

PA13-12

HB6405

General Law	738-743, 963-965	9
House	1727-1736	10
Senate	1309, 1509-1511	4
		23

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**GENERAL
LAW
PART 3
580 - 891**

2013

So -- and, obviously, they're open now on Sundays. And from my two liquor stores, who are on my business council, they said that price just pretty much stayed the same. What they sold stayed the same throughout the week. It just now was spread out over seven days.

REP. CARTER: Okay. Thank you.

SENATOR DOYLE: Any further questions from the committee?

Seeing none, thank you very much.

REP. KUPCHICK: Thank you.

SENATOR DOYLE: Next speaker is Jay DuMand. Did I spell it correct. Is Jay here? Jay?

JAY DUMOND: DuMond.

SENATOR DOYLE: DuMond, sorry about that. Jay DuMond then Representative Ziobron, Peter Berdon, Representative Terrie Wood, Tim O'Keefe, Representative James Maroney.

Thank you.

Please proceed.

JAY DUMOND: -- Baram and members of the General Law Committee. My name is Jay DuMond. I'm here today to testify with Phil Barnett, who's with the Hartford Restaurant Group, operator of a number of restaurants in Connecticut, to testify in support of House Bill 6405, AN ACT CONCERNING -- AN ACT CONCERNING BAR ROOM PARTITIONS.

As a long-time Connecticut restaurateur, I support the change proposed in House Bill 6405 because I believe the current laws de-antiquated in the changing marketplace. I've been a backer

or permittee in over 15 restaurant liquor licenses over the last several decades, and as the designer of all these restaurant spaces, I have not had the flexibility to design a space that would be the most functional for the customer and the operator because of the items addressed in 6405.

I cite a couple of examples. We've had a comedy club for over 25 years at City Steam in downtown Hartford. Because we have a six-seat bar there, we're not allowed to have anybody under 21 on the premises, even though the area that we have designated for under age is way off to the far end of the room and it's on a raised platform. But the Liquor Commission is deemed that if there is ever any bar stools in that bar that we cannot use it to have adults under 21.

Furthermore, the trend throughout the country is to have open spaces when designing a restaurant environment. In these spaces, the customer can see the bar, the dining room, and sometimes the kitchen from one vantage point. This creates high energy level that customers enjoy.

This bill would not exclusively give restaurateurs the right to be able to have this separation voided but on a case-by-case basis where it it's apparent that the operator is a good operator that the concept that he's doing is primarily a food-driven concept. It's not just one giant open bar where 18-year-olds can come in and mingle with 21-year-olds. So it's giving the Commission the latitude to look on a case-by-case basis to make their decision.

And I'll turn it over to Phil.

PHILLIP BARNETT: All right. Thank you all for listening today.

My name is Phil Barnett. I'm with the Hartford Restaurant Group, which consists of the Wooden Tap, the seven Wooden Taps, Agave Grill in Downtown Hartford and TD Homer's Grill in Southington.

I'm actually going to speak on behalf of Agave, just due to the fact that we have this -- the same challenge in the fact that, at Agave, there is -- there is a dining room as well as a bar area but, unfortunately, the guests have to walk through a corner of the bar and go -- walk by about two or three bar stools to get to the -- to the bathrooms; therefore, we have to have a different permit and we can't have a restaurant/liquor permit. Therefore, if we have anybody of the age of 18 to 20 in the establishment that are not accompanied by a parent or guardian, they will not be able to dine. Although we do have the separation between the bar and the dining room, if they do sit in the dining room and they're a Coke Cola and having a burrito, unfortunately, at that point we'd be breaking the law, therefore, we can't do it.

So what we're asking today -- or I'm asking today is that you -- that you support House Bill 6405 and just help us keep current with the times.

Thank you.

SENATOR DOYLE: Thank you.

Any questions from the committee?

Representative Rutigliano.

REP. RUTIGLIANO: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

And good afternoon, Mr. DuMond. I see you brought the distinguished chairman of the Connecticut Restaurant Association. That's good.

Just to be clear, this bill its intention is just to give the Department of Consumer Protection discretion when approving your liquor permit.

JAY DUMOND: That's correct.

REP. RUTIGLIANO: That's correct. Because right now as it stands right now, if you don't have an effective separation, which is a wall between the bar and the -- and the rest of the restaurant, you have to get a different liquor license. You have to get a café permit; correct? And the café permit restricts you in who could dine there. If you have two 20-year-olds on a date, that would technically be illegal if you have a café permit. Yes or no?

JAY DUMOND: Correct.

REP. RUTIGLIANO: So you're looking to just have the - - the Department of Consumer Protection the option, based on your plan, to say, yes, you're a restaurant or no you must be a café?

JAY DUMOND: Correct.

REP. RUTIGLIANO: Correct. All right. Thank you very much.

SENATOR DOYLE: Representative Carter.

REP. CARTER: Thank you very much, Mr. Chairman.

And with respect to walking through the bar room, you say this is just a -- a small corner area of the bar room where somebody has to walk through to get to the restrooms?

Yeah. Are looking for the -- the Department of Consumer Protection to be able to do that as well just to say, well, this is legitimate because it's only an attempt was made to not walk through the bar room? Is that what you're looking for for that part --

PHILLIP BARNETT: Yeah, we're looking for, like, an exemption for it. So when you -- you put in your liquor permit, we're looking to see if they can go ahead and make an exemption for certain layouts of different restaurants. It's also -- it's going to come down to the fact that -- that, you know, as long as -- you know, with a café, as well as a restaurant permit, you have to serve food. Restaurants itself, like we -- when we have a restaurant compared to a bar, you're looking at defining between a restaurant and bar and sometimes, based on different layouts, you do have to walk through the bar area just to go to the bathroom; and therefore, it makes it a café permit as opposed to a restaurant permit.

REP. CARTER: Thank you.

SENATOR DOYLE: Representative D'Amelio.

REP. D'AMELIO: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Phil, can you explain to me what happens at Agave now if -- if a young couple walks in and you're not sure if they're of age. I mean, do you card them and escort them out if they're not of age?

PHILLIP BARNETT: Yeah. You do have to card them at Agave and if they are not of age, unfortunately, we do have to turn away the business.

REP. D'AMELIO: If they're there just for a meal, you'd have to refuse them.

PHILLIP BARNETT: Yeah. If they're just for a meal and they want to sit in the dining room on the right-hand side -- when you walk into Agave on the right-hand side, we have the dining room. We have a 5-foot wall on the left-hand side that they can go to the bar area but if they go even into the dining room and there's two 20-year-olds that are going to a show downtown and they decided they want to -- they'd like to come to Agave to have a burrito and a Coke Cola, unfortunately, they can't come in.

REP. D'AMELIO: Thank you.

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR DOYLE: Thank you.

Any further questions?

Seeing none, thank you.

Next speaker is Representative Ziobron. Is Representative here? Yes, she is okay.

Then it's Peter Berdon, Representative Terrie Wood, Tim O'Keefe, Representative James Maroney, Becky Bombero.

REP. ZIOBRON: Good afternoon members of the committee. My name is Representative Melissa Ziobron. I represent the 34th District: East Hampton, East Haddam and a part of Colchester.

I'm here to testify on behalf of my bill proposal 5300. Bill 5300 was brought to me by a constituent in my -- one of my towns, East Hampton, by the name of -- by a gentleman by the name of Russell Blow. Russell is a former state employee of the Department of Consumer Protection in the Liquor Control Division, and he's also a retired Hartford Police detective.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**GENERAL
LAW
PART 4
892 - 1204**

2013

City Steam

Brewery Café

P 2
PS 7 W 4

**Testimony Before the General Law Committee
House Bill 6405 An Act Concerning Barroom Partitions**

Good afternoon Senator Doyle, Representative Baram and Members of the General Law Committee. My name is Jay DuMond and I am here today to testify in support of House Bill 6405 An Act Concerning Barroom Partitions.

As a long time Connecticut Restaurateur, I support the changes proposed in House Bill 6405 as I believe the current laws to be antiquated in the changing marketplace. I have been a backer or permittee in over 15 restaurant liquor licenses and as the designer of all these restaurant spaces, I have not had the flexibility to design a space that would be the most functional for the customer and the operator.

I site the following examples, currently:

1. We have had a comedy club for over 25 years at City Steam Brewery Café and because we have a six seat bar which patrons can watch the comedy show from, we have not been able to have a section of the club open to 18-20 year olds even though we have a separate area far from the bar which is also in a raised area.
2. The trend throughout the country is to have open spaces when designing a restaurant environment. In these spaces the customer can see the bar, the kitchen and the dining room from one vantage point. This creates high energy level that customers enjoy.

This bill would give the liquor commission the ability to make exceptions to those permittees seeking a more open floor plan in their restaurant.

Owner, designer and/or operator since 1971:

Last National Bank
Panchos Dos
Waterfall Tavern
Brown Thomson and Company
Oasis
Pancho's
City Steam
Blue Plate Kitchen

Chalupas
The Brownstone
36 Lewis Street
Pancho Mc Gee's
BT II
Hop Brook
BT III

Phone: 860-246-1840 Fax: 860-278-6133
E-mail: jaydumond@citysteambrewerycafe.com
Web: citysteambrewerycafe.com

CONNECTICUT
Restaurant
ASSOCIATION

38 Hungerford Street – Hartford, CT 06106 – www.ctrestaurant.org
Phone: (860) 278-8008

Testimony Before the General Law Committee

February 26, 2013

HB 6405 An Act Concerning Barroom Partitions

The Connecticut Restaurant Association represents over 500 restaurants and affiliated businesses across the state. Our members range from quick serve to casual to fine dining establishments. The Connecticut hospitality industry employs 145,000 people, making up approximately 9% of the workforce. Restaurants are a driving force in the state's economy and generate tremendous tax revenue.

The Connecticut Restaurant Association is in strong support of House Bill 6405 An Act Concerning Barroom Partitions. Current regulations regarding various aspects of restaurant permitting are antiquated and in the modern design world, sometimes difficult to comply with. Many restaurateurs, in designing their space, are looking to have more open floor plans where patrons have a view of the bar, kitchen and dining room irrespective of where they might be in the restaurant. Erecting five foot walls to separate the dining room from the barroom often doesn't fit into these plans, but due to current regulations, the licensee must adhere to the "effective separation" rule. House Bill 6405 would allow the Department of Consumer Protection to grant exceptions to this regulation, at their discretion.

The Connecticut Restaurant Association supports alcohol education and training for employees of restaurant who are serving alcohol to patrons. We do not believe this bill, were it to become law, would affect a restaurant's ability to continue to operate in a manner that is safe for its patrons, staff and the public.

We urge you to support House Bill 6405. Thank you.

HRG Hartford Restaurant Group

30R Bartholomew Ave , Hartford, CT 06106 • Phone: 860 206 6284 • Fax: 860.206.6251 • Email: HRG@wntus.com

PS 7 CNS

February 26, 2013

Good Afternoon. My name is Philip Barnett and I am the Chairman of the CT Restaurant Association and one of the owners of The Hartford Restaurant Group which consists of the 7 **Wood-n-Taps** (located in: Hartford, Farmington, Southington, Rocky Hill, Vernon, Orange & Wallingford), **Agave Grill** (Downtown Hartford) and **TD Homers Grill** (Southington).

As a person that has been working in the hospitality industry for the past 22 years and being self employed for the past 14 years, I am asking for you to support HB 6405 "An act concerning barroom partitions" as I believe the current law needs to be updated to meet the current market demands. I have been involved with the design and layout of 12 different establishments over the past 15 years and I believe having this flexibility would be very beneficial to our guests and design team. The current challenge with the law is that it does NOT allow some adults (18 years of age – 20 years of age) the ability to dine at an establishment without the presence of a parent or guardian if there is alcohol being served and there isn't a restaurant permit. The current law requires a 4' partition between the barroom and any dining room or hallway for a restaurant permit.

Agave Grill is a great example of this. Agave has a café permit because there is not a 4' separation between the bar and hallway to the restrooms. This creates a challenge for Agave because under the current law Agave is not allowed to have anyone under the age of 21 in the establishment if they are not accompanied by a parent or guardian. Although the dining area is near the bar, they are designed differently and any person in either area has to provide valid identification before ordering alcohol. Although our primary demographics are from the age of 25-50, it hurts me as a business owner to turn away an 18-20 year old couple or group of friends who comes in on a dinner date or before a local performance because they have to walk on the side of the bar area to use the bathroom. With the struggling economy, it hurts to turn business away because of a stipulations within the permit. I ask that you support HB 6405 to allow the hospitality industry of CT to meet the current market.

Kindly submitted,

Philip Barnett
Partner (Hartford Restaurant Group)
Cell: 860-306-3690
Email: phil@wntus.com



H – 1155

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL.56
PART 6
1695 – 2023**

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

53
April 24, 2013

Bill Number 950 in concurrence with the Senate.

Total Number Voting	143
Necessary for Passage	72
Those voting Yea	143
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	7

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

The bill passes.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 113.

THE CLERK:

On Page 6 of the House Calendar, Calendar Number 113, Substitute House Bill Number 6405 AN ACT CONCERNING BARROOM PARTITIONS. Favorable Report of the Committee on General Law.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Baram of the 15th District. Sir, you have the floor.

REP. BARAM (15th):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. I move for acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

The question is acceptance of the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative, you have the floor.

REP. BARAM (15th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. This bill requires the Department of Consumer Protection to amend its regulations to provide for two things.

The first is to allow an exception for separation of the dining area and the barroom lounge area, so that there can be an open, visible site from wherever you're sitting.

And secondly, to allow them to grant an exemption so that you can reach the bathrooms by going through the barroom area, provided the separation walls are not required.

The purpose of this is to provide for better dining, so that somebody can be sitting in a restaurant and see the entire area.

It also provides for more enthusiasm by being able to see the barroom area.

This would be effective upon passage. It was unanimously passed by the General Law Committee and there is no fiscal note on this, and I move for passage of this bill.

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

55
April 24, 2013

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Carter of the 2nd District.

REP. CARTER (2nd):

Thank you very much. Good morning, Mr. Speaker. I rise in support of this bill.

You know, there are a lot of small restaurants, a lot of small businesses out there, and what this does is, this gives a little more leeway for the Commissioner to come in and say, you know what? Just because you have a small restaurant you don't have to have a separate room, or separate direction to get to the bathroom.

I mean, really, it's a very common sense kind of bill. I don't think we see a lot of these some days.

It also talks about giving some latitude to the Commissioner to decide what they're going to do with the partitions, which again, I think really helps those smaller restaurants, those smaller establishments.

Mr. Speaker, this is a very good bill and I would urge my colleagues to vote for it. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

56
April 24, 2013

Thank you, sir. Representative Rutigliano of the
123rd.

REP. RUTIGLIANO (123rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I also rise in support
of this bill.

What it basically does, it simply allows the
restaurateur during the plan and review stage to
request an exemption to the five-foot rule and then
allows the Commissioner of the Department of Consumer
Protection to allow the exemption to the five-foot
rule.

It's pretty common sense. It takes into account
the changing architectural of the modern business and
modern restaurants and I urge all to adopt. Thank
you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Miner
of the 66th.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. I have just a couple of
questions, if I might, to the proponent of the bill,
please, through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed.

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

57
April 24, 2013

REP. MINER (66th):

Mr. Speaker, I probably wasn't around when this bill was originally drafted and I can only imagine that the separation requirement had something to do with normal drinking age in a bar, and so if I could, through you to the gentleman, did that issue come up at all in terms of the conversation about a separation between a dining room and a barroom in terms of youth maybe having to pass there unattended by parents? Through you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Baram.

REP. BARAM (15th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, yes, it did. Again, the intent is to allow on an exception basis, DCP to grant for the separation walls to be removed or reduced in height, and this would require then somebody going to the facility, bathroom facilities to perhaps pass through a portion of the bar.

I've been assured by DCP that they would use discretion. There are other ways to have separation. It could be through an aesthetic separation like plants or a row, and they assured me that they would never allow a minor to be able to pass right through

the barroom. We're talking perhaps a corner of the barroom to reach the bathroom facilities.

But they feel fairly confident that they can control this and again, this would be on an exception basis. It would not be the rule.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

So, the exemption then would be for perhaps the height of the petition, not whether that would be the only bathroom in the whole facility. The restaurant then would still have its own bathroom? Through you?

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Baram.

REP. BARAM (15th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the number of bathrooms is governed by building code and regulations and I'm not prepared to say how many bathroom facilities there would be.

All I'm suggesting is that if an exception was granted to allow there to be no walls of separation and it required you to pass through a portion of the barroom, DCP could grant that as an exception on a

case-by-case basis, but they have assured me that they would use their due diligence.

They have their agents go in and inspect the facility to make sure that it's appropriate for that purpose. And again, it's not going to be the rule that you automatically get this exception, it's in rare cases where the restaurateur can show that it makes sense given the space configuration of the restaurant.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and I thank the gentleman for his answer.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, Representative. Representative Sawyer of the 55th District.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Good afternoon, ma'am.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

A question, through you to the proponent of the bill.

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

60
April 24, 2013

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, ma'am.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

In reading the bill it has very clear language that says that either the Commissioner or his designee would be making these decisions.

Do you have any feeling, any understanding as to the length of time or duration it would take for such a person to be able to get back to the proprietor?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Baram.

REP. BARAM (15th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, the proponent of the application would submit the application, go through a plan review. I'm not sure how long that plan review takes, but as part of it, DCP will send out a liquor control agent to inspect the building. They review the floor plans and then they meet with the applicant to make a decision.

So my understanding is it's a pretty speedy process and I believe it's within like a 30 to 60-day period.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Representative Sawyer.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. And I appreciate your bringing out the bill and that thoughtful answer because what we know is, in the business world they look forward to a government that does little harm, that gets out of the way, that does everything that they can to help them move forward and yet protect the public safety, so I'm pleased to hear that there is a speedy process.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Thank you, ma'am. Will you remark further on the bill? Will you remark further on the bill?

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

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by Roll.

The House of Representatives is voting by Roll.

Will Members please return to the Chamber immediately. Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

pat/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

62
April 24, 2013

Have all Members voted? Have all Members voted?

Will the Members please check the board to see if their vote is properly cast.

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

THE CLERK:

House Bill 6405.

Total Number Voting	144
Necessary for Passage	73
Those voting Yea	144
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	6

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

The bill passes.

Representative Hwang of the 134th.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. A point of personal privilege.

DEPUTY SPEAKER RYAN:

Please proceed, sir.

REP. HWANG (134th):

Thank you. I would actually like the Chamber to give a big, warm welcome to the Sacred Heart

S - 656

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL. 56
PART 5
1213 - 1511**

mhr/gbr
SENATE

9
May 8, 2013

Moving now, Madam President, to Calendar Page 22, Calendar 436, the fourth item on that page, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 673 is marked go; Calendar 438, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 761, also marked go.

Moving to Calendar Page 23, Madam President, Calendar 443, Senate Bill Number 1056 is marked go; the last item on that page, Calendar 449, Senate Bill Number 828, also marked go.

Moving now to Calendar Page 24, Madam President, will mark, at the bottom of that page, Calendar 459, House Bill Number 6222 is marked go.

Moving to Calendar Page 25, Madam President, Calendar 461, Substitute for House Bill Number 6540 is marked go. Also on that page, Madam President, Calendar 463, Substitute for House Bill Number 6405; Madam President, would move to place that item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, moving to Calendar Page 26, Calendar 469, Substitute for House Bill Number 6574 is marked go. And Calendar 473, Senate Bill Number 237 is marked go.

Moving, Madam President, to Calendar Page 28, Calendar 480, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 238, marked passed temporarily.

Moving to Calendar Page 29, Madam President, at the top, Calendar 486, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 1140 is marked go, and Calendar 487, Senate Bill Number 1141 is marked go.

Madam President, moving to Calendar Page 30, Calendar 492, Senate Bill Number 1103 is marked passed temporarily.

ed/cd/gbr
SENATE

209
May 8, 2013

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Calendar page 48, Calendar 309, Senate Bill Number 899, Madam President, move to place this item on the foot of the Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

And Madam President, on Calendar page 50, Calendar 405, Senate Bill Number 848, Madam President, move to refer this item to the Committee on Finance, Revenue and Bonding.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, if the Clerk would now read the items on the first Consent Calendar and then if we might proceed to a vote on that first Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 1, Calendar 496, House Joint Resolution Number 98; Calendar 497, House Joint Resolution Number 99.

On page 2, Calendar 498, House Joint Resolution Number 100; Calendar 499, House Joint Resolution Number 101;

ed/cd/gbr
SENATE

210
May 8, 2013

also on page 2, Calendar 500, House Joint Resolution
Number 102.

On page 4, Calendar 119, Senate Bill 564.

On page 5, Calendar 155, Senate Bill 231.

On page 6, Calendar 169, Senate Bill 881; and Calendar
188, Senate Bill 1029.

On page 7, Calendar 192, Senate Bill 835.

On page 12, Calendar 284, Senate Bill 964.

Page 16, Calendar 353, House Bill 6481.

On page 18, Calendar 376, Senate Bill 878; Calendar
372, Senate Bill 977.

On page 19, Calendar 387, Senate Bill 386; and
Calendar 392, Senate Bill 366.

On page 20, Calendar 396, Senate Bill 991; and
Calendar 413, Senate Bill 1049.

On page 21, Calendar for 424, House Bill 6212.

And on page 25, Calendar 463, House Bill 6405.

THE CHAIR:

Those are all the bills on the Calendar.

At this point, Mr. Clerk, will you call for a roll
call vote of the first Consent Calendar of the day and
the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

~~Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.~~
Voting the first Consent Calendar of the day.
Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.
Senators please return to the chamber.

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

THE CHAIR:

ed/cd/gbr
SENATE

211
May 8, 2013

Would members please check the board to see that your vote has been properly recorded? If all members have voted and all votes have been properly recorded, the machine will be closed.

And would the Clerk please take and announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

On the first Consent Calendar of the day.

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

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar has passed.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President.

If we might stand at ease for -- for just a moment.
Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

The Chamber please stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

SENATOR LOONEY:

Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY: