

PA13-188

SB1099

Education	856-863, 1018-1019, 1058	11
House	8707-8723	17
Senate	1419-1432, 3045-3053, 3061-3062	25
		53

H – 1174

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL.56
PART 25
8346 – 8707**

cjd/lgg/cd/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

237
June 1, 2013

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted?

Would the members please check the board to determine if your vote is properly cast.

If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

Will the Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Yes, Madam Speaker.

In concurrence with the Senate, Substitute Senate Bill 461, as amended by Senate "A"

Total Number Voting	143
Necessary for Passage	72
Those voting Yea	106
Those voting Nay	37
Those absent and not voting	7

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The bill passes in concurrence with the Senate.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 656.

THE CLERK:

On page 34, Madam Speaker, Calendar Number 656,

SB 1099

H – 1175

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL.56
PART 26
8708 – 9049**

favorable report of the joint standing committee on Public Safety and Security, Senate Bill Number 1099, AN ACT CONCERNING SCHOOL SAFETY.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Good evening, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Good evening, sir.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill in concurrence with the Senate.

Representative Fleischmann, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, the original file before us was really a simple study, and the Clerk is in possession of an amendment, LCO 6550, that added substance to the bill. I ask that the Clerk please call and be permission to

cjd/lgg/cd/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

239
June 1, 2013

summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Will the Clerk please call LCO 6550, which is previously designated Senate Amendment Schedule "A."

THE CLERK:

Madam Speaker, LCO Number 6550, designated Senate Amendment Schedule "A," offered by Senator Stillman, Representative Fleischmann, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment.

Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection?

Hearing none, Representative Fleischmann, you may proceed with summarization, sir.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

The amendment that's now before us, previously designated Senate Amendment "A," essentially ensured that if someone was going to be operating on school grounds, elementary or secondary, providing security and caring a weapon that they would be POST certified. This was something that was worked on in a bipartisan manner, as you'll see in a moment. We ended up supplanting it with

cjd/lgg/cd/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

240
June 1, 2013

another measure but this -- this was the gist of what we were trying to do, and I move adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The question before the Chamber is adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "A."

Will you remark on the amendment? Will you remark on the amendment?

Representative Ackert of the 8th.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

On Senate "A," I just urge adoption. Please support it.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us?

If not, let me try your minds.

All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

All those opposed, nay.

The ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted.

Will you remark further on the amendment as adopted -- the bill as adopted? Will you remark -- will you remark further on the bill as amended?

cjd/lgg/cd/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

241
June 1, 2013

Representative Fleischmann, you have the floor, sir.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, as I mentioned previously, Senate Amendment "A" was a first draft. The bill went to Public Safety, there was further discussion. And again, on a bipartisan basis, we developed new language that's encapsulated in LCO 7634. I asked that the Clerk please call, and I be given permission to summarize.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Would the Clerk please call LCO 7634, which is previously designated Senate Amendment Schedule "B."

THE CLERK:

Yes, Madam Speaker.

LCO Number 7634, designated Senate Amendment Schedule "B," offered by Senator Stillman, Senator Hartley, et al.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The representative seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the amendment.

Is there objection to summarization? Is there objection?

Hearing none, Representative Fleischmann is, you may proceed in summarization, sir.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

So this amendment before us really represents a collaboration that happened between the Senate Chamber and the House Chamber, between the Republican Caucus and the Democratic Caucus, between the Public Safety Committee and the Education Committee. I'd really like to thank everyone who's on this amendment, everyone who was involved in the discussion.

What we were seeking to do was to make sure that if there was an individual who is being employed on school grounds to provide safety that they had proper training. So under this amendment, someone who is providing safety on school grounds must either be a currently certified police officer or a retired police officer who has retired in good standing and who has received annual training pursuant to section 7-294x of the General Statutes, which is the type of training that one would need to know about differentiated use of force on school grounds and friend or foe recognition and also successful -- successfully complete annual firearms training, which obviously we would want for any individual who would be given the -- the profound responsibility of guarding a school, an elementary or secondary school.

So I think this is a very well-drawn amendment that

ensures that any of these individuals carrying a weapon on school grounds fully understands, not only the use of the weapon, but the -- the full environment in which they're operating.

And again, I thank my friends on both sides of the aisle who worked so hard on this and I urge adoption.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The question before the Chamber is on adoption of Senate Amendment Schedule "B."

Will you remark on the amendment? Will you remark on the amendment?

Representative Candelora of the 86th.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I rise in support of this amendment. I want to thank that Chairs and ranking members of the Education Committee and the Public Safety Committee.

As we've dealt with the issues in Newtown, many communities come together and have tried to bring armed security into their schools. And our statutes really haven't -- didn't appropriately contemplate how we were going to do this and, as Representative Fleischmann represents, this is a good negotiated amendment that provides alternatives in a cost-effective manner for our

communities if schools so choose to take this route of bringing armed security into their buildings.

And what this will do is make sure we have appropriate level of training that goes along with this so that we make sure that if it is done, that our children are kept safe. And I urge everybody to support the bill.

Thank you.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Ackert of the 8th.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I do, also, rise in support of this legislation.

I do have a couple of questions for legislative intent to the proponent of the bill as amended.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Please frame your questions, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

On -- you mentioned the term -- and this is, I should say the amendment -- the term "retired." Also in the designation retired also deals with separated. So somebody could also serve just 10 years, not get a retirement, and also take on this position; is that true?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Fleischmann, will you respond, sir?

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes, I believe that is a proper reading of the amendment. So, for instance, if an individual put in ten years on a municipal police force or the state police then took another job elsewhere as a security official and then took this type of job on school grounds, so long as they received the training that's described in subsection b, they would also qualify.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Ackert, you still have the floor, sir.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And one further question for legislative intent and maybe clarification, in line 26, it uses, organized local police department, you did mention local, municipal and state. I was wondering if we couldn't also with this -- if somebody was returning as a military police officer which has a similar training as a local police officer -- another term is security police in our U.S. Armed Forces -- if they received -- had the correct training as an officer and then received POST certified training, would he -- he or she fit

this designation to serve?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, I thank the distinguished ranking member. That's a hypothetical that had not been posed before.

There was something that came at the end of his statement that I think provides the answer. If the individual involved has received POST certification, which is the standard for anyone serving in a municipal police force in the State of Connecticut, then I believe in deed, they would qualify.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Ackert.

REP. ACKERT (8th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I'd like to thank the chairman for his good work on this with the other parties on this amendment so thank you, Madam Speaker, and I urge support.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Thank you, sir.

Representative Noujaim of the 74th.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Good evening, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Good evening, sir.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Good to see you as always.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Thank you.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Madam Speaker, obviously, a piece of legislation of this magnitude is a legislation that we support because we all would like and want and desire to ensure that our school grounds and our students are always safe. And obviously, it's a bill that I would support, but, through you, Madam Speaker, as I was reading the content of the legislation, I looked on page 9 where it mentions a retired police officer and, through you, Madam Speaker to Representative Fleischmann, in my opinion a retired police officer is a person who was at one time active on the police force regardless, as described by Representative Ackert before me, and then the person has retired and perhaps he or she now is on his own or her own and, perhaps, they've formed an LLC or they continued to just

work individually and independently. But then I continue to read the legislation and I derived to page 26 where it says, "retired police officer means a sworn member of an organized local police department."

So through you, Madam Speaker, would a retired police officer be obligated to continue to be a member of a police department?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, if I understand the question correctly, the answer is no, because in lines 28 and 29, it's -- it's talking about someone who's retired or separated in good standing from either a local police department or the Division of State Police within the Department of Emergency Services, so a retired police officer is someone who's -- who is either retired or have been separated in good standing.

But I would also point out that an active police officer is -- is, obviously, also covered under this amendment because, in line 8, we make it clear that a sworn member of an organized local police department can be providing these services. So someone who is retired or

cjd/lgg/cd/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

249
June 1, 2013

separated know they are no longer part of their -- their previous police force, but someone who has not retired is going to be able to provide security to schools under this amendment.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Noujaim, you still have the floor, sir
REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Through you, Madam Speaker to Representative Fleischmann, so my assumption was correct that a retired police officer does not have to be a member of a -- sworn member of an organized local police force, because line 26, specifically, says that the police officer means a sworn member of an organized local police department. So if that person is retired, would he or she remain a member of a police department, and if that is the case, does this mean that they're still a member of the union if it is a unionized police department and are still under the union regulations obligated to pay union dues?

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Fleischmann.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, no and no.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Noujaim.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

So, essentially, and through you, Madam Speaker, a person who has retired has the ability to work independently then to be a -- perhaps, working -- is either part-time or a full-time officer in the school but not having to belong to a specific local police department.

Through you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Can the Chamber please take the conversations outside of the chamber. It's difficult for the chair to hear the representative. Thank you.

Representative Fleischmann, will you respond, sir.

REP. FLEISCHMANN (18th):

Through you, Madam Speaker, yes, I believe the summarization just given by my good colleague is accurate.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Noujaim.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

And I just wanted for legislative intent to ensure

cjd/lgg/cd/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

251
June 1, 2013

that this discussion has taken place.

I would like to extend a gratitude to Representative Fleischmann for his answer.

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

I'm sorry, sir. I was preoccupied. What were your comments?

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

I commented.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Thank you.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Thank you to Representative Fleischmann for his answer.

And thank you, Madam Speaker.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Thank you very much, sir.

Will you remark further? Will you remark further on the amendment before us?

If not, let me try your minds.

All those in favor, please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

All those opposed, nay.

The ayes have it, and the amendment is adopted.

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

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 call.

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

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Have all members voted? Have all members voted?

Will the members please check the board to determine if your vote is properly cast.

If all members have voted, the machine will be locked and the Clerk will take a tally.

Will the Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Yes, Madam Speaker.

In concurrence with the Senate, Senate Bill 1099, as amended by Senate "A" and Senate "B"

Total Number Voting 142

cjd/lgg/cd/gbr
HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

253
June 1, 2013

Necessary for Passage	72
Those voting Yea	142
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting .	8

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The bill passes in concurrence with the Senate.

Would the Clerk please call Calendar Number 173.

THE CLERK:

Yes, Madam Speaker.

On page 39, Calendar Number 173, favorable report of the joint standing committee on Appropriations, Substitute House Bill Number 6546, AN ACT CONCERNING COPAYMENTS FOR PHYSICAL THERAPY SERVICES.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

Representative Megna.

REP. MEGNA (97th):

Thank you, Madam Speaker.

Madam Speaker, I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

DEPUTY SPEAKER MILLER:

The question before the Chamber is on acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report and passage of the bill.

Representative Megna, you have the floor, sir.

S - 656

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

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

mhr/gbr
SENATE

119
May 8, 2013

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On Calendar Page 17, Number 359, Senate Bill Number 9
-- 1099, AN ACT CONCERNING SCHOOL SAFETY, Favorable
Report of the Education Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Good afternoon, Madam President.

I move the joint committee's Favorable Report and
passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Sorry. The motion is on passage. Will you remark?

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Yes; thank you.

The bill that you have before us has an amendment
which becomes the bill. I'd like to ask the Clerk to
please call LCO Number 6550, and that I be allowed to
summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO 6550, Senate Amendment "A," offered by Senator
Stillman, et al.

THE CHAIR:

mhr/gbr
SENATE

120
May 8, 2013

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you. I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on adoption. Will you remark, ma'am?

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Yes. Thank you, very much, Madam President.

As -- as we all know, and the public, I'm sure, realizes as well by now, that we passed an omnibus bill which had a section, and we passed an omnibus bill which had sections on gun prevention violence; it had a school safety section; and, it also had mental health issues addressed within that bill.

It, since the passage of that bill, it's become clear to many members of the General Assembly that some of the districts are out looking at what they can do to help make their schools safer. This particular issue was not addressed in that bill, and the Education Committee had a -- a bill ready and prepared that we felt was an opportunity to address this particular issue. All this amendment does is to state that if a, if a school district or -- is interested in hiring school security guards, that they have to go through what's considered our municipal training academy or P.O.S.T. in order for them to be hired for those positions.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you, very much, Madam President.

Some questions, through you, to the --

mhr/gbr
SENATE

121
May 8, 2013

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed.

SENATOR KISSEL:

The Chair.

Thank you.

As you're probably aware, there's just a couple of communities right now that are at the forefront of this. I know North Branford is one of them and Enfield is the other, and I -- I represent Enfield. I have been in touch with Chief Carl Sferrazza regarding this.

Also, in the last year or so, I did have an opportunity to -- to tour P.O.S.T., and I will say this, I am concerned by trying to utilize P.O.S.T.s for all these positions because they have, first of all, limited facilities, limited amount of, amount of training. There are certain programs offered through P.O.S.T.s that state police cycle through, and so we have to know that there's -- there's a limited, quantifiable amount of resources out there.

That being said, in talking to Chief Sferrazza of Enfield -- and Enfield is way down the road on this already -- the idea is to use retired police officers for these positions. And my question, through you, Madam President, is: Does the amendment contemplate that someone has at least gone to P.O.S.T. once in their career? Because it's my understanding, sitting as Ranking on Judiciary, that if you're a police officer and let's say you get either laid off or you're in between service for one municipality, you need to go back and keep your certifications current within a certain number of years.

In -- in thinking that we're going to use the retired police officers, I can envision that many of them may not be able to keep all of their certifications current, and I don't think that's what Enfield is trying to do, but we're trying to use people that were at least trained at some point in their career, especially as to handling firearms and being in those

mhr/gbr
SENATE

122
May 8, 2013

dangerous situations. So would this amendment address Enfield's issue that some of these retired police officers, they -- they will have all have gone through P.O.S.T., but they may not have all of their certifications current.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

The -- I -- I understand the concern and I've certainly been keeping up on some of -- of these proposals that are in front of various school districts, as -- as they look at hiring school safety guards, et cetera. The concern that has been raised is that the folks that may -- districts that may have been thinking of hiring may not have had appropriate firearms training for them to be in a school with children and not -- and still be allowed to carry a gun, we want to make sure they're appropriately trained.

In terms of your -- your question, we are -- it's my understanding that in order for them to be P.O.S.T.-certified, they do have to go back every couple of years, I believe, for sort of a refresher course to make sure that all their certifications are in order.

I will tell you that if, hopefully if this amendment is adopted, the bill will go to the Public Safety Committee before we can -- can act on it today. But so I think some of those -- those questions certainly can be answered through the Public Safety Committee.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

mhr/gbr
SENATE

123
May 8, 2013

Thank you, very much.

So it's my understanding that the amendment becomes the bill and that perhaps then this bill will be referred to Public Safety Committee. Is that correct?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Yes. Thank you, Madam President.

Through you, yes, that is correct, Senator.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you --

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

-- very much, then. I appreciate knowing exactly what the course is for this particular measure.

What I'll set about doing, Senator Stillman, is I will contact the folks in Enfield, Chief Sferrazza and the Public Safety overseer, Christopher Bromson. I will have them immediately start getting the information together, so that they can provide that information to the Public Safety Committee as to what the needs of our community is. Because to my mind, again, other than North Branford, I think Enfield is the -- the town that is at the very forefront of making this happen. The target date is September. Things are already in the works as far as hiring, and there's already contemplation of a \$650,000-or-thereabouts advance of -- of funds to make this happen. So I look forward to working with you so that we can make sure that this is addressed.

mhr/gbr
SENATE

124
May 8, 2013

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark further?

Senator Witkos.

SENATOR WITKOS:

Thank you, Madam President.

I -- now that I know that it's going to go to the Public Safety Committee, of which I -- I serve on, I'm going to just put something on the record so we can address it when it gets to the committee. While I wholeheartedly support the bill or the amendment that's before us, I want to make sure that it allows folks that may have had their P.O.S.T.'s certification lapse -- and I'll use myself as an example; I recently retired after 28 years in law enforcement -- my P.O.S.T. certification will be good for three years, and then after that I'm no longer P.O.S.T. certified. And I would be somebody that probably, I would think, most people feel comfortable having a gun in a school versus somebody that just got their P.O.S.T. certification; they've been on the job a year. So I -- there has to be some consideration there.

And, also, the state troopers in our state are not P.O.S.T. certified, so we want to make sure that they're allowed to access that same ability to serve as an armed service person in our schools; because they don't, they do not go through P.O.S.T., so I don't want to exclude that group of -- of uniformed police officers. So we'll work on that in the Public Safety Committee.

But I thank the Chairwoman for bringing the bill up.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

mhr/gbr
SENATE

125
May 8, 2013

Thank you.

Will you remark?

Senator -- no, Senator Stillman, yes.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you.

If I may respond to the concerns. I thank both Senators for their remarks and certainly their concerns within their respective communities and throughout the state. Certainly someone who is a retired state police officer would, I would assume, if there, if their certifications are current, that they could be hired by a school district. But as has been stated, we'll get that all clarified through the Public Safety Committee to make sure that the -- the bill that is finally passed in this Legislature is appropriate to meet all the respective needs.

The most important thing is to make sure that people that are hired to patrol the halls of our schools, and if they carry a weapon, that they be appropriately trained and know how to respond. And so I thank them for their concern and look forward to continuing to work on this issue.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark?

Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, the Chair of the Education Committee and I have worked very closely together in multiple meetings, including the Gun Violence Subcommittee on School Security and Safety. And the issue of schools

mhr/gbr
SENATE

126
May 8, 2013

employing individuals that carry a weapon, including teachers and staff, was hotly debated and a big concern. And it became very clear that we did not support, as a general rule -- and law enforcement did not support and school administrators did not support -- having staff and teachers armed in our schools, simply because of the level of expertise that's required in a school setting has to be that much greater than in almost any other place, probably including in an even military setting, because the damage that could occur by just one mistake is too much for any of us to bear.

So the issue now rose to if, in fact, schools decide to have armed security guards or armed school security officers, what should the level of training be. And as was just stated by our good Senator who was just recently a police officer, Senator Witkos, that his certification lasts three years. And if you're retired, they -- it could be quite some time before you are constantly in practice. And when you're in law enforcement or in the military, you practice regularly, because when you're out of practice, you can lose some of your ability to respond in the way that you should. And in this setting, clearly we want to be the most careful we can be.

Even if my own profession, which is in the financial services industry, I have to get recertified and take a three-hour test every three years, because they feel that after three years, you may have lost touch or not remember the details of what you need to know. So in this, it's clear that we do need some certification, even if you're retired. And given the fact that our schools responded so rapidly, prior to this legislation even being put in place, to hire armed security guards for their schools -- in fact, I can think of eight, just in our immediate region -- this bill would affect them directly, and some of the concerns, yes, can be dealt with at Public Safety. But we shouldn't take away from the fact that there is a need to make sure that individuals are highly trained, in addition, get refresher courses on a regular basis, if they're going to be in our school setting with our school children.

mhr/gbr
SENATE

127
May 8, 2013

So I think that I would urge every member of this committee to support it. It is a good idea, certainly, to go to Public Safety, so a further review on the technicalities of this so it can be implemented and not in an adverse way affect those schools that have already decided to employ new security guards that are armed, starting with the 2013 school year. In fact, they may be wanting to look at that with some caveats with possibly a change in date or a process, so that they can have some refresher courses, particularly those that are required [sic] police officers.

Thank you, Madam President. I -- I really appreciate our Chairman for bringing this forward, and, again, we hope that everyone will support it.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark?

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE:

Thank you, Madam President.

I stand in strong support of this amendment and want to make sure that I thank the Chair of Education for bringing it forward.

There are a lot of opinions on this, but as Senator Boucher was saying, in our Higher Ed Committee, when we had experts come before us, their testimony was that if you had someone armed in the school, they should be P.O.S.T. certified because of the regular training and -- and I -- we really took that. They said it was less safe to have somebody armed who wasn't certified than to have nothing at all. So we don't want guns in the hands of people who don't have ongoing training and a strong connection to the police force in town.

So I just thank you, so much, Senator Stillman, for bringing this forward.

mhr/gbr
SENATE

128
May 8, 2013

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark?

Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LeBEAU:

Thank you, Madam President.

And I also want to thank Senator Stillman and those who worked on this bill for bringing this forward. I, as a former teacher, I think this is extremely important. We don't want gun-slingers in the, in the halls of our, of our schools. We want people who are knowledgeable and have the right temperament and are there because they're professionals. And our children's lives are too important for anything but that, so, again, thank you for bringing this forward.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark further? Will you --

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR McLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

I stand in support of this bill, though knowing that it's going to Public Safety, I'd just like to raise one issue I think is appropriate for consideration. It's my understanding that P.O.S.T., in Connecticut, a terrific organization, may have some grave limitations in their resources, and this bill does seek to give them more responsibility. So if that's the case, we have to be sensitive to P.O.S.T. ability to deliver, if you will, with the existing resources. And if that's the case, as my concern I believe to be true, then appropriate resources will have to be added.

mhr/gbr
SENATE

129
May 8, 2013

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Thank you.

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

I -- the reason that this idea is before the -- the Circle is because there have been just a few communities that have raised this issue. I -- I find it hard to believe that most of our school districts will be availing themselves of armed guards within their schools. Some of them already have police officers through their school resource officers, so I'm not sure how widespread this would be, that it would be a burden on P.O.S.T. But certainly if there are folks who have been through the -- the P.O.S.T. certification already and are there for a refresher course, that's certainly a different level of commitment from P.O.S.T. than it would be for somebody who has never had municipal police officer training.

So -- so I think -- which I believe is one reason why the fiscal note said very little about the cost. So, but with that, I appreciate the comments, and, again, I move adoption of this amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Sorry. Will you remark? Will you --

Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

I -- I too rise in support, and I know it's going to the Public Safety Committee and will be brief. But if I, if I could, Senator Stillman mentioned school resource officers, some who are armed, some who are not.

mhr/gbr
SENATE

130
May 8, 2013

Through you, Madam President, are armed school resource officers required to have P.O.S.T. certification?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you.

Through you; Senator McKinney, I believe most of them are municipal officers, so they would already have that.

Thank you for your --

THE CHAIR:

Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

And thank you. That was my understanding.

And through you, Madam President.

I believe Senator Kissel asked this, but I, just for clarification, if someone is a retired municipal officer, as long as they maintain P.O.S.T. certification, they would be eligible.

Through you, Madam President, is that correct?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you.

Through you, Madam President, yes.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

mhr/gbr
SENATE

131
May 8, 2013

Thank --

THE CHAIR:

Senator McKinney (inaudible).

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you. I apologize, Madam President. I should have, I should have asked a longer question. It's not hard for me to do, if you need.

But through you, Madam President, I, my understanding is there may be one or two communities; I don't know if there are more. But regardless of how many there are, if a community has entered some type of contractual relationship and this bill were to pass, is that community grandfathered in; does that contract, is it nullified; are the -- what are the implications of that?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

If they have a municipal police department, they probably already have a contract with P.O.S.T. If they do not, because let's say they have a -- a resident state trooper, they would have to enter into a contract.

Through You, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator McKinney.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

mhr/gbr
SENATE

132
May 8, 2013

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

Those -- and I will ask for a roll -- I mean a voice
vote on the amendment. All in favor, please say Aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed?

The amendment passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes; thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, would move that the bill as amended
be referred to the Committee on Public Safety and
Security.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, if we might mark Calendar Page 17,
Calendar Number 340 passed temporarily.

Calendar Page 18, Calendar 372, passed temporarily.

And move to Calendar Page 18, Calendar 375, if the
Clerk would call that item next, followed by Calendar
Page 18, Calendar 376.

S - 661

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL. 56
PART 10
2837 - 3149**

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

105
May 23, 2013

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

SENATOR CASSANO:

Seeing none, Mr. President, I would ask that it be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing and hearing no objection, so ordered.

SENATOR CASSANO:

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, if the Clerk would next call Calendar Page 41, Calendar 359, Senate Bill 1099.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On Page 41, Calendar 359, Senate Bill Number 1099, AN ACT CONCERNING SCHOOL SAFETY. It's amended by Senate "A", a Favorable Report of the Committee on Education.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I move the Joint Committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

106
May 23, 2013

THE CHAIR:

On acceptance and passage, will you remark?

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you, sir.

This bill that is before us today was before the Chamber and sent to the Public Safety Committee after it was amended. It has returned from the Public Safety Committee with a -- a new amendment which will become the bill. I'd like to ask the Clerk to please call LCO Number 7634 and that I be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 7634, Senate "A", offered by Senators Stillman, et al.

Senate B

THE CHAIR:

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I move its adoption.

THE CHAIR:

On adoption, will you remark?

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you, sir.

There are many members of this Legislature who are listed as co-sponsors of this amendment and I thank them all for their input and concern. The amendment

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

107
May 23, 2013

that is before us makes it very clear that as we look at providing the best school safety and security that we can in our schools within the state, that -- that we make sure that those personnel are trained properly especially if they're going to be carrying firearms.

So the bill makes it very clear that in order for a municipality or a local regional board of education to employ or enter into an agreement with a retired police officer or that -- those individuals are number one in good standing at the time of their retirement but also that anyone who serves in that capacity to make our schools safe for our children and the -- and the people that work there and teach our children that those buildings are as safe and secure as possible.

This came before the Legislature sadly due to what we have been talking about in a bill that we acted upon just two bills ago where we were talking about the -- the mental health of our youth but this -- this issue came to light due to the tragedy at -- in Newtown.

I believe this is a responsible way to address an issue that's been raised by many boards of education although I -- as I say many I think it's only a few that have decided to embark on going down this path of having security in the schools that goes above and beyond what they are used to.

So with that, I urge adoption of the amendment.

Thank you, sir.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator, and just for clarification it's Senate -- this is Senate Amendment "B" not Senate Amendment "A".

Will you remark further on the amendment?

Senator Boucher.

SENATOR BOUCHER:

Thank you, Mr. President.

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

108
May 23, 2013

I join my colleague and Chair of the Education Committee in supporting this particular amendment. It was indeed a bipartisan effort to improve the safety and security of our schools. In fact after the unfortunate situation that we had on September -- December 12th -- December 14th, pardon me, there was a flurry of activity in a lot of our school systems with regards to school security and it was very important to many of us that those individuals that possessed a weapon, a gun, in our schools should be trained, should be of the highest caliber and that even those that were retired police officers also should have regular training because they would be in a very vulnerable situation in an environment where we had very young children and any amount of error could produce collateral damage that would be unthinkable.

And so I think these safeguards were put in place to make sure that we had the best trained individuals there if they were to possess a gun in our schools. So we support this and we hope that the Circle will also support it. I believe that there was some consideration given about the various kinds of -- of licensing requirements and so forth for our retired police officers and it really focused on the actual training itself and I think the bill is very acceptable to all parties involved and, in fact, there indeed are quite a number of school systems that have moved forward to add police officers that are armed in some of our schools.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I'd like to at -- at the outset acknowledge and thank Senator Stillman for her leadership on this issue helping to put together the working group to come up with this bipartisan solution to concerns that

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

109
May 23, 2013

individuals had regarding efforts by municipalities in enhancing school safety by making a very tough decision about whether to have armed individuals in schools.

Right now there's two municipalities that are engaged in this. One is North Branford and one is the Town of Enfield which I represent, a town of about 44,500 people and in the negotiations regarding school security, it became apparent that we did not want to pursue a model that would essentially replicate a security guard in a store or a business.

We wanted something that was a little bit better than that, a little bit safer than that and a little bit more secure than that for our precious little ones. And so what this amendment fundamentally does is it takes what was called the Blue Card area and takes that off the table. The business security guard model will not be the model in Connecticut for armed guards in schools.

But what will be the model, and Enfield is trying to create what I call the Gold Standard, and whether one in Enfield or any other town agrees with this policy or not, by majorities on Enfield's town council and board of education they decided to move in this direction. They have allocated within this year's budget \$650,000 to initiate this program and are basically stating that it will cost \$500,000 per year going forward.

They have a goal to have armed personnel in each and every one of the ten schools in -- in Enfield with at least two individuals assigned to each school so that it can be shifted throughout the week. Enfield has decided to have a supervisor of all those individuals and then turn their part-time public safety advisor, Chris Bromson, into a full-time person working cooperatively with Chief Carl Sferrazza, the chief of police in Enfield, under the guidance of folks like Mayor Scott Kaupin and Councilman Greg Stokes on the town council.

The standard that this amendment puts forward, the gold standard is this, that retired police officers and troopers who retire, thanks to the advice of

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

110
May 23, 2013

Senator Witkos, retire in good standing, will be utilized as the pool of individuals but that there will be a training requirement, an annual training requirement, in firearm safety and that training will be done by certified POSTC trainers, police officers and standard training -- police -- Police Officer Standards and Training Council and that in the next few years POSTC shall also develop other areas where these individuals will have to stay up to speed on an annualized basis such as areas specific to juveniles and maybe things that juveniles go through while they're in school.

The ideal clearly would be fully trained and certified police officers but that would make it inordinately expensive to have any of these folks in schools. We have folks that are police officers already in our schools but if we were to expand that type of program I would posit that absolutely no town or city in Connecticut could afford to expand to that level to use school resource officers, fully trained and qualified police officers, in all their schools.

So this is the very next best thing. It is something that is affordable but not, as I have indicated, inexpensive but it will allow municipalities that wish to go down this path to have someone who is armed in the school trained annually with the goal that if they can stop harm for precious seconds or minutes that that will afford the local law enforcement time to get to the school.

And Police Chief Carl Sferrazza for years has been training the Enfield Police Department, in cooperation with other police departments, in fighting back against active shooters. Enfield has been at the forefront of this. They have reached out to local businesses, large corporations, and said it costs a little money to train our personnel but if you're willing to foot the bill for a half a day, we will utilize your business to go in there as if there's an active shooter.

The business gains because now the police department is familiar with that facility in case something tragic goes wrong there. At the same time the police officers, 98 or probably around that number of

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

111
May 23, 2013

officers in Enfield, get trained in a business in town. They've been doing that for years.

Chief Sferrazza has reached out to surrounding police chiefs. Can we work together on an active shooter scenario? Because what we saw at Columbine so many years ago was that the notion of secure the perimeter and sit tight is exactly the wrong strategy when it comes to these incidents.

And so the horrific tragedy that took place on December 14th at Sandy Hook Elementary School, the heart-wrenching impetus for the reforms as Senator Stillman so eloquently said we just discussed two bills ago and we're discussing now, that out of that tremendous tragedy and -- and serving on one of the sub-committees regarding gun control during our recent investigation into that and promulgation of bill proposals, having sat there for hours and hours at public hearings with many of you here in this Circle listening to the moms and dads of the victims, going down to Newtown itself for a public hearing on the initiatives, we are taking away from that not just lessons that were embedded in the bill somewhat controversial, what's called the gun bill but it addressed mental health needs and school safety as well, but as we're seeing this afternoon and this evening we are now not letting it just go at that but that we are building upon those underpinnings and moving forward.

And so for the people of north central Connecticut and Enfield, from the bottom of our hearts, we specifically thank Senator Stillman for her great cooperation in this effort, Senator Boucher, tireless advocate for education initiatives, Senator Witkos for his input on the underlying amendment going forward and anyone else involved in this endeavor as well as all the House members that were involved in these negotiations.

I cannot and the people of north central Connecticut cannot, and specifically the people of Enfield, cannot thank you enough for moving this particular amendment and this bill forward.

Thank you, Mr. President.

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

112
May 23, 2013

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment?

If not, try your minds. All those in favor please signify by saying aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

All those opposed nay? The ayes have it. Senate "B" is adopted.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

Senator Stillman.

SENATOR STILLMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

I want to thank Senator Kissel for his remarks and his kind words about everyone that worked on this bill. The Chairs of the Public Safety Committee certainly were folks who had input, helped to bring us all together. I believe that the Department of -- I can't get these new acronyms straight but I'm going to say DPS or our public safety department, they were obviously instrumental in making sure that we made this bill appropriate for legislative intent.

And so again I thank everyone and -- but it is certainly my hope that there won't be too many communities who take advantage of this because I think we made a concerted effort in the state to say that putting armed guards in school is not the way we wanted to go but it is certainly up to each and every community how they chose to secure their buildings and this just gives them another option but one that is extremely safe, we feel, and will keep the people who

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

113
May 23, 2013

learn in those buildings and the people who work in those buildings as safe as possible.

If there isn't any objection, I'd like to ask that it be placed on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing and hearing no objection, so ordered.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, if we might stand at ease for just a moment.

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

Senator Looney.

Senate come back to order.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes thank you, thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, wanted to mark one additional item as go for which there had been an amendment waited but has now arrived and that is Calendar Page 39, Calendar 251, Senate Bill Number 1012 from the Environment Committee. Would ask the Clerk to call that item.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

121
May 23, 2013

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On Page 2, Calendar 49, Senate Bill 523; Page 15,
Calendar 489, Senate Bill Number 871.

On Page 35, Calendar 44, Senate Bill Number 809; on
Page 36, Calendar 152, Senate Bill 465.

On Page 37, Calendar 177, Senate Bill 972 and on Page
40, Calendar 293, Senate Bill 814.

Page 41, Calendar 359, Senate Bill 1099 and Calendar
377, Senate Bill 889.

On Page 43, Calendar 400, Senate Bill 1137 and on Page
45, Calendar 488, Senate Bill 1153.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Please announce that the machine is open on the first
Consent Calendar.

THE CLERK:

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

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? If all members have voted,
please check the board to make sure your vote is
accurately recorded. If all members have voted, the
machine will be closed and the Clerk will announce the
tally.

THE CLERK:

Today's Consent Calendar.

Total Voting

36

cah/med/gbr
SENATE

122
May 23, 2013

Voting Yea	36
Voting Nay	0
Absent, not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

Consent Calendar 1 passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, before moving to the item which will be marked for the order of the evening, I believe the Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda Number 2 for today's session.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda Number 2. It's dated Thursday, May 23, 2013. Copies have been made. They are on Senators' desks.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Mr. President, I move all items on Senate Agenda Number 2 dated Thursday, May 23, 2013 to be acted upon as indicated and that the Agenda be incorporated by reference into the Senate Journal and the Senate Transcript.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**EDUCATION
PART 3
724 - 1073**

2013

jmf/gbr EDUCATION COMMITTEE 11:00 A.M.
MIDDLESEX COMMUNITY COLLEGE, MIDDLETOWN, CT

retention issue, that's still important to us and we're going to hold that out there. But we wanted to make sure that the program that we put in place and the interventions that we are now asking for that are currently being implemented, we want to evaluate them and make sure that -- that they are appropriate interventions before we try to broaden that.

And one of the financial realities of the retention issue is it probably would have cost us \$20 million to deal with the 50 percent of African American students and the 48 percent of Latino students that would've been impacted by that retention issue. So a significant cost, you know, those are the realities that we had to take into account when we decided to pull that back. But we waited far too long to deal with the reading crisis that exists in Connecticut, so just know, be comfortable knowing that the Caucus still has that as a -- as a goal for eventually getting there if the interventions that we have in place right now don't work out the way we hope that they do. So thank you.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Thank you, Representative. Commissioner, am I right in sensing you must go now. Well, thank you for making the time and, you know, to the extent that people have follow-up questions, we'll follow up with your staff. But we appreciate your having worked it out and Godspeed.

COMMISSIONER STEFAN PRYOR: Thank you, sir. Thank you, members of the Committee.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: We go now to Representative Candelora to be followed by Bill Phillips.

REP. CANDELORA: Thank you. Good morning, Chairman

SB 1099

jmf/gbr EDUCATION COMMITTEE 11:00 A.M.
MIDDLESEX COMMUNITY COLLEGE, MIDDLETOWN, CT

Fleischmann and Ranking Member Ackert. I'm here to testify on behalf of Senate Bill 1099. And specifically what I just wanted to talk about to bring to the Committee's attention is I think a new issue that is being faced in the schools. As we address the issue of school security, we have some schools in particular in my district, in North Branford, have made the decision to have armed security guards in their buildings.

And as I've perused through the process in which this is being done, it appears that there is a criminal statute that makes it a felony. As part of that felony, there's an exclusion that a school may enter into an agreement with a person to bring a gun onto school grounds. And through that exemption, the schools are able to create a policy to allow for the armed security guards, and they're working with the Department of Emergency Services to get those licenses.

I think that -- that this is an important issue that as we move forward that the Education Committee may want to take a look at because there certainly are plenty of other issues involved in these decision making of bringing, you know, deadly force into -- into a building. And as I interpret it and I look at the way we're moving forward, it seems as if teachers would be able to bring weapons into schools if boards of ed so choose. And the statutes are really silent on this issue.

And so I wanted to bring this to all of your attention in the context of -- of that Senate Bill, that as we move forward through this session, we may need to take a look at this issue because for me trying to address it, it doesn't seem exactly clear, you know, how a

school would go about doing this. And if they do so, I think we need to make sure that they have the appropriate policies in place before they do it. Thank you.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Thank you. I'm sorry that Senator Boucher is busy with a Transportation Committee meeting because, as you know, she was my co-chair of the School Safety Task Force Subcommittee of the Newtown Task Force. And we heard extensive discussion and candidly most districts that are looking at security enhancements talked about school resources officers, which in plain English is police officers who have training to be in schools. Are you saying that in your town rather than looking at police officers, they're considering armed guards who might not have gone through the Post Academy but instead are part of some private security force and are hired simply for the purpose of guarding the school in the way some people are hired to guard stores to the mall?

REP. CANDELOR: That's exactly correct. And as I understand it, the process by which these individuals are being licensed is through the private security guards statutes. But they're getting blue cards. As I understand it under - - under a private security guard scenario, each individual guard is bonded, they have their own levels of experience that required not necessarily having anything to do with education.

In the context of where a school is hiring an employee to serve as a guard, they don't have that type of structure in place. And as I understand it because they're employed by the district, public safety isn't even requiring the institutional or the individuals to be

bonded in a way that we would bond security guards. So I'm not sure if this standard is even lesser, but it doesn't seem to be paralleled.

And I think some of the questions, I guess as I understand it, it's more akin to like an electric post where companies would hire their own security guards that are only working for that employer. And in those situations, the guns are procured by the business, the business is licensed and the weapons are kept on premises and stored on premises. The guards go in, have the weapons, they go to their post and then they go home. And I think that that's sort of the model that our department is following in allowing these schools to go forward with their structure.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: I thank you for that clarification. You know, it's interesting because the bipartisan consensus of the School Safety and Security Subcommittee was that we wanted, without creating any mandate, we wanted to be supportive of districts that were moving towards school resource officers. There was great discomfort with the notion of teachers being armed in any way. There was great discomfort also with security guards because their training is so much less than police officers. So you're brought an important issue to our attention. And I know -- I for one will be looking to see if we have an emergency certified bill that comes out of the Newtown Task Force that doesn't address these questions that we think about them more. So thank you.

Other comments or questions from members of the Committee?

Senator Bye.

SENATOR BYE: Thank you, Mr. Chair, and welcome, Representative. Thank you for coming to Middletown for your testimony. So in the higher ed -- Higher Ed Committee we recently had the college campus chiefs at a hearing. And they were very clear that they had grave concerns about anybody outside of a Post-certified officer having a weapon anywhere near a college campus. And I imagine that would translate to schools, so I'm trying to make sense of this. So are you asking that -- that that be allowed, that there be others who could be armed in schools or does that currently go on now and we're just not aware of it? I'm sorry I missed your whole testimony because I was talking to the Commissioner.

REP. CANDELORA: Well, what is currently happening right now is North Branford, which is part of my district, has just gone through this process. And they're in the -- in the -- they've hired security guards in the schools. I think all of them are retired police officers. But that doesn't necessarily need to be a requirement under state law, it could be any private individual. And currently they are not yet armed. The police department is in the process of procuring weapons for these individuals that will somehow be transferred to the school district.

I've had conversations with the district, with the Department of Emergency Services with their licensing bureau, trying to wrap my arms around it. It's sort of a delicate situation because I think there are individuals that want it. So I'm not going to pass judgment on whether or not it's a good or bad idea, but I think there are things that need to be worked through. And given that the statutes really are silent on

this issue, I feel that -- that it might be something we need to look at because, you know, one example, in Highland, New York, they implemented a program of an armed security guard who was a Post-trained police officer.

And that weapon was accidentally discharged in the hallway during school. And that program has been suspended, it was only in place for about two months before they decided to suspend it. So that's one issue. I think our Department of Emergency Services is looking at it from a licensing perspective, so we're going to give these individuals weapons. Under the criminal statutes, the board of eds can come up an agreement to allow for this.

The way North Branford did it is they passed a policy that states that no guns are allowed on school unless there's an agreement between the board of education and an employee. And I think -- I think it's probably under our statutes perfectly legitimate to do it that way. But the next question is, and I know you've had discussions on teachers carrying weapons, if I'm a teacher and I have a pistol permit and the school decides to create an agreement between me and the school that I can carry the weapon into the school, I think they're free to do that.

I think if we are going to bring deadly force into the schools, there's certainly pros and cons to it. But there are issues beyond just guarding a door that need to be addressed. You know, I'm sure you know, do these individuals get involved in arguments in the hallways? Do they have arresting authority? Where are these weapons going to be stored? Are they just there to -- to react if an intruder comes in? So it's just sort of -- it's murky.

jmf/gbr EDUCATION COMMITTEE 11:00 A.M.
MIDDLESEX COMMUNITY COLLEGE, MIDDLETOWN, CT

And so right now the weapons have not yet been procured, but I know there are numerous other towns that have made phone calls into the department and they are all looking at going to this avenue. And given our budget constraints, you know, one of the things that have been said is our school is doing this for about \$100,000. One SRO officer would cost about that much money. So when we're addressing budget constraints, you know, this is the path of least resistance.

SENATOR BYE: Thank you for that answer. And so it seems like you're -- you're asking us to think about it. And I would just say here that my thoughts would be that, first of all, there are hazards about having school resource officers and students getting arrested for things that may not have been arrested for if there hadn't been a school resource officer. But for the most part I think principals and superintendents find them supportive. So I'm just saying it's not like they're not without their hazards in some ways as it is.

But I would have serious reservations, particularly after hearing from the chiefs at both the colleges because this -- this came up. And I think we had a good discussion about it -- about the importance of having if you're going to have guns on campuses, you cannot have rent-a-guns on campuses, and you cannot -- security guards are the same as almost having nothing. So if you want a presence, an armed presence, then it should be Post-certified.

And as a policymaker, that's a really nice line in the sand for me to say I know that this officer has been Post-certified. But -- but I do think that you raise a really important

jmf/gbr EDUCATION COMMITTEE 11:00 A.M.
MIDDLESEX COMMUNITY COLLEGE, MIDDLETOWN, CT

point that the Committee needs to think about. And as usual, you're being thoughtful about it and seeing how complicated it is. So I think it's complicated to us, and I really appreciate you raising it.

REP. CANDELORA: Thank you.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Other questions for Representative Candelora?

If not, thank you very much for your time and for bringing this to our attention. I think Representative -- Senator Bye did a very nice job of giving you the context that we're dealing with. I'm hopeful that budget constraints don't lead districts to make decisions that are potentially dangerous and that we figure out ways to enhance security with personnel who know exactly what they're doing and we'll be glad to continue this dialogue.

REP. CANDELORA: That would be great. I'm happy to share any information I have.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Thank you.

SENATOR BYE: Thank you.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: We go to Bill Phillips now to be followed by Paige MacLean. Welcome. The floor is yours.

BILL PHILLIPS: Thank you. I'm Bill Phillips, I am with the Northeast Charter Schools Network, and I am here to speak in favor of House Bill 6622 which is the district partnership act. You already have my testimony, so I'm just going to make some observations on that testimony.

with the operations of quasi-governmentals, you know, for the last ten years. And I cite some of the examples in my -- in my testimony. But I think you're then creating a precedent for quasi-governmental agencies that didn't exist previously. You're really taking on what are -- are legitimate state agency functions and now saying that the state's not going to do them, we're going to have them done by, again an organization that's an arm's length away from state agency, and we're going to be paying their general fund basically with state dollars.

I think that's -- that's new ground, I don't think it's necessary to do for educational policy. And again given the track record of quasis, they do some great work, they provide excellent service for the state in some unique complex matters, but they have traditionally had a lapse in the ability to -- to be transparent and to show that they're -- that they're not avoiding perceptions of impropriety. And I just think the cost, particularly when you're talking about education practices in schools and the potential influence from outside money into a quasi-governmental as opposed to a state agency and who's controlling those strings, I think by and large keeping SERC within the state agency realm is a far better proposition.

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Thank you. I appreciate that.

SENATOR STILLMAN: Thank you.

Laura Harvey. Welcome.

LAURA HARVEY: Thanks, members of the Committee for letting me testify, I appreciate it.

SB1098 SB1099
HB6624 HB6626

186

March 15, 2013

jmf/gbr EDUCATION COMMITTEE

11:00 A.M.

MIDDLESEX COMMUNITY COLLEGE, MIDDLETOWN, CT

REP. FLEISCHMANN: Just to clarify, that's your right. If you're a citizen of the United States and a resident of Connecticut, we're just doing our jobs here.

LAURA HARVEY: I'm here to testify in favor of Senate Bill 1098, AN ACT CONCERNING EDUCATION COST-SHARING FORMULA, Senate Bill 1099, AN ACT CONCERNING SCHOOL SAFETY, House Bill 6624, AN ACT CONCERNING MINOR REVISIONS TO THE EDUCATION STATUTES, and House Bill 6626, AN ACT CONCERNING SPECIAL ED. And I'm here testifying on behalf of underperforming students of which one is very dear to my heart.

Regarding Senate Bill 1098, AN ACT CONCERNING THE COST-SHARING FORMULA, I would like to see this studied. I'd like to eventually see a major component of the percentage of underperforming students, and any forthcoming funds coming from the State with strings attached earmarked to follow those individual underperforming students in an audit of both that money that's following those underperforming students and the student's adequate yearly progress.

From my district, which is Region Nine, I have some data from 2011, it was the most recent I can get, that said 13 percent of the incoming eighth graders were in the C, D, and F range. And luckily now I can hope that from their own data, that my sophomore when they become a sophomore, it will be 25 percent will be in the C, D, and F range. This is what I call underperforming students, and I think they kind of slip through the cracks. Because, for example, in Region Nine, you know, most of these kids are -- they're going to go to college, they're going to go probably good colleges, they're going to achieve, and they'll



State of Connecticut

HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES
STATE CAPITOL
HARTFORD, CONNECTICUT 06106-1591

REPRESENTATIVE VINCENT J. CANDELORA
EIGHTY-SIXTH ASSEMBLY DISTRICT

LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING, ROOM 4200
300 CAPITOL AVENUE
HARTFORD, CT 06106-1591

TOLL FREE (800) 842-1423
CAPITOL (860) 240-8700
Vin.Candelora@housegop.ct.gov

DEPUTY REPUBLICAN LEADER

MEMBER
FINANCE, REVENUE AND BONDING COMMITTEE
REGULATIONS REVIEW COMMITTEE
PLANNING AND DEVELOPMENT COMMITTEE
LEGISLATIVE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

Education Committee
Public Hearing
Friday, March 15, 2013
Testimony In Support of,

Senate Bill 1099 An Act Concerning School Safety

Good Morning Co-Chairs Senator Stillman, Representative Fleishchmann and Ranking Members Senator Boucher and Representative Ackert and members of the Education Committee.

I appreciate the committee raising this bill in an attempt to deal with the important issue of school safety.

Over the past few months, many districts are contemplating how to keep our children in a safe learning environment. Given the constrained education budgets, schools are looking for the most cost effective alternatives. Districts are beginning to navigate through the process of employing private citizens as armed security guards. The process requires making sure that the Board creates a written agreement with the employee in order to insulate that employee from committing a felony. Further, it requires licensing of these guards with appropriate permits and requires licensing of the schools to own and possess firearms. Currently, our laws do not expressly contemplate these armed guards and there are no minimum standards or procedures in place. As these schools move forward in the process, I believe that it is imperative that this committee address the issue to ensure the protection and safety of our children.

Thank you again for your time and your consideration of this bill.

Vincent Candelora