

PA12-034

HB5318

House	1709-1726	18
Planning & Development	510-514, 612C	6
<u>Senate</u>	<u>2951, 2952-2953</u>	<u>3</u>
		27

H – 1127

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2012**

**VOL.55
PART 5
1395 – 1745**

machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

The House is voting by roll call; all members to the Chambers, please. The House is voting by roll call.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked.

The Clerk will take a tally. And the Clerk will announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 139.

Total number voting	139
Necessary for passage	70
Those voting Yea	139
Nay	0
Not voting	12

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The bill is passed, in concurrence with the Senate.

Mr. Clerk, kindly call Calendar 99.

THE CLERK:

On page 4, Calendar 99, Substitute for House

Bill 5318, AN ACT CONCERNING THE REVISION OF
MUNICIPAL CHARTERS, favorable report of Planning and
Development.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Gentleman from Hartford, Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The question is on acceptance and passage.

Would you explain the bill, please, sir?

REP. RITTER (1st):

Yes, through you, Mr. Speaker.

Essentially, we had this last year and it's
been a bipartisan effort in the Planning and
Development Committee, in particular.

Currently, when we establish charter revision
commissions in the State of Connecticut for those
municipalities which have charters, the language
reads that the -- the -- that basically the
appointed authority can give a charge to the
commission; however, the commission is free, as it

so desires, to review any item that it wants. So the charge is, I suppose, advisory at best, if nothing more. And that has caused problems in some commissions of costly reviews of their charters when the appointing authority perhaps did not want them to go down that road and how they reviewed the charter.

The way the amendment to the statute will read is that after October 1, 2012, any charter revision commissions that are empaneled by a municipality, like I said, that has a charter, the items for inclusion opposed to charter -- for imposed charter, the ones they can review are only those deemed desirable or necessary by the appointing authority.

So essentially what we're doing is we're giving the appointing authority, which is often cases a town council or a board of selectmen, the ability to sort of limit what the review of a charter commission can be.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

Remark further on the bill?

Distinguished Ranking Member of the Planning

and Development Committee, Representative Aman.

REP. AMAN (14th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Yes, this does deal with something that especially the smaller towns have been involved in, in wanting to make minor changes to their charter. The cost of bringing in the legal assistance to do a complete review is very high. As a result, we have charters that are very, very much out of date. Hopefully this will make it a little easier for towns to revise their charters when they only have fairly minor revisions.

From my instance, in my own town, it requires anything over \$2500 to go out to competitive bid. And in this economy, trying to find to buy anything under \$2500 is fairly difficult and, of course, has caused any number of problems for our purchasing people.

So it's this type of changes that would be looked at by a charter commission and avoid things like a strong mere system change or other very politically charged items from coming up under the revision.

There is nothing in the bill, however, that

stops a municipality from saying yes, at this time we want a full charter revision commission to look at every single aspect in the charter.

So I urge my colleagues to support the bill.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

The gentleman from New Milford, Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Some questions to the proponent, through you, please.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I heard you say that the appointing authority would in probably all likelihood be the authority that may also set the charge for the charter revision commission.

Is that correct, through you, Mr. Speaker?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Ritter, do you care to respond?

REP. RITTER (1st):

Yes. The appointing authority is charged under state statute with setting the -- the charge for the commission.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker; and, again, through you.

So I'm assuming that would be held during a public meeting so the public would have an opportunity not only to add input as to who is being appointed to the commission but also as to the charge as well, at that point.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, that is correct.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Chapin.

REP. CHAPIN (67th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I thank the gentleman for his answers.

Mr. Speaker, I do believe that the bill before us does provide certainly adequate opportunity for the public to weigh in. There are times when this body may actually pass legislation that makes a town's charter inconsistent with state statute, and I think those times are certainly opportunities where a town may want to engage in some sort of a limited charter revision.

I appreciate the advocates and the Planning and Development Committee's support of the bill in bringing it forward this year, and I encourage my colleagues to support it.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

The gentleman [sic] from Simsbury,
Representative Schofield.

REP. SCHOFIELD (16th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, I just have a couple questions for the proponent of the bill, sir.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed, madam.

REP. SCHOFIELD (16th):

Thank you.

I actually am interested in the prior speaker's comments about public meetings. I've actually been on a charter review commission before and I don't -- didn't remember there being a public meeting where there was input from the public about what the charge would be.

Could the proponent please elaborate on whether there is a statutory requirement for such a public meeting or can the board of selectmen simply decide the charge, themselves?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I mean, every municipality probably has a -- a different approach once they sort of decide to impanel a commission. I -- I can't speak to any individual experience that you had, but as the previous speaker alluded to, what I think that one would normally see when you impanel a charter revision commission is, let's say it's a town council and the City of Hartford would just impanel

one, for example.

The commission members have to be approved by a vote of the appointed authority, in this case, the legislative body, and in that task of appointing them, they also would put a charge together. So I suppose that the public would, just like any other item that they would act on or a resolution, would have rights to review the minutes; they could speak at a generic public hearing before that town council meeting, although it may not be specific to charter revision.

So I guess I would say that if there definitely is a chance for input in what the charge is, but I think it is accurate to say that the appointed authority, the legislative body is given that authority to do so and they can listen to the public at their -- or not listen to the public at their own peril, is what I would say.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. SCHOFIELD (16th):

Thank --

REP. RITTER (1st):

Representative Schofield.

REP. SCHOFIELD (16th):

-- you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

One other question: When the -- in my town it's a board of selectmen -- when they determine what the charge will be, is it based on a majority vote of the board of selectmen or is there minority opportunity to also have a topic added to the charge that maybe the majority doesn't want to have but that many people in town might want to see included?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1st):

Yes. The -- the one thing I would say is that I think it's a majority vote of the legislative body, if they're making the recommendations. But you do have the right of petition, which might help protect some of the minority interests that you're referring to.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Madam Schofield.

REP. SCHOFIELD (16th):

Oh; thank you.

So could you help me understand the right of

petition, please? Would that mean that only the minority person on the board of selectmen could petition or any member of the public can petition to put something on the charge? And does it then need to be adopted by the entire legislative body or can any member of the public petition and successfully put something into the charge?

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It's sort of a -- a long answer, and I'll try to be brief, through you.

But essentially if the charge is coming from the legislative body, you know, as we have sort of the -- the way it would work is if you had three members of a board of selectmen, I suppose their charge could be two to one. It could be very political and you could have an issue in which the minority party and majority party simply disagree.

You also have the right of petition which could be done by residents who meet a certain threshold, which could bring an item, be part of the conversation.

Ultimately, once the recommendations have gone through and the charter revision commission hands the legislative body or the appointing authority what their recommendations are, they can either -- they can adopt those or they can reject those provisions. So the charter provision commission, through you, Mr. Speaker, can never set policy without the appointing authority's say so or approval.

However, there is a mechanism -- in this particular chapter of the General Statutes it's 7-190-something -- I don't know off the top of my head -- in which if the legislative body rejected certain recommendations from the charter revision commission, residents could then also seek another petition to have that item included in the charter revision vote.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Schofield.

REP. SCHOFIELD (16th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I appreciate the gentleman's answers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, madam.

The gentleman from the 135th, Representative
Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Through you, a question or two to the --

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Proceed, sir.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

-- proponent.

Thank you, and through you, a couple questions
on mechanics, I guess.

I -- I like the thrust of this bill, right, and
my question was really triggered by some of the
previous discussion. If the commission or if
this -- if the charter revision possibility is
limited by the referral but then during the public
hearings a discussion ensues where arguably it
expands upon what the charter or the scope was, I'm
concerned about whether or not there's going to be a
germaneness dispute, you know, whether it be after
the fact in a -- in a litigation or do they have to
start the process over?

The -- and through you, Mr. Speaker, could --

my question is: How do you iron that out?

Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

And I'll tell you what; whoever the town attorney is in this concept whose, as Representative Aman alluded -- through you, Mr. Speaker -- about who you hire to do this got to be really careful in how you sort of -- what the -- and even the -- the drafting of that charge is going to be critical in this case.

Because I think it's a fair point if -- if, for example, the appointing authority said something to the effect of, you know, we have nine -- I'll give you the City of Hartford, for example; we elect nine people at large -- they said, you know what? Let's do district voting; right? Well, is it -- that's a -- we think we can figure it out but then what if they did a hybrid; is that ignoring the charge?

And I can certainly understand where you can make that case. So I guess what you can say is that the charge has got to be very well written, and

ultimately I think the -- the town attorney has to make a determination if they've gone beyond that scope.

Through you, Mr. Speaker, there is one protection, though, of course, that let's say the commission goes rogue, if you will, and comes up these -- these suggestions. Ultimately, it would get rejected by the legislative body, is my guess, for being outside the charge or just because they voted it down. And that might be a good firewall protection.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, and through you, one final question.

With -- can the appointing authority under this new construct have essentially a, I don't know, a line-item veto, per se, if they did, maybe not go rogue but kind of came back with recommendations or suggestions or their resolutions that, you know, Items 1 through 8 but the appointing authority said, you know, I think Number 3 and 5 went over the line? Would the appointing authority in this construct

have the ability to reject those individual items
but not the others? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Ritter.

REP. RITTER (1st):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

I don't know if this bill changes the way it works now, which again is that, yeah, they have the right to -- to pick and choose which items they prefer and send a referendum. Having said that, though, and this is, I think, the -- the question from the good Representative from Simsbury, that she alluded to, is if there's an idea that the public is so in favor of and a board of selectmen had a, you know, was not listening to its residents, they could petition it to referendum. So there is redress in case you had a -- a governing body that, for some reason, disregarded the public's will or the charter revision's commission will.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Representative Shaban.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I thank the gentleman for his answers.

I'm going to vote in favor of the bill. I thank the -- the effort and thank you for bringing it to the floor.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Thank you, sir.

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

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

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll call; members to the Chamber, please. The House of Representatives is voting by roll call; all members to the Chambers.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted? If all the members have voted, the machine will be locked.

The Clerk will take the tally, and the Clerk will announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

House Bill 5318.

Total number voting	142
Necessary for passage	72
Yea	137
Nay	5
Not voting	9

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The bill is passed.

Mr. Clerk, please call Calendar 233.

THE CLERK:

On page 14, Calendar 233, Substitute for House
Bill Number 5515, AN ACT CONCERNING PHYSICIANS
ASSISTANTS, favorable report on the Committee of
Public Health.

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

Distinguished Vice Chairman of the Public
Health Committee, Representative Lyddy.

REP. LYDDY (106th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

The question is on acceptance and passage.
Would you explain the bill, please, sir?

REP. LYDDY (106th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this bill is a result of Public Act 11-209, which basically set forth a procedure to address requests for a change in a professional scope of practice and therefore has been -- there's been significant stakeholder input into this bill and into the agreement of this bill.

The bill as written sets in place protocols for supervision of physician's assistants in two ways; the first, ensuring that the documentation of the supervising physician's relationship to the physician assistant is clear and identified, and two, documenting the expectations of the physician assistant's role in delivering patient care.

I want to make sure that it's clear that the bill has been signed off by -- by the physicians assistants, the Connecticut Hospital Association, the Connecticut Department of Public Health, and the Connecticut State Medical Society.

To further describe the bill, the definition of supervision in a hospital setting for physician assistants is found in lines 4 through 21 and covers the following areas: (1) It ensures that continuous

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**PLANNING AND
DEVELOPMENT
PART 2
342 -679**

2012

1

slj/gbr PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT
COMMITTEE

March 2, 2012

10:30 A.M.

CHAIRMAN: Senator Cassano
Representative Gentile

MEMBERS PRESENT:

SENATORS: Fasano

REPRESENTATIVES: Grogins, Fasano, Aman,
Candelora, David, Flexer,
Fritz, Korkoruda, Lemar,
O'Brien, Perillo,
Reynolds, Ritter, Rojas,
Simanski, R., A. Smith

SENATOR CASSANO: Good morning. Good morning,
welcome to the public hearing of the Planning
and Development Committee. As per our usual
rules, we will have elected officials speak
first. If we get into a second hour, we will
rotate back and forth. We also -- if you'll
notice, the sign up has been based by bills so
that when the bill comes up, please be ready
for yours. There are not a lot of them on the
Agenda.

To begin, I'd like Representative Clark Chapin
from New Milford, and then John Shaban,
Easton, Redding and Wilton -- Weston.

REP. CHAPIN: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Good
morning. Good morning, Madam Chair and
members of the Planning and Development
Committee. For the record, my name is Clark
Chapin, the State Representative from the 67th
District.

I'm here today, first of all, to thank you for
the opportunity to provide testimony in
support of Raised Bill 5318, AN ACT CONCERNING
THE REVISION OF MUNICIPAL CHARTERS. As I'm

sure you recall, it met with kind of a surprising demise last year, and I am pleased to see -- number one, I'm pleased to see it back again this year as well as some changes that I think address some of the concerns that were raised through the process last year.

One of the criticisms last year was that others believed that perhaps it cut down on the opportunity for people to -- for the public to offer input. I certainly know in my own towns, through my own town's experience, the public has an opportunity not only to address who would be appointed to charter revision, but also what that charge may be. And I think the provision that was added this year that suggested if the charter had been reviewed in the last -- over a 12-year period, I think that that addresses some of those concerns as well.

So, again, you have my written testimony. But thank you very much for raising the bill this year, and I'm happy to answer any questions and also help move the bill along.

SENATOR CASSANO: Thank you for testifying.

Any questions from members of the panel?
Linda? Madam Co-Chair.

REP. GENTILE: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Clark, first of all, I'd like to thank you for coming in and giving testimony, and your tenacity in pushing this bill forward. I believe it's an important piece of legislation. But I just want to clarify something.

I know that one of the big changes here is

that instead of having -- when you open a charter for revision, instead of having everything subject to revision, you can pick limited items; is that correct?

REP. CHAPIN: That is correct.

REP. GENTILE: And that the appointing authority, whatever that may be, whether it's a mayor, First Selectman, a Board or whatever, that those individuals would have the final say as to whether or not to in fact go forward with the revisions that are recommended, correct?

REP. CHAPIN: That is correct.

REP. GENTILE: Okay. Just for legislative intent. Thank you again, Clark.

REP. CHAPIN: And I would also point out that there's two ways charters -- charter revision can begin. One is by that appointing authority commencing the action. The other is by petition. Of course, those -- nothing in this bill would change any of that petition portion of the statute that allows the general public who thinks it's a good idea to undergo charter revision to still come forward in the way that they always have.

REP. GENTILE: And, again, I just wanted to make sure that it was clear legislatively because I think that was some of the problem last year, that it quite frankly surprised us that it, you know, it died. But I think those concerns have been addressed and have been clarified. So, again, I thank you.

REP. CHAPIN: Well, hopefully it will be the easiest bill that this Committee passes this year.

REP. GENTILE: Let's hope so. Thank you.

REP. CHAPIN: Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO: Let me -- one follow-up question, because we heard this a couple of times.

There's some -- the Mayors themselves, First Selectmen, express concern that we could literally select every four to six years what we want to, but never really look at the charter. A suggestion was made that every town should review its charter at least once every 10 years. Would you be amenable to something like that?

REP. CLARK CHAPIN: Yes, similar to how towns are -- having that requirement on their plans of conservation and development. I think -- I might draw a differentiation in that a plan of conservation and development is more of a dynamic document for a municipality whereas if you have a real strong charter, it should stand the test of time. I'm not sure you can -- and I was the one who put them in the same category, and I'm not sure that I should have done that. But certainly, at least undertaking some sort of a review can't be considered a bad thing.

SENATOR CASSANO: Thank you.

Anyone else?

Thank you very much. Oops, I'm sorry, Lonnie. Representative Reed.

REP. REED: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

Just a quick question. So, I'm trying to --

because I, I loved this bill last year. This would work very well in my District. So, it was just a language issue or conceptually were people concerned that we would be cherry picking items out of the charter, or both?

REP. CHAPIN: As I recall reading the Governor's veto message, it had to do with whether it limited the public's opportunity to participate and whether or not, quite frankly -- and actually Senator Cassano brought this up last year during the hearing -- whether it would be used politically. I think at that time I might have suggested that charter revision under our existing statute gets used politically and some of those opportunities may continue to exist. But I think this change -- I think the benefits of this change would outweigh any of the negative aspects.

REP. REED: Thanks for refreshing my memory. So many of these bills have interesting journeys. So, it's good to kind of catch up with their story line. Thank you for testifying.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR CASSANO: Anyone else?

Thank you very much.

REP. CHAPIN: Thank you.

SENATOR CASSANO: Representative John Shaban, then Gayle Weinstein.

REP. SHABAN: I want to thank the Chairs, vice Chairs, ranking members and the members for giving me a couple minutes today. I'm John Shaban, State Rep from 135th which is Weston,

SB263



State of Connecticut

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STATE CAPITOL

REPRESENTATIVE CLARK J. CHAPIN
SIXTY-SEVENTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING ROOM 4200
HARTFORD, CT 06106-1591

TOLL FREE (800) 842-1423
Clark.Chapin@housegop.ct.gov

ASSISTANT REPUBLICAN LEADER

RANKING MEMBER
ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

MEMBER
FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE
HUMAN SERVICES COMMITTEE

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF RB 5318
AN ACT CONCERNING THE REVISION OF MUNICIPAL CHARTERS

Planning and Development Committee Public Hearing
March 2, 2012

Thank you for the opportunity to provide testimony in support of RB 5318, An Act Concerning the Revision of Municipal Charters. This bill is intended to provide municipalities with an **option** to engage in a limited charter revision process. By having such an option, the appointing authority would be able to either set a limited agenda of what may be considered by the charter revision commission or direct the commission to undertake a comprehensive review.

CGS 7-190 states that 'The commission may also consider other items for inclusion in the proposed charter, other changes to the charter or home rule ordinance and such other items as it deems desirable or necessary.' Often times, municipalities are reluctant to make necessary changes to their charters since everything is subject to scrutiny once a charter is opened up under existing law. Those who have served on a charter revision commission know that public comment and hearings along with deliberations can be both time-consuming and costly. By providing an option to allow for limited items to be considered when appropriate, municipalities may be more likely to update their charters in a timely and cost-effective manner.

It is important to note that the public would still have an opportunity to provide input regarding the commission's charge at the time the commission is appointed. Also, this legislation does not in any way change the process for charter revision commenced by petition (CGS 7-189) which may include a list of general or specific recommendations for consideration. It simply provides the appointing authority with the option of limiting consideration to those general or specific recommendations and other issues the appointing authority may choose to direct the charter revision commission to take up.

Thank you for giving consideration to favorable passage of RB 5318. As always, I am happy to provide additional information or answer any questions.

Sincerely,

Clark Chapin
State Representative, 67th District

S - 644

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2012**

**VOL. 55
PART 9
2639 - 2991**

pat/rgd/gbr
SENATE

313
May 3, 2012

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Calendar page 11, Calendar 389, House Bill 5318.
Madam President, move to place this item on the
consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Moving to calendar page 13, Calendar 400, House
Bill 5515, Madam President, move to place this item on
the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

On calendar page 14, Calendar 407, House Bill 5484,
Madam President, move to place that item on the
consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

And calendar page 15, Calendar 409, House Bill 5498,
move to place this item on the consent calendar.

pat/rgd/gbr
SENATE

314
May 3, 2012

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

And a final item is on calendar page 25, Calendar 112, Senate Bill 61, move to place that item on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, if the Clerk would now read the items on the consent calendar, both these just added and the ones placed on it earlier today, and then if we might move to a vote on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Absolutely.

Mr. Clerk, will you please call the calendar first, the consent calendar.

THE CLERK:

On calendar page 1, Calendar 106, Senate Bill 316; page 3, Calendar 235, House Bill 5030; on page 6, Calendar 315, Senate Bill 367; on page 9, Calendar 363, House Bill 5073; on page 10, Calendar 377, House Bill 5346; on page 11, Calendar 39, House Bill 5318; on page 13, Calendar 400, House Bill 5515; and on page 14, Calendar 407, House Bill 5484.

On page 15, Calendar 409, House Bill 5498; page 25, Calendar 178, Senate Bill 384. On page 25, Calendar 112, Senate Bill 61; page 26, Calendar 202,

pat/rgd/gbr
SENATE

315
May 3, 2012

Senate Bill 383; page 27, Calendar 280, Senate
Bill 345. And on page 29, Calendar 352, Senate
Bill 353.

THE CHAIR:

Okay. All right.

Mr. Clerk, will you please call for a roll call vote on the consent calendar, and the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Senators please return to the Chamber. Immediate roll
call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted?

If all members voted, the machine will be locked.

Mr. Clerk, will you call the tally.

THE CLERK:

On today's consent calendar.

Total Number voting	36
Necessary for passage	19
Those voting Yea	36
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The consent calendar passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

First of all, of the matters referred to committee earlier, would move that those items be immediately