal history and a check to ascertain whether the candidate has a record of motor vehicle law conviction for operating a motor vehicle under the influence of intoxicating beverages or narcotics or controlled substances or evasion of responsibility. It is very likely that someone could have such a conviction with it being unknown to the current employer and certainly might not be discovered by the prospective employer.
6. The background investigation includes the completion of a polygraph examination. This process permits the hiring agency to determine information which simply may not be available about the applicants conduct from any other source.
7. The background investigation also includes the completion of a psychological examination. There have been cases where incumbent police officers have suffered emotional or psychological anomalies that have led to performance issues and eventual resignation or termination from the employing agency.
8. A candidate is required to have a controlled substance screen indicating no presence of a controlled substance not prescribed. Once again, the reasoning underlying this standard is apparent.
9. Lastly, of the critical standards, an applicant must certify under oath that they have been truthful in the process. Any conduct which constitutes perjury, false statement or tampering with physical evidence would preclude the hiring of such candidates. The Legislature, not too long ago, included this type of conduct as a basis for decertification of a police officer.

In conclusion, there have been incidents, some in the fairly recent past where actively employed police officers have engaged in misconduct, some on duty and some off and that misconduct has led to their discipline, resignations or dismissal. If this Bill were enacted, conceivably, a hiring authority might not ever discover this activity.

S - 632

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2011**

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

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

495
June 7, 2011

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Also, calendar page 12, Calendar 500, House

Bill Number 6614.

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

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Also, calendar page 12, Calendar 507, House

Bill Number 6295.

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

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Also, calendar page 12, Calendar 508, House

Bill Number 6222.

Move to place the item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

518
June 7, 2011

SENATOR LOONEY:

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, ah...

THE CHAIR:

The Senate please come back to order. Senate
please come back to order.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

At this point we have one item to remove from
the Consent Calendar. And to...

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR LOONEY:

To mark it go and then we'll have one item to
add, and then another item to mark go. The item to
be removed from the Consent Calendar, Madam
President, is calendar page 12, Calendar 507, House
Bill 6295. If that item might be removed from the
Consent Calendar and marked go.

THE CHAIR:

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

519
June 7, 2011

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you Madam President.

And an item to be placed on the Consent Calendar, Madam President, is calendar page 14, Calendar 517, House Bill Number 6350. That item will be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

And also, an item, another item to be marked go, is on calendar page 13, Calendar 513, House Bill Number 6557; an act concerning liability for recreational use of lands. That item might, would be marked go.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, if we might have the Clerk now read the items on the Consent Calendar so that we might proceed to a vote on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

540
June 7, 2011

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you Madam President.

One additional item, final item, to call before calling the Consent Calendar, and that is the item on calendar page 12, Calendar 507, House Bill 6295.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Mr. Clerk

THE CLERK:

Madam President, calling from calendar page 12, Calendar number 507, Substitute for House Bill Number 6295; AN ACT CONCERNING POLICE OFFICERS WHO ACCEPT EMPLOYMENT WITH ANTOHER POLICE DEPARTMENT, as amended by House Amendment Schedule "A," which is LCO Number 6138. The Clerk is in possession of amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley, good evening, or good morning almost.

SENATOR HARTLEY:

Yes, almost Madam President.

Madam President, I move acceptance of the Joint Committees Favorable Report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the House, Madam.

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

541
June 7, 2011

THE CHAIR:

Approval on the bill.

Will you remark further?

SENATOR HARTLEY:

Yes. This bill simply allows lateral transfers for police officers. It is helped municipalities to allow seasoned police officers to be available when there are openings. There is also a House amendment which was essentially a clean-up amendment to say that in such a lateral transfer those police officers...

THE CHAIR:

Senator Hartley, do you want to call the amendment first, please.

SENATOR HARTLEY:

It's not a strike all, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

Ok.

SENATOR HARTLEY:

Yea.

THE CHAIR:

Sorry.

SENATOR HARTLEY:

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

542
June 7, 2011

So the House amendment simply said that they would still have to continue to meet entry-level requirements, and I would like to yield, Madam, to Senator Fasano for an amendment, Madam.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano, will you accept the yield sir?

SENATOR FASANO:

Thank you, Madam President.

Yes I do accept the yield. I would ask the Clerk to call LCO 8559, 8559.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, will you call 8559 please?

THE CLERK:

Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of LCO Number 8559, which shall be designated Senate Schedule Amendment "A," introduced by Senator Looney, Senator Fasano, Senator Roraback, Representative Albis and Representative Candelora, copies of which have been made available.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO:

Thank you, Madam President.

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

543
June 7, 2011

Request permission to summarize. I move the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Questions on adoption. Please continue sir.

SENATOR FASANO:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, what this essentially does it allows a person who's retirement on the State municipal retirement system for disability to be able to work 20 hours, not more than 20 hours per week, for gainful employment and still receive the disability payments.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Let me try your minds.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you Madam President.

Madam President, speaking in support of the amendment. This is a bipartisan amendment that would, in fact, allow someone who is disabled to have a part-time, elected position in a municipality.

Thank you, Madam President.

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

544
June 7, 2011

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark further? Will you remark..

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

It is a friendly amendment and I would ask that everyone support it.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

I will try your minds. All in favor of the amendment please say aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed, nay?

The amendment passes.

Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY:

And if there is no objection, Madam President, I would ask that this be moved to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

545
June 7, 2011

See no objections, so ordered.

Senator Looney.

(Pause.)

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

A couple of additional items to place on the
Consent Calendar at this time before voting...

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Before voting that second Consent Calendar.
The first, Madam President, is calendar page 2,
Calendar 580, 580, Substitute for House Bill 6250.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

And the second...

THE CHAIR:

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

547
June 7, 2011

From the items previously placed on the Consent Calendar, the first one is on calendar page 12, Calendar 507, Substitute for House Bill Number 6295.

The second is on page 20, Calendar number 556, House Bill 6249.

The next is on calendar page 23, House Bill 569, I mean Calendar 596, House Bill 5816.

Next is on page 25, Calendar 580, House Bill 6250.

The next is on page 44, Calendar 296, Senate Bill 1160.

THE CHAIR:

Will you call for a roll call vote, please?
And the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

An immediate roll call vote has been ordered 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:

Senator Musto, will you join us in a vote please?

Thank you sir.

mhr/cd/gbr
SENATE

548
June 7, 2011

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

THE CLERK:

Madam President.

Vote on the second Consent Calendar.

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

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar 2 has passed.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, would move all items voted this evening that require additional action in the House of Representatives be immediately transmitted.

THE CHAIR:

See no objections, so ordered sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, since it is midnight I was tempted to make a motion for sine die but I think