

PA13-72

SB0804

Environment	93, 96-97, 108-109, 113-115, 123, 125, 157-158, 170, 172	14
House	4211-4221	11
Senate	1239-1243, 1284-1286, 2763-2773, 2937	20
		45

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**ENVIRONMENT
PART 1
1 – 305**

**2013
INDEX**

CHAIRMEN: Senator Meyer
Representative Gentile

MEMBERS PRESENT:

SENATORS: Chapin, Maynard

REPRESENTATIVES:

Albis, Shaban, Case,
Backer, Bolinsky, Bowles,
Buck-Taylor, Davis,
Hennessy, Megna,
P.Miller, C. Miner, Mushinsky,
O'Dea, Ryan, Sampson, Sear,
Urban, Vicino, Wilis, Ziobron

SENATOR MEYER: Ladies and gentlemen. Can we come to order please? This is the Public Hearing of the Environment Committee. We have some 11 bills we're going to hear today. We thank your -- we thank you for your interest. Commissioner Reviczky you're lead off here. Nice to see you.

COMMISSIONER STEVEN K. REVICZKY: Good morning Chairman Gentile, Chairman Meyer, Vice-Chair Albis and ranking member Chapin. My name is Steve Reviczky. And I serve as Commissioner of the Connecticut Department of Agriculture. I am here to testify on the Department's 2013 legislative agenda. Joining me this morning from the Department of Agriculture are George Kribda who serves as our Legislative Program Manager and Public Information Officer. Steve Anderson and Linda Petrowitz from the Office of the Commissioner, and Doctor of Veterinary Medicine, Bruce Sherman, Director and Wane Cosegic Assistant Director of the Bureau of Regulation and Inspection.

Also joining me is David Carey, Director of the Bureau of Aquaculture and Jay Dipple who

HB6313
HB6314
HB6316
SB806
SB804
HB6315
HB6317
SB802
HB6318
SB803
SB805

other as closely as possible.

House Bill 6316 simply provides for the joint municipal and state purchase of development rights on easements to farms on which part of the agricultural land is situating in an abutting municipality. There are many instances where the state purchases easements on agricultural lands that are situated in two or more municipalities. The department believes that municipalities should -- should not be constrained from jointly holding such an easement with the state merely because a portion of the land is in an adjacent town.

Senate Bill 806 allows for municipalities to acquire or accept a gift -- except as a gift the right of the owner to construct any residence, residences or any farm structures on -- on the agricultural land.

Moving on. The Department of Agriculture is asking for the Committee's consideration of Senate Bill 804, An Act Concerning a Preference from Connecticut Grown Protein in Certain State Contracts. The proposed legislation would -- would adjust language in an existing statute concerning contract procurement to include preference when comparable in cost for additional Connecticut grown proteins other than milk, cheese and eggs. Specifically beef, pork and lamb which would be added.

Public Act 11-189 explicitly charges the Governor's Council for Agricultural Development with making recommendation to the Department of Agriculture on ways to increase the percentage of consumer dollars spent on Connecticut grown fresh produce and farm products including but not limited to ways to increase the amount of money spent by

residents of the state on locally grown farm products by 2020 to not less than 5% of all monies spent by such residents on food. That's statutory language, not mine.

The proposed act would help Connecticut significantly in achieving that 5% goal by -- by 2020. Because many institutions serve thousands of meals each week, the incorporation of additional Connecticut grown products into their food service operations can translate into millions of additional dollars going -- going to Connecticut farmers related agricultural businesses and the state's economy overall.

Another department initiative is House Bill 6315, An Act Concerning the Resale of Dogs to Military and Law Enforcement Agencies. This proposed legislation will remove barriers preventing the military and law enforcement agencies from obtaining certain types of dogs for training purposes. Presently, Connecticut pet shops must purchase any out of state dogs from a USDA registered breeder or broker. Most dogs trained in Connecticut for exclusive use in military or law enforcement work are imported by trainers into Connecticut from Europe. Because these working dogs are imported from Europe, trainers do not comply with Connecticut law.

This proposed change in statute would exempt dog trainers who sell dogs to military or a law enforcement agency from having to procure a pet shop license. The intent of the USDA requirement in the current statute is to ensure pet shops purchased -- to ensure pet shops purchasing puppies for re-sale from outside Connecticut are not purchasing puppies from USDA regulated breeders and brokers -- are purchasing puppies from USDA regulated

16
tld/gbr ENVIRONMENT COMMITTEE

February 15, 2013
11:00 A.M.

SENATOR MEYER: So what you're -- you're saying is that the ball is still in his court? And he hasn't really made out the case yet for a successful new industry?

COMMISSIONER STEVEN K. REVICZKY: Yes. And I don't know if -- if David has any -- I think I've handled it.

SENATOR MEYER: Yes. Okay.

COMMISSIONER STEVEN K. REVICZKY: There's a lot of work to do.

SENATOR MEYER: Okay. The last -- the last comment or question I had was the next bill, Senate Bill 804 that relates to home grown products in Connecticut and the fact that -- that we will give preference to home grown products and what you've done here in this bill is -- is added to the number of products that are grown in Connecticut that will be given a preference in buying. And in doing that -- in making the additions of beef, pork and lamb as you've done here in this bill, I'm wondering why you didn't complete it by also adding fish.

It look -- it looks like you're trying to be more comprehensive in terms of recognizing home grown food in Connecticut and you've -- on the meat side you've expanded it with beef, pork and lamb. Is there a reason that fish is left out? Is what I'm asking you.

COMMISSIONER STEVEN K. REVICZKY: Not on purpose. I -- I basically there have been -- there's been a lot of conversation at the regional level, New England specifically, in terms of increasing our ability to get locally grown foods into industrial markets -- industrial market schools K through 12, colleges,

universities private and public, state
cafeterias. So our focus has been
historically on fruits and vegetables. And we
-- and milk.

But we sort of left out the other side of
protein. So I'm open to discussing additions.
I'm not sure how many of our state contracts
include fish. But let's explore it. And I'm
-- the other partner in this, obviously, is
the Department of Administrative Services and
if we could put our heads together with
Commissioner DeFonzo and work out some decent
language. I'm all for that.

SENATOR MEYER: Okay. So, it would be helpful if
we could hear from you just about if we added
-- if the Committee decides to amend this, to
add fish and probably shellfish as well. You
know, we'd like the support of your department
or -- or tell us a reason why we shouldn't do
it.

COMMISSIONER STEVEN K. REVICZKY: So let us look
into it.

SENATOR MEYER: Would you?

COMMISSIONER STEVEN K. REVICZKY: I'm happy to get
back to you.

SENATOR MEYER: And get back to us?

COMMISSIONER STEVEN K. REVICZKY: Yes.

SENATOR MEYER: That's great.

Madam Chair, do you have any questions?

Senator Chaplin?

Representative Backer on oysters. Thank you

be that Representative Backer and I had chatted many times. We chatted right before this public hearing. And we offered to continue the conversation and get to some understanding. And I look forward to that and working with the Committee to -- to move forward with these proposals in some way that there -- they are acceptable to you all.

SENATOR MEYER: Representative Miller.

REP. MILLER: Thank you, Commissioner, for your very thoughtful and comprehensive analysis of these bills. It's very helpful. My question is also on Senate Bill 804. Putting in the beef, pork and lamb. Certainly it behooves all of us and it's in all of our best interests to grow and consume more of what we grow here in Connecticut. And it is as good as it gets anywhere. I think we all know that.

My question is, we know that we can produce more beef, pork and ham, but do we have enough capability right now to cut this meat? And if not, are we making provisions in our feeder system with the voc-tech schools perhaps and others to make sure that we'll have adequate resources so we can grow this as we want to?

COMMISSIONER STEVEN K. REVICZKY: So, one of the major holes that the Connecticut food system experiences is exactly what Representative Miller talks about, the ability to slaughter and process in state. We have limited infrastructure here necessary to -- to do the work. To get food from the farm to the plate. And it's -- what I've experienced over time as an employee of the Department of Agriculture and then as Executive Director of the Connecticut Farm Bureau, it's -- and now as Commissioner, it's -- it's always the chicken

or egg question.

Do you have the capacity first? Or do you have the product first? And quite frankly, if -- if we had the -- the volume of animals to move through facilities somebody would be doing it. So, because they could make a profit by that. So, what we need to do is to figure out how do we close the gap in the short term. Right now, most of our animals are traveling out of state and then coming back as finished product. We do -- we are working with partners to try to bolster existing slaughtering facilities to make sure they have the business flowing through their doors that will make them sustainable.

And -- and try to direct some of the product that is moving to slaughter houses in Rhode Island, and New Hampshire and Vermont, and New York and Massachusetts to re-direct some of the current work here locally, so that we can grow that processing capability. But it's a very good point.

SENATOR MEYER: Okay. Do you have any questions?

Yes, Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON: Thank you, Chairman.

I have some questions to follow up with what Representative Miller was talking about. In discussing poultry to be specific with some of my farmers in East Hampton. What I hear from them, is that they are moving away from having chickens and bringing them in because it's so cost prohibitive for them to bring them to one of the two sites that are available in the state.

And they are now really considering stopping

producing poultry all together. And instead putting their resources towards beef. So, I would ask that while you're considering the framework for the future, you consider the regional access part. Because the gas prices are so prohibitive for some of these farmers to take their livestock, you know, 50 miles up towards the northern part of Connecticut when you come from a rural district is quite a strain. So, when you're planning I hope you keep that in mind.

Thank you.

SENATOR MEYER: Thank you, Representative.

Anybody else have any questions?

Thanks so much, Commissioner.

I'm sorry. Representative Vicino.

REP. VICINO: Thank you. Commissioner, thank you for coming today. I like the idea of bringing some of this business back to Connecticut and looking out for our workforce. I did have a question though about House Bill 6318, the Cultivation of Seaweed. It sounds like we in -- we are importing the seaweed. And what are we doing with it? Are we ingesting it? I've never seen it on the market? Are we using it in other products? If you could just bring me up to speed on the big boom and the growth of the seaweed industry.

COMMISSIONER STEVEN K. REVICZKY: So, some of the seaweed is used in food products, wrapping various menu items in seaweed. Some of it's used in salads. A lot of it is used in processing. And I have with me the Director of my Aquaculture Bureau who could probably fill in more for you what division it is.

Thanks, Henry.

HENRY TALMAGE: Thank you very much.

SENATOR MEYER: Nice to see you.

Our next witness is Kip Kolesinskas. Am I getting that right?

KIP KOLESINSKAS: Yes. That's very good thank you.

SENATOR MEYER: Working Lands Alliance.

KIP KOLESINSKAS: Yes. Again, name is Kip Kolesinskas and I'm on the steering committee and speaking on behalf of the Working Lands Alliance. Dear Senator, Representative and members of the Committee, thank you for this opportunity to speak in support of three bills that aim to improve the state's farmland preservation and community farms programs.

If enacted, these changes will facilitate and expand the state's capacity currently protecting farmland. The Working Lands Alliance is a broad based coalition dedicated to saving Connecticut farmland. Our 200 plus members reflect the diversity of organizations, businesses and individuals that care deeply about our lands and the farmers who steward them and the farms that grow our economy and jobs, provide our foods, filter our water and air. And make our community a special place to live and visit.

WLA supports the three bills 806, 6314 and 6316 on today's calendar that relates to farmland protection and our priorities of the state's Department of Agriculture. Bill 806 clarifies existing law with regards to municipal purchased development rights. Local

SB804
HB6313

administration in those situations where land crosses town boundaries.

These three bills offer small but important improvements to the state's Farmland Preservation and Community Farm Programs and we urge the Committee to act favorably on them. I would like to take a minute to also express support for 804 and 6313. These two measures would open new markets for Connecticut's poultry and livestock producers.

And have the potential to improve profitability for the farms that steward a majority of Connecticut's farmland. I appreciate this opportunity to testify. And urge the Committee to act promptly and favorably on these bills.

Thank you.

SENATOR MEYER: Thank you.

Any questions?

Representative. Yes.

REP. BOWLES: Thank you. I appreciate that Chair.

Could you briefly go ahead and provide the distinction between the Community Farms Program and the -- and the -- in terms of -- is there an acreage difference?

HB6314

KIP KOLESINSKAS: There is. Of course, at -- there's certainly as Henry Talmage mentioned, the original purpose of the -- of the state Farmland Preservation Program was keying in on larger farms. So there is a -- a 30 acre minimum of active prime and important farmland. And so one of the major differences between that and the Community Farms Program



Steven K. Reviczky
Commissioner

STATE OF CONNECTICUT

DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
OFFICE OF THE COMMISSIONER



Tel: (860) 713-2500
Fax: (860) 713-2514

Testimony presented to the Environment Committee of

The Connecticut General Assembly

By the Connecticut Department of Agriculture

February 11, 2013

S.B. 804 – AN ACT CONCERNING A PREFERENCE FOR CONNECTICUT GROWN PROTEIN IN CERTAIN STATE CONTRACTS

Chairmen Meyer and Gentile, Vice Chairs Maynard and Albis, Ranking Members Chapin and Shaban and members of the Environment Committee, thank you for the opportunity to testify today.

The Connecticut Department of Agriculture respectfully requests your support of An Act Including Connecticut Grown Protein in State Procurement Language.

The proposed legislation would simply adjust language in an existing statute concerning state contract procurement, CGS 4a-51(b), to include preference (when comparable in cost) for additional Connecticut Grown proteins other than milk, cheese, and eggs. Specifically, beef, pork, and lamb would be added.

This adjustment is important because Connecticut farms today are producing significantly more beef, pork, and lamb today than when the statute's language was enacted. In addition, consumer interest in and demand for these types of Connecticut Grown proteins also have risen during the same timeframe. The proposed language provides significant market opportunity for Connecticut's meat producers, while at the same time better allowing for state institutions to meet the growing demand for the purchase of these products.

Over the past year, the Governor's Council for Agricultural Development has interviewed, surveyed, and conducted listing sessions with hundreds of agricultural stakeholders in the state in the development of the first-ever holistic, strategic plan for Connecticut agriculture. In this process, the council identified as a high priority the enhancement of farm-to-institution channels, due to the vast opportunity institutions provide for increasing consumption of Connecticut Grown farm products.

Public Act 11-189 specifically charges the Governor's Council for Agricultural Development with making "recommendations to the Department of Agriculture on ways to increase the percentage of consumer dollars spent on Connecticut-grown fresh produce and farm products, including, but not limited to, ways to increase the amount of money spent by residents of the

state on locally-grown farm products, by 2020, to not less than five per cent of all money spent by such residents on food.”

The proposed act would help Connecticut significantly in achieving that five percent goal by 2020. Because many institutions serve thousands of meals each week, the incorporation of additional Connecticut Grown products into their foodservice operations can translate into millions of additional dollars going to Connecticut farmers, related agricultural businesses, and the state’s economy.

The Department of Agriculture and the Department of Administrative Services have been conducting training meetings with farmers to encourage them to participate in the state procurement process. This effort, along with continually improving communications about such opportunities, will also facilitate the use of more Connecticut Grown products—including proteins—by state institutions.

The proposed act does not require state contract users to pay more for Connecticut Grown products, nor does it place any other financial burden on them. It does provide them with additional options and encourages them to use products grown and produced by Connecticut agricultural businesses, thus fueling economic growth and meeting consumer demand for these Connecticut Grown products.

Thank you for your time today and for your thoughtful consideration of this testimony. Please let us know if we can provide any additional information that would be helpful.



Connecticut Farm Bureau Association
 775 Bloomfield Ave., Windsor, CT 06095-2322
 (860) 768-1100 • Fax (860) 768-1108 • www.cfba.org

pg 2

1

February 15, 2013

Testimony in Support of:

H.B. No. 6313 AN ACT CONCERNING LOCALLY GROWN POULTRY IN CONNECTICUT FOOD MARKETS.

H.B. No. 6314 AN ACT CONCERNING CERTAIN REVISIONS TO THE COMMUNITY FARMS PROGRAM.

H.B. No. 6316 AN ACT CONCERNING THE STATE PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS FOR AGRICULTURAL LAND PRESERVATION.

H.B. No. 6317 AN ACT CONCERNING REGISTRATION OF GROWERS OF SWINE AND THE CONTROL OF CERTAIN DISEASES.

H.B. No. 6318 AN ACT CONCERNING THE CULTIVATION OF SEAWEED.

S.B. No. 802 AN ACT CONCERNING CONNECTICUT'S EGG STATUTES.

S.B. No. 803 AN ACT CONCERNING AQUACULTURE JOB GROWTH.

S.B. No. 804 AN ACT CONCERNING A PREFERENCE FOR CONNECTICUT GROWN PROTEIN IN CERTAIN STATE CONTRACTS.

S.B. No. 805 AN ACT CONCERNING THE TAKING OF EASTERN OYSTERS.

S.B. No. 806 AN ACT CONCERNING THE MUNICIPAL PURCHASE OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS FOR AGRICULTURAL LAND PRESERVATION.

Submitted by: Henry N. Talmage, Executive Director, Connecticut Farm Bureau Association

The following testimony is submitted on behalf of the Connecticut Farm Bureau, a statewide nonprofit membership organization of over 5,000 families dedicated to farming and the future of Connecticut agriculture.

Senator Meyer, Representative Gentile and Members of the Environment Committee:

H.B. No. 6313 AN ACT CONCERNING LOCALLY GROWN POULTRY IN CONNECTICUT FOOD MARKETS.

Connecticut Farm Bureau Association supports H.B. 6313 as an expansion of PA 10-103 to add retail food markets as an approved food source. This is the logical next step following passage of the Farms, Food and Jobs bill of 2010 which established a program for CT grown, processed and inspected poultry to be sold by farmers at their farms, farmers markets, restaurants and boarding houses. This bill will allow Connecticut poultry producers to also sell fresh Connecticut poultry to retail food establishments and thereby provide Connecticut consumers with additional access to fresh Connecticut grown poultry. Initiatives such as this

Connecticut Farm Bureau Association supports S.B. 802 which will assist in clarifying state agency jurisdiction over the regulation of egg production, processing and distribution and the exemption for egg producers who sell directly to consumers.

S.B. No. 803 AN ACT CONCERNING AQUACULTURE JOB GROWTH.

Connecticut Farm Bureau Association supports S.B. 803 which will provide smaller, new companies access to Connecticut's shellfish beds thereby contributing to the expansion and diversity of the Connecticut aquaculture industry.

S.B. No. 804 AN ACT CONCERNING A PREFERENCE FOR CONNECTICUT GROWN PROTEIN IN CERTAIN STATE CONTRACTS.

Connecticut Farm Bureau Association supports S.B. 804 to allow for Connecticut Grown beef, pork and lamb to be considered in state food procurement contracts. This initiative will help expand markets for Connecticut livestock producers and provide greater opportunities to meet the demand for CT Grown meats.

S.B. No. 805 AN ACT CONCERNING THE TAKING OF EASTERN OYSTERS.

Connecticut Farm Bureau Association supports S.B. 805 which would remove the current size restriction on Connecticut Grown oysters thereby creating new market opportunities for Connecticut shellfish producers by allowing them to provide oysters sized to meet market preferences.

H – 1162

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL.56
PART 13
4177 – 4511**

Calendar 487 on page 26, Substitute Senate Bill 804, AN ACT CONCERNING A PREFERENCE FOR CONNECTICUT GROWN PROTEIN IN CERTAIN STATE CONTRACTS (As amended by Senate Schedule "A") LCO 6165 Committee Report of Environment (inaudible).

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Representative Albis of the 99th District.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Mr. -- thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good evening.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Good evening, sir.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

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

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

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

Will you remark, sir?

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this bill requires the Department of Administrative Services to give preference to state-grown protein, such as beef, pork, lamb, and fish that have been raised and produced here in Connecticut,

when procuring for various state agencies. Currently, the Department of Administrative Services can give preference to items, such as vegetables, fruits, poultry, eggs, and other dairy products, so this just allows for other types of protein to be included in that list.

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk does have an Amendment. It's LCO Number 6165. I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment and I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

sir, could you repeat the LCO Number?

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Sure, Mr. Speaker.

The LCO Number is 6165.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Will the Clerk please call LCO 6165, which is Senate Amendment "A"?

THE CLERK:

Senate Amendment "A" LCO 6165, adopted by the Senate and introduced by Senator Meyer et al.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Gentleman seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize the Amendment.

Is there objection? Is there objection?

Seeing none, you may proceed with summarization,
sir.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this Amendment allows the
Commissioner of Agriculture, upon request of any
farmers' market, to include that farmers' market on
any list of farmers' markets that are published by the
Department of Agriculture in their publications on the
internet or otherwise. And I move adoption.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Thank you, sir.

Would you care to remark? Would you care to
remark further on Senate Amendment "A"?

Representative Shaban of the 135th. You have the
floor, sir.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

I rise in support of the Amendment. This -- as
you can see this came out of the Senate. It is a
little off base from the general core of what we're
trying to do here, but overall, it's a good idea and I
urge adoption.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Thank you, sir.

Do you care to remark? Do you care to remark further on the Amendment before us?

Representative Ziobron of the 34th, you have the floor, madam.

REP. ZIOBRON (34th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just have a quick question of clarification to the proponent of the Amendment, please.

Through you.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Please proceed, madam.

REP. ZIOBRON (34th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

To the good Representative, how would a farmers' market request to be included on that list?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Would you care to respond, Representative Albis?

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Yes, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

A farmers' market could request in writing to the Department via actual snail mail or via email.

Through you.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And in addition, is there a deadline for this request? Sometimes, I know in -- in my area, usually those things any subsequent fliers are done, you know, in advance. Sometimes a farmers' market may miss the deadline. I'm just curious if it can be done at any time through the growing season or does it have to be done early on?

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

It would depend on the various publication deadline for that particular publication, but other than that, there is no deadline.

Through you.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Representative Ziobron.

REP. ZIOBRON (34th):

Thank you.

I rise in support of the Amendment. I think it's very important that our farmers' markets be given every opportunity they can to promote themselves and I thank the good Representative for proposing the Amendment.

Thank you.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Thank you, madam.

Do you care to remark? Do you care to remark further on Senate Amendment "A"?

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Those opposed, nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Nay.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The ayes have it.

The amendment is adopted.

Representative Albis, you still have the floor.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has another Amendment and that is LCO Number 6785. I would ask the Clerk to please call the Amendment and that I be granted leave of the Chamber to summarize.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Will the Clerk please call LCO 6785, which will be designated House Amendment "A"?

THE CLERK:

House Amendment "A", LCO 6785, introduced by Miner, et al.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Gentleman seeks leave of the Chamber to summarize.

Is there objection?

Seeing none, you may proceed with summarization, sir.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This Amendment simply strikes the word "fish" in all instances and replaces it with the phrase "farm-raised fish" to specify that the fish must be raised on a farm in the state of Connecticut to qualify for

the preference of the Department of Administrative Services, and I move adoption.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Thank you, sir.

Do you care to remark? Do you care remark further on the Amendment?

Representative Shaban of the 85th.

REP. SHABAN (135th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of the Amendment. The general thesis of the -- or the general idea of this Amendment is to not put pressure on a somewhat dwindling stock of naturally occurring commercial fish and if we're going to have a commercial preference, you know, if when state purchases, let's push it towards the commercial side of the equation for farm-raised fish. So good -- good idea and I urge adoption.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Thank you, sir.

Do you care to remark further on the Amendment before us?

If not, let me try your minds. All those in favor of House Amendment "A", please signify by saying aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Those opposed, nay.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Nay.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The ayes have it. ✓

The amendment is adopted.

Do you care to remark further on the bill as amended? Do you care to remark further on the bill as amended?

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

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.

The House of Representative is voting by roll. Will the members please report to the Chamber immediately.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Have all the members voted? Have all the members
voted?

Will the members please check the board to make sure your votes are properly cast?

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

Will the Clerk please announce the tally?

THE CLERK:

Bill Number 804, as amended by Senate "A" and House "A".

Total Number Voting	136
Necessary for Passage	69
Those voting Yea	136
Those voting Nay	0
Absent and not voting	14

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Representative Morris, for what reason do you rise?

REP. MORRIS (140th):

Mr. Speaker, I would like to have my vote cast in the affirmative.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

We've already announced the vote tally, sir, but the transcript will reflect that you are voting in the affirmative.

REP. MORRIS (140th):

Thank you.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Thank you, sir.

The Bill, as amended, passes.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 488?

THE CLERK:

Calendar 488, on page 26 of today's calendar, favorable report of the Joint Standing Committee on Human Services, Senate Bill 822, AN ACT CONCERNING INTERVIEWS OF CHILDREN BY THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES DURING INVESTIGATION OF CHILD ABUSE AND NEGLECT.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Representative Urban.

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

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

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

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

Will you remark, madam?

REP. URBAN (43rd):

Yes, Mr. Speaker.

S - 656

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

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

law/gbr
SENATE

122
May 1, 2013

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 21, Calendar 367 substitute for Senate Bill number 804, AN ACT CONCERNING A PREFERENCE FOR CONNECTICUT GROWN PROTEIN IN CERTAIN STATE CONTRACTS, favorable report of the Committee on Government, Administration and Elections and there are amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

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

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on passage. Will you remark, Sir?

SENATOR MEYER:

I would like -- shortly, yes. Right now under Connecticut law the Commissioner of the Department of Administrative Services is responsible -- responsible for buying food for State agencies and we have an existing law that says assuming that cost is no different than from outside the State that the Commissioner will buy -- will buy certain food in Connecticut and that includes dairy products, poultry, eggs, fruits and vegetables.

What this bill simply did -- does is it adds to that list by which the Commissioner will buy Connecticut food it adds beef, pork, lamb and fish as long as the cost is comparable. So that's what this bill does. There's also an amendment. I'm going to respectfully ask if we might call LCO 6165 and I'd be given permission to summarize. (Inaudible.)

THE CHAIR:

law/gbr
SENATE

123
May 1, 2013

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO number 6165, Senate A offered by Senators Meyer and Chapin.

SENATOR MEYER:

I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on adoption. Will you remark, Sir?

SENATOR MEYER:

Yes. Colleagues, this is an important farmers market bill and I'd like to yield to Senator Chapin to describe it.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin, will you accept the yield, Sir?

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President, I do accept the yield. Madam President, I think it was in 2006 the Legislature created a definition for farmers market in the State of Connecticut and since that time in the last six -- six and a half or seven years we've seen a tremendous growth in our local's farmers markets. The number of municipalities and those residents who have an opportunity to purchase fresh fruits and vegetables from their local farmers markets.

This amendment here simply clarifies that any farmers market who is recognized by the Department of Agriculture would like to be promoted by the agency, would be promoted upon request. What we -- if you've been on the Department's website lately you can find a nice brochure for certified farmers markets but not all farmers markets are certified.

This amendment would make sure that those are not certified farmers markets would therefore be promoted

law/gbr
SENATE

124
May 1, 2013

along with the certified ones as well. And I encourage my colleagues to support it. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark? Will you remark?
Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

May we have a voice vote on the amendment?

THE CHAIR:

Absolutely, Sir. All those in favor of the amendment please say aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed. The amendment passes. Senator Meyer.
Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President. A quick question to the proponent of the bill as amended. Through you, please.

THE CHAIR:

Please -- please proceed, Sir.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President. As you described we will be adding these protein sources or meats to the preferential treatment they may receive through DAS for those that are grown or produced in the State. Can you just clarify for me how we would define a fish that's grown or produced in the State? Through you, Madam President.

law/gbr
SENATE

125
May 1, 2013

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Yes, Madam President. This has been a well-rehearsed question and answer and I appreciate it as a matter of legislative intent. The fish that we described will consist of either fish farms that are located within the State of Connecticut or if a fish is caught in the waters it will be where the fish is docked. So that would -- that's the fish that we're looking at. Either farmed fish in Connecticut or where a fish is docked.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President. I thank the Gentleman for his answer. It does make sense that we do include those fish that are both farmed as well as those where the boats actually bring the fish into Connecticut ports. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much. Will you remark? Will you remark? Senator Meyer for the second time.

SENATOR MAYNARD:

I -- I am being reminded that the word is not docked. It's landed.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Maynard for your help.

SENATOR MEYER:

If there's no objection, can this please go on our Consent Calendar?

law/gbr
SENATE

126
May 1, 2013

THE CHAIR:

There is an objection. Would you like to speak, Senator McKinney?

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Madam President, I -- I don't have an objection to it going on Consent but I did want to first stand up and speak in favor of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, Sir.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

As a former member of the Environment Committee and proud of the work that we did on the Connecticut grown issue it has worked extremely well. It's been very important with dairy products and -- and fruits and vegetables produced by terrific Connecticut farmers. And I want to thank Senator Chapin and Senator Meyer for their work expanding what is a very good law that we already have to add I guess proteins we're calling them, meats, fish and the like. And excited to know that if you catch a fish somewhere in Long Island Sound if you're docked at Connecticut it's now a Connecticut grown fish. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark? Will you remark? If not, seeing no objection it will be placed on the Consent Calendar. Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. If the Clerk would call as the next -- the next two items, first Calendar page 16, Calendar 315, Senate Bill 278 and then if we might return to an item that we were waiting for an amendment earlier on and that is Calendar page 14, Calendar 283, Senate Bill 963. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

law/gbr
SENATE

167
May 1, 2013

Seeing no objection, so ordered, Sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. If we might now call for a vote on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Sounds like a great idea. Senator -- Mr. Clerk, will you please call for a vote and -- and first read the Consent Calendar before I open the machine.

THE CLERK:

On page one, Calendar 454, Senate -- Senate Joint Resolution number 55, Calendar 455, Senate Joint Resolution number 56, on page two, Calendar 456, Senate Joint Resolution number 57, Calendar 470, House Joint Resolution number 5. Also --

THE CHAIR:

Ninety five, Sir. I think the House Joint Resolution is number 95.

THE CLERK:

It is indeed 95. Also on page two, Calendar 471, House Joint Resolution number 96, Calendar 472, House Joint Resolution number 97, on page ten, Calendar 230, Senate Bill 235, page 14, Calendar 283, Senate Bill number 963, on page 16, Calendar 311, Senate Bill 1118, also Calendar 315, Senate Bill 1078, on page 21, Calendar 367, Senate Bill 804, page 24, Calendar 395, Senate Bill 967, on page 33 Calendar 102, Senate Bill 822, page 34, Calendar 104, Senate Bill 833, and on page 34, Calendar 105, Senate Bill 887.

THE CHAIR:

At this time Mr. -- Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

law/gbr
SENATE

168
May 1, 2013

Thank you, Madam President. One item that needs to be removed from the Consent Calendar that is Calendar 104 -- page 34, Calendar 104. If that might be removed from the Consent Calendar and marked passed temporarily.

JB833

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no -- seeing no objection, so ordered, Sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. And if the -- if we would -- might call for a -- a vote now on the other items marked consent.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, I will open the machine.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate in voting today's Consent Calendar. Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer. Senator Meyer, would you like to vote on the Consent Calendar, Sir. No problem.

Have all members vote, all members have voted. The machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk, will you call the --

THE CLERK:

On today's Consent Calendar.

Total Number Voting 35

Necessary for Adoption 18

Those voting Yea 35

Those voting Nay 0

law/gbr
SENATE

169
May 1, 2013

Those absent and not voting 1

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam -- thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I believe the Clerk is in possession of Senate Agendas two and three for today's session.

THE CHAIR:

Senator -- Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

The Clerk is in possession of Senate Agendas two and three both dated Wednesday, May 1, 2013. Copies have been distributed and are on Senators' desks.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Yes, thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I move all items on Senate Agendas numbers two and three dated Wednesday, May 1, 2013 to be acted upon as indicated and that the Agendas be incorporated by reference in the Senate Journal and the Senate transcript.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, Sir. Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, that will conclude our business for today. Before yielding the floor to members for announcements or points of personal privilege it's our intention to be in session

S - 660

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

**VOL. 56
PART 9
2501 - 2836**

vkd/gbr
SENATE

45
May 22, 2013

years past we raised the interest on delinquent taxes to keep in pace with the interest rate, it seems to me when the interest rates go down we should afford that same luxury. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark, Senator Looney?

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, if the bill might be passed temporarily.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk -- oh, sorry.

SENATOR LOONEY:

And Madam President, if the Clerk would call as the next item. (Inaudible).

If the Clerk would call Calendar page 48, Calendar 367, Senate Bill 804. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On Calendar page 48, Calendar Number 367, substitute for Senate Bill Number 804, AN ACT CONCERNING A PREFERENCE FOR CONNECTICUT GROWN PROTEIN IN CERTAIN STATE CONTRACTS AND THE INCLUSION OF FARMERS' MARKETS IN CERTAIN PROMOTIONAL MATERIALS OF THE DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE as amended by Senate Schedule "A" and House Schedule "A" Favorable Report of the Committee on the Environment.

vkd/gbr
SENATE

46
May 22, 2013

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Madam President, I move acceptance of the Committee's Joint and Favorable Report and move passage of the bill in accordance with the House amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on acceptance and passage in accordance with the House. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR MEYER:

I will. Colleagues, right now, as you may know, the Commissioner of the Department of Administrative Services often purchases food for use by -- by the state in one regard or another. And right now, there's a preference given, a priority given for purchasing certain foods that are grown in Connecticut. And that -- that priority for Connecticut-grown foods is for poultry, eggs, and dairy products. What this bill does is it adds to that list and says that assuming there's no greater cost by giving a priority to Connecticut home-grown products from -- from the price and cost in other states, it -- it extends the same priority to certain other protein products, and that includes beef, pork, lamb, and farm-fished -- farm-raised fish.

So this is a very significant step, I think, for Connecticut. It recognizes the priority of our -- of our fine foods, and that's what the first part of the bill does.

The second part of the bill, which comes, I think, at the suggestion of Senator Chapin, provides that farmers' markets must be -- should be listed on the Department of Agriculture's Internet Web site. So farmers' markets will get that kind of publicity, and will get that kind of a market and exposure that we like. So that is what the bill does and I urge its support.

THE CHAIR:

vkd/gbr
SENATE

47
May 22, 2013

Will you remark? Will you remark? Seeing none -- oops, Senator McKinney. Oops. Senator Chapin.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President. And, Madam President, for the purposes of an inquiry?

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President. I believe this is -- is this bill a disagreeing action so we would either have to accept or reject the House Amendment that came up from the House?

THE CHAIR:

I believe we have to accept the House Amendment. We've already had the bill in front of us which was amended by Senate "A", and then it was sent down where the House then adopted -- we have to accept the bill. We just have to accept the bill.

SENATOR CHAPIN:

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. So I will try your minds. Nope, I can't, because we have to accept the bill. If not, well, Mr. Burke I'm going to have to call -- Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Yes, the House -- the House made an amendment to define fish, to define the word fish, which was not defined when we passed the bill here in the Senate. And I wanted to make sure that it would be Connecticut farm-raised fish. And so they made that. It was a helpful amendment, a good amendment, I think. And that's why I -- I support, and I hope the Circle will support that amendment made by the House.

vkd/gbr
SENATE

48
May 22, 2013

THE CHAIR:

Okay, the vote is on the bill, sir, not the amendment. So I'm going to ask for a roll call vote and ask the Clerk to call for a roll call vote on the bill. Senator McKinney? Hold the vote, please.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Thank you. Madam President, if -- if Senator Meyer -- I think we all support the House Amendment. So I guess the question would be one of a point of order. Do we need a motion to accept House -- House "A" or can we just vote on the bill as an amendment?

THE CHAIR:

Senator McKinney, I was told by the legal counsel that we only had to vote on the -- on the bill.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Vote on the bill as amended by the house.

THE CHAIR:

That's it.

SENATOR MCKINNEY:

Well, Madam President, let me just rise -- let me just rise again in support of the bill. When the bill came out of the Senate, Senator Meyer and I had a question about what was a Connecticut-grown fish. And at one point I think we -- the conclusion was reached that a fish in Long Island Sound that was brought to Connecticut was Connecticut grown. So I feel that we've now orphaned a whole bunch of fish swimming around in Long Island Sound. But obviously there's tremendous amount of ambiguity with that definition. And knowing that the Connecticut-grown fish are farm-raised in Connecticut is obviously the more accurate definition and gets to the heart of what we're trying to do here. And I rise again in support of the bill. Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

vkd/gbr
SENATE

49
May 22, 2013

Thank you. Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ:

Thank you, Madam President. A little out of order here, but it's a very quick question through you to Senator Meyer.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR FRANTZ:

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. In line 19 of the amended bill, it goes on talking about beef, pork, lamb, farm-raised fish, fruits or vegetables will be given preference if their prices are comparable in cost to other dairy products. We sort of got into this discussion the last time, but not to my satisfaction. What do you consider for legislative intent purposes a comparable price or as long as they are comparable in cost. What does that mean? Does that include shipping? Does that include handling, et cetera, et cetera?

SENATOR MEYER:

Yes --

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Madam President, and that's a very good question. And from the standpoint of legislative intent, the cost of buying poultry or fish or beef or whatever from another state would certainly include, not just the cost of the product itself, but the cost of -- any other costs of handling and transportation.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ:

Thank you. Through you, Madam President. Can you then just to finish up on this particular question, can you give us a percentage range that would qualify an out-of-state bid for a contract or for the supply of whatever the material might be. What sort of a range would be acceptable in terms of a comparable price or cost? Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Madam President. I don't think I understand that question, sorry.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz, would you try to describe?

SENATOR FRANTZ:

Yes, through you, Madam President. The bill's language would say if we wanted it to be the exact same price, it would say, you know, the exact same price in the language. Then preference should be given to Connecticut companies. Here it's insinuated that there is a range of acceptable variation in price on a contract for this food stock. And line 19, it says, specifically "fruits or vegetables are comparable in cost to other dairy products, poultry, eggs, et cetera." So what I'm trying to get at, drill down to, is the comparable. In your judgment if it's a 1 percent difference should preference be given to Connecticut companies, if it's a 10 percent difference? In your judgment.

SENATOR MEYER:

I'm sorry --

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Thank you, through you, Madam President. I understand the question better now. Yeah, this bill does not say equivalent. It doesn't say equal. It says comparable. So that the intent here is that if -- if a product in Massachusetts, for example, was 1 percent or -- or less lower in cost that would be viewed as comparable to the Connecticut price, particularly when you add in the cost of transporting the product from Massachusetts to Connecticut.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ:

Thank you, through you, Madam President, not to go down this road too far, but if it was 3 percent after all the transportation costs were included as a final price for that contracted food stock would that still be comparable?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Madam President, I think 3 percent would still be comparable. Anything certainly 5 percent and under would be comparable as a rule of reason.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Frantz.

SENATOR FRANTZ:

Thank you, that helps tremendously. Thank you for assigning a range of 5 percent to equivalent value or cost is a big help for me. I stand in favor of this bill. Thanks for your hard work on that. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Will you remark? Senator Kissel.

vkd/gbr
SENATE

52
May 22, 2013

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much, Madam President. I just want to go back to the colloquy that Senator Meyer had with Senator McKinney because I just want to be clear. Because I remember distinctly the night that we originally passed this bill that Senator Maynard actually brought to our attention that the proper terminology for fish to be utilized in Connecticut was if they were landed in Connecticut. And so through you, Madam President, are we now saying that all seafood that is landed in Connecticut is now out, and it has to be farm-raised within Connecticut? Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

I'm sorry, Madam President, somebody else was speaking to me while that question was -- could you repeat the question?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel, could you please repeat the question, sir?

SENATOR KISSEL:

Sure. I remember very distinctly the night that we originally passed the bill and sent it down to the House that there was an interesting discussion regarding terminology as to what fish brought to Connecticut shores, and Senator Maynard, being down from the shoreline, said the proper terminology was landed in Connecticut.

A VOICE:

Docked.

SENATOR KISSEL:

And so I distinctly remember that because I learned something that evening about what the proper terminology is. Now the House has changed the underlying bill, and

vkd/gbr
SENATE

53
May 22, 2013

in the colloquy that you had with Senator McKinney, it seems like we are now limiting ourselves to farm-raised fish in Connecticut, and did the House actually take out all seafood that is landed on Connecticut shores. Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Through you, Madam President. To Senator Kissel, my view is that they did do that. They narrowed the definition of fish. I did -- I agree with you that we -- we were contemplating in here in the Senate when it went down to the House, two -- two types of fish. One was fish that was docked in Connecticut. I think that's the word that Senator Maynard used, and the other was farm-raised fish, which the House put in. I'm just reluctant, speaking to Senator Kissel and my colleagues, to make any further amendment now at this late in the session and send it down there. I'd be open to expanding that definition at the next session of the Legislature.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you, very much. And it's my recollection that we were using the term docked, and that Senator Maynard said that was incorrect, that landing the fish in Connecticut was the proper terminology, but we'll have to go back and scour the record for which one is which.

But, you know, I look forward to next year when Senator Meyer revisits this issue. Because I think are, A, we are foreclosing a huge source of protein by all that seafood that is brought in from the ocean and the Sound that is landed on Connecticut shores, and two, I won't spend a long time, but I don't know how great our stocks of farm-raised fish are.

And there are certain things that are farm-raised, such as tilapia and others, but there's a whole slew of seafood

vkd/gbr
SENATE

54
May 22, 2013

that we don't farm-raise in Connecticut, but we do catch right off of our shores that would be comparable sources of protein, and my guess would be comparably priced as well. So this was a golden opportunity. I think we brought in an awful lot of good things with the bill. I'll support the bill. But I -- I think the House Amendment was a bit unfortunate, and unfortunately tied our hands a little bit unnecessarily, and I'd like to see us broaden the definition a little bit, maybe after a public hearing so that we could offer similar benefits, not only to folks here in Connecticut, but to all the seafarers that ply their -- their trade and work so hard off of Connecticut's shores and rivers. Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Will you remark? Senator LeBeau.

SENATOR LEBEAU:

Thank you, Madam President, good afternoon.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon.

SENATOR LEBEAU:

Through you, Madam President. First of all, a comment. I want to congratulate the Chairman of the Environment Committee on working on this bill. I think this is a laudable effort in terms of trying to do something that we've tried to do in Commerce and tried to do in Administrative -- with Administrative Services and GAE in the past.

I think it's a difficult hill we're trying to climb. And that is trying to give preferences to the Connecticut State products of any kind. My fear is that this will trigger, since you just defined comparable as 5 percent or up to 5 percent, that this will trigger reciprocity agreements, some of which are in our own laws that we cannot, without having a reciprocal, in a sense, payback from other states, like New York, New Jersey, other neighboring states that this will trigger something that will -- that will basically actually hurt our producers in selling to other states. I hope that is not true. I hope comparable may

be acceptable language.

So with having that proviso in my mind, I -- I am going to vote for this, and let's -- let's hope that there are no negative consequences. I would like to continue working on this. The Commerce Committee this year had a couple of bills that dealt in this area not so much in terms of protein stocks, but just in terms of -- actually in terms of contracts. We have still one bill alive that has a different approach on trying to hire in-state workers and making an effort in that direction. But whenever we've gotten down to percentages, in terms of purchases from other states and giving preferences to Connecticut growers or producers, we've gotten into very thin ice on this. So I'm going to vote for this and hope it goes forward and hope that it doesn't have any negative consequences for our state. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Will you remark? Will you remark? Will you remark? Senator Meyer.

SENATOR MEYER:

Madam President, just to, in brief, response to the Distinguished Chair of Commerce Committee, we've had for some years in Connecticut a preference law in existence for Connecticut-made dairy products, poultry, and eggs. And as we went through the public hear in this bill, the members of the Environment Committee did not hear any concern about retaliation from the states, in part probably because we used the word comparable in the past, and we repeat that with respect to the new protein products we've added here.

So we'll watch this carefully, as Senator LeBeau says, but I think because of our experience with the -- with the other products that have done well, we're not going to experience a bad -- a bad event here.

Madam President, if there's no further comment, may this bill go on the Consent Calendar?

THE CHAIR:

Is there any -- not seeing no objection, so ordered.

S - 661

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2013**

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

vkd/gbr
SENATE

219
May 22, 2013

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 3, Calendar 202, Senate Bill 979. Calendar 215, Senate Bill 912. On page 15, Calendar 466, House Bill 5602. Page 35, Calendar 106, Senate Bill 916. Page 36, Calendar 120, Senate Bill 803 And Calendar 121, Senate Bill 918. On page 37, Calendar 132, Senate Bill Number 79, and Calendar 138, Senate Bill 886. On page 38, Calendar 196, Senate Bill Number 961. On page 39, Calendar 233, Senate Bill 995. On page 42, Calendar 301, Senate Bill 1015. Page 44, Calendar 385, Senate Bill 1070. Page 47, Calendar 504, House Bill 5345. And on page 48, Calendar 367, Senate Bill 804.

THE CHAIR:

I apologize. At this time, Mr. Clerk, seeing no objection, will you call for a roll call vote and the machine will be open.

THE CLERK:

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

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? All members have voted? The machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk, will you call a tally please?

THE CLERK:

On today's Consent Calendar,

Total number voting	36
Those voting Yea	36
Those voting Nay	0
Absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar passes. Senator Looney, you have