

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

**PA 14-173**

SB152

House	6522-6530	9
Senate	2384-2387, 2449-2450, 3465, 3473, 3480-3481	10
<u>Judiciary</u>	<u>916-925, 1207, 1211-1213</u>	<u>14</u>
		<b>33</b>

**H – 1199**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2014**

**VOL.57  
PART 19  
6233 – 6539**

THE CLERK:

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Will you please call Calendar Number 510.

THE CLERK:

On page 26, Calendar 510, Favorable Report of the joint standing Committee on Human Services, substitute Senate Bill 152, AN ACT CONCERNING COURT SUPPORT SERVICES.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The distinguished Chairman of the Judiciary Committee, Representative Fox; you have the floor, sir.

REP. FOX (146th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Good afternoon.

REP. FOX (146th):

I move for acceptance of the joint committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill, in concurrence with the Senate.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The question is on acceptance of the joint committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill,

in concurrence with the Senate. Will you remark, sir?

REP. FOX (146th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This bill is brought to us from the Judicial Branch, specifically the Office of Court Support -- the Division of Court Support Services; it makes several changes to their laws. Court Support Services is the division of the Judicial Branch that deals with probation, as well as family relations.

The -- the bill makes -- amends certain -- certain sections. It allows the PRAWN system to be used more, which is the Paperless Arrest Warrant Network. It also allows -- improves the communications between probation officers and the Division of Criminal Justice and the Department of Correction.

It also makes it clear that a violation of -- of a protective order that is issued by the Court as a conditional probation is a criminal offense. And it allows -- it amends the Pretrial Drug Education Program to allow a treatment option for first-time users.

Mr. Speaker, the Clerk has an amendment, LCO 5454. I would ask that that be called and I be given

leave to summarize.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Will the Clerk please call LCO 5454, which will be designated House Amendment "A."

THE CLERK:

House Amendment "A," LCO 5454, introduced by Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

This amendment addresses Section 4, which deals with the COLLECT System. If the members will recall, we had a bill last week dealing with state marshals, and we had taken out their -- a delayed access to the COLLECT System due to some concerns about federal law. This also takes the COLLECT System provision out of this bill.

And I would move adoption of the amendment.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

And -- and you moved adoption, sir.

REP. FOX (146th):

Yes, I --

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Is that correct?

REP. FOX (146th):

-- just did. Yes, sir.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The question -- we'll stand at ease for a moment.  
I'm not sure the amendment has been distributed to  
both sides of the aisle.

REP. FOX (146th):

Oh.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

So we'll stand at ease for a moment.

(Chamber at ease.)

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The Chamber will come back to order.

I believe the amendment has been distributed.

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

Would you care to remark?

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS (70th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and good afternoon.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Good afternoon, madam.

REP. REBIMBAS (70th):

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment. Consistent, as Representative Fox had indicated on another bill, we did have to limit the access to the COLLECT System, because it -- under federal provisions, certainly there is only specific agencies and people who are authorized to view that information. And, once again, it's something that we caught in this legislation that's before us, so we do have to take that out of the legislation.

So I do rise in support of the amendment.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Thank you, madam.

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

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

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Those opposed, Nay.

The ayes have it. The amendment is adopted.

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

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker, and happy last day to you.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

And to you, sir.

REP. SMITH (108th):

Thank you.

Just a -- I heard a comment by the good Chairman about the alcohol -- Alcohol Education Program, and I'm just wondering if he could clarify that, what the changes are for the, for the Chamber.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, actually, I was referring to the Pretrial Drug Education Program, so it was not the Alcohol Education Program.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108th):

And I think it's been too many late nights, Mr. Speaker, so if he could explain that, then, I'd appreciate it for the Chamber.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And what it does is it -- it will, the proposed change will allow a treatment option for first-time users of the program.

Through you.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108th):

And I'm just wondering you how that might differ from the current program.

Through you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Representative Fox.

REP. FOX (146th):

Through you, Mr. Speaker, well now, it's my understanding, that it's an education provision; this will also allow for a treatment provision.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Representative Smith.

REP. SMITH (108th):

I -- I thank the Chairman for his answers.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Thank you, sir.

Would you care to remark? Would 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 Representatives is voting by roll. Will  
members please report to the Chamber immediately.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Have all members voted? Have all the members  
voted?

Will the members please check the board to make  
sure your vote is properly cast. If all the members  
have voted, the machine will be locked. And the Clerk  
will take a tally.

And will the Clerk please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Senate Bill 510 as amended by House "A"

Total Number Voting 143

Necessary for Passage 72

Those voting Yea	143
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	8

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

The bill, as amended, passes, not in concurrence  
with the Senate.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar 334.

THE CLERK:

On page 34, Calendar --

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Three-three -- three?

A VOICE:

Nine.

A VOICE:

Three-nine.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Three-three-nine?

A VOICE:

Three-nine.

SPEAKER SHARKEY:

Sorry; could you please call, Mr. Clerk, the  
Calendar 339. .

THE CLERK:

Yes, Mr. Speaker. On page 34, Calendar 339,

**S - 676  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2014**

**VOL. 57  
PART 8  
2311 – 2667**

lgg/rd/cd  
SENATE

222  
May 2, 2014

forward.

Thank you very much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

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

Senator Coleman.

SENATOR COLEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

Late one night during a committee meeting Senator  
Klarides' name just slipped my mind. I just  
couldn't bring it up so before I make AND  
compound that mistake, let me also give credit  
and acknowledge Senator Klarides' work on this  
bill.

And with that said, Mr. President, if there are  
no further remarks to be made, may I move this  
item to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Is there objection?

Seeing none, so ordered.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Also on page 43, Calendar 399, Substitute for  
Senate Bill Number 152, AN ACT CONCERNING COURT  
SUPPORT SERVICES, favorable report of the  
Committee on Judiciary.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Coleman.

lgg/rd/cd  
SENATE

223  
May 2, 2014

SENATOR COLEMAN:

Amendments.

SENATOR COLEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

May we stand at ease for a second or two?

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will stand at ease.

(Chamber at ease.)

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will come back to order.

Senator Coleman.

SENATOR COLEMAN:

Mr. President, this bill --

THE CHAIR:

Move the bill.

SENATOR COLEMAN:

I'm sorry. Did I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report in passage of the bill? If I didn't, I will now.

THE CHAIR:

On acceptance and passage, will you remark?

SENATOR COLEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

SENATOR COLEMAN:

Regarding this bill, the main purposes of this bill is to provide for the access of records and sharing of information to facilitate the operation and the responsibilities of the court support services division.

So among other things, this bill would allow DCF to share information records with the court support services division. It would also allow probate courts to access juvenile records. It would allow the employees of the criminal justice division and the Department of Corrections to access information and plans regarding alternative sentencing and community release plans.

Additionally it would provide for the judicial branch to access the Connecticut Online Enforcement Communications Teleprocessing System. It also provides that violations of protective orders that are entered as a condition of probation would now be considered an additional crime. And it provides that an applicant, through the drug education program, may do substance abuse treatment rather than attend the classes of the drug education program. I urge the Senators to support the bill.

Thank you, Mr. President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Coleman.

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much, Mr. President.

I'm happy to support the bill. It's one of those administrative cleanup bills that we do typically

either every year or every other year for court support services. Senator Coleman did a commendable job in listing off the laundry list of things that the bill does.

Essentially much of what the bill does is make sure lines of communication are open and clearly delineated, such that the free flow of information can help court support services do their appropriate mission. And for those variety of reasons I'm happy to support the bill.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will your remark further on the bill? Will your remark further on the bill?

Senator Coleman.

SENATOR COLEMAN:

I move the bill to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Is there objection to placing the bill on the Consent Calendar?

If not, so ordered.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Page 43, Calendar 405, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 457, AN ACT CONCERNING REVISIONS TO THE COMMON INTEREST OWNERSHIP ACT, favorable report of the Committee on Judiciary. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Coleman.

lgg/rd/cd  
SENATE

287  
May 2, 2014

Page 43, Calendar 387, Senate Bill 432.

Page 43, Calendar 399, Senate Bill 152. Also on  
page 43, Calendar 405, Senate bill 457.

On page 6, Calendar 328, House Bill 5125.

And on page 8, Calendar 337, House Bill 5131.

On page 19, Calendar 460, House Bill 5057; and on  
page 20, Calendar 462, House Bill 5472; and on  
page 25, Calendar 501, House Bill 5578.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, please call for a roll call vote on  
the Consent Calendar. And the machine is open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the  
Senate. Immediate roll call on the Consent  
Calendar Number 2 has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? All members voted. The  
machine will be closed.

Mr. Clerk, will you please call the tally.

THE CLERK:

On today's second Consent Calendar.

Total Number Voting	34
Necessary for Adoption	18
Those voting Yea	34
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	2

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, would request suspension for  
purposes of immediate transmittal to the House of  
calendar page 37, Calendar 198, Senate Bill 357.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, yield the floor to members for  
announcements or points of personal privilege or  
upcoming committee meetings.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any points of personal privilege or  
upcoming meetings?

Senator Linares.

SENATOR LINARES:

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good morning, sir.

SENATOR LINARES:

Good morning. Happy Saturday to you.

THE CHAIR:

I don't know about that sir, but go ahead.

**S - 679  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2014**

**VETO  
SESSION**

**VOL. 57  
PART 11  
3246 – 3508**

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. And the second item under disagreeing actions on Senate Agenda Number 1 is Substitute Senate Bill Number 152. Move to place this item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. If we might stand at ease for just a moment to verify any additional items.

THE CHAIR:

Senator, can we look at Page 24 please and see if you have anything that you wanted to put on Consent on Page 24, please.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Not on this list. I believe we had added some, may have added some earlier, but on this list, I don't have any from Page 24, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Okay, thank you.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Okay, thank you.

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

pat/gbr  
SENATE

288  
May 7, 2014

SENATOR LOONEY:

Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. One additional item to place on the Consent Calendar at this time. It's Calendar Page 25, Calendar 562, Substitute for House Bill Number 5466. I move to place that item on the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. Now, Madam President, if the Clerk would list the items on the Consent Calendar so we might proceed to a vote.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

We have items from previously adopted Senate Agendas, House Bill 5525, Senate Bill 152, House Bill 5528, House Bill 5311.

On Calendar Page 5, Calendar 327, House Bill 5099.

Also on Page 5, Calendar 330, House Bill 5441.

On Page 6, Calendar 341, House Bill 5117.

Calendar 338, House Bill 5323.

Calendar 344, House Bill 5442.

pat/gbr  
SENATE

295  
May 7, 2014

SENATOR LOONEY:

If we might pause for just a moment to verify a couple of additional items.

Madam President, to verify an additional item, I believe it was placed on the Consent Calendar and Calendar Page 30, on Calendar Page 30, Calendar 592, Substitute for House Bill 5476.

THE CHAIR:

It is, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

It is on? Okay. Thank you. Thank you, Madam President. If the Clerk would now, finally, Agenda Number 4, Madam President, Agenda Number 4 one additional item ask for suspension to place up on Agenda Number 4 and that is, ask for suspension to place on the Consent Calendar an item from Agenda Number 4.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President, and that item is Substitute House Bill Number 5566 from Senate Agenda Number 4.

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

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk. Will you please call for a Roll Call Vote on the Consent Calendar. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

An immediate Roll Call has been ordered in the Senate.

pat/gbr  
SENATE

296  
May 7, 2014

An immediate Roll Call on Consent Calendar Number 2 has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

If all members have voted, all members have voted, the machine will be closed. Mr. Clerk will you please call the tally.

THE CLERK:

Consent Calendar Number 2.

Total number voting	36
Necessary for adoption	19
Those voting Yea	36
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar passes. Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President. Two additional items to take up before the, our final vote on the implementer. If we might stand for just, for just a moment.

The first item to mark Go is, Calendar, to remove from the Consent Calendar, Calendar Page 22, Calendar 536, House Bill 5546. If that item might be marked Go.

And one additional item, Madam President, and that was from Calendar, or rather from Agenda Number 4, ask for suspension to take it up for purposes of marking it Go, that is House Bill, Substitute for House Bill 5417. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**JUDICIARY  
PART 3  
886 – 1483**

**2014**

SENATOR COLEMAN: I get a little confused by your comment that there can only be two parents. Let's go back to the scenario that Representative Rebimbas proposed.

So assuming that there is a biological parent and a step-parent pursuing an adoption, the biological parent who is the spouse of that step-parent joins in the adoption, could the other parent who is not the spouse of the step-parent pursuing the adoption also join in the adoption proceedings?

JUDGE PAUL KNIERIM: Not as it's drafted.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Okay.

JUDGE PAUL KNIERIM: So as long as there is a biological parent who is participating in the adult adoption, only one other person can be an adoptive parent and the converse is also true the way it's drafted, only one biological parent can join in that adoption.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Okay. Thank you. Are there others with questions? If not, thank you for your testimony.

JUDGE PAUL KNIERIM: Thank you very much.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Next is Senator Martin Looney. I don't see him in the room. Next would be then Judge Carroll and Stephen Grant.

STEPHEN GRANT: Good morning.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Good morning.

SB152

STEPHEN GRANT: Senator Coleman, Representative Fox, Senator Kissel, Representative Rebimbas and members of the Judiciary Committee, my name is Stephen Grant and I was recently appointed the Executive Director of the Court Support Services Division.

It's a pleasure to appear before you today on behalf of the Judicial Branch to testify in support of Senate Bill 152 AN ACT CONCERNING THE COURT SUPPORT SERVICES DIVISION.

This bill is one of two bills that the Branch has submitted this year. It includes language from Senate Bill 995, our proposal in 2013 that did not make it through the House of Representatives, as well as items that are new to this Session.

The purpose of all of these changes is to allow the Judicial Branch to function more effectively and efficiently and specifically for the Court Support Services Division to serve our clients in a more effective and meaningful fashion.

Briefly, the bill would accomplish the following. Section 1 will allow CSSD to screen families that we're working with to see if there is involvement with the Department of Children and Families.

If this proposal passes, the procedure would be for CSSD to inquire with DCF about family involvement. If DCF indicates there is family involvement we would secure a release of information form from the parents and families, forward that to the Department of Children and Families and exchange information.

The intent here is for the two systems, the two state agencies, to have a coordinated response to families that are in crisis. We have frequently seen more often, families that have dual system involvement cases in the child protection system and cases in the delinquency court. The outcomes are far more effective for families when we are able to fashion a coordinated response.

Section 2 amends the juvenile confidentiality statute to allow probate judges and employees to access juvenile records to the extent necessary to perform their official duties and to allow for the taking into custody orders to be disclosed to the necessary individuals.

The second aspect is a conforming change related to proposed changes in Section 5, which I'll cover shortly.

Section 3 would amend language that was enacted at our request in 2012 to make the alternative sentencing plans confidential in order to allow the State's Attorneys and the Department of Corrections access to these sentencing plans and community release plans.

Precluding access to those entities was an oversight. The State's Attorney's office and DOC employees need access to this information in order to perform their duties.

Section 3 would specifically authorize the Judicial Branch to access the Connecticut On-Line Enforcement Communication Teleprocessing System, otherwise known as COLLECT in order to evaluate the suitability of applicants for sensitive Judicial Branch and private contracted positions.

As you can imagine, the Branch has a significant amount of sensitive information. We're working with families, children that are detained, victims of sexual assault and domestic violence, and this would be our effort to preserve the integrity of the hiring process so that we can ensure that prospective employees meet their prerequisite requirements.

Section 5 would enable law enforcement officers to locate and execute, take into custody orders through the paperless re-arrest warrant network

otherwise known as PRAWN, a secured system maintained by the Judicial Branch.

Presently, in 2014, this is a manual paper process. The vast majority of the request from law enforcement regarding the take into custody occurred during non-court hours, typically weekends and holidays.

Converting to an automated format would allow for a more accurate and efficient service of these orders and ultimately help to prevent unauthorized detention of children and the misuse of sensitive information.

Section 6 would add standing criminal protective orders that are entered as conditions of probation to the criminal violation protective order statute, thus allowing the violations to be prosecuted under that statute.

Presently, when a judge orders a protective order as a condition of probation and a probationer violates that order, it's a violation of probation, not a separate and distinct criminal offense.

Our goal here is to strengthen again, the integrity of the protective orders and ultimately ensure the safety of victims of domestic violence.

Sections 7 and 8 would amend the language enacted in 2013 that merged the pretrial drug education and the community service programs in order to provide treatment options for persons who are using this program for the first time. I'd like to respectfully request a technical change to this language, and specifically on line item 429 after it says 15 sessions, we'd like to insert language that says as ordered by the court based on the evaluation and

determination required under subsection c of this section, and the intent here is not to have a cookie cutter automatic 15 session format. It will still have the evaluation drive the needs of the client have and would receive.

Thank you for this opportunity to testify and I'd be pleased to answer any questions you have.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Are there questions for Mr. Grant? Representative Rebinbas.

REP. REBINBAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and good morning.

STEPHEN GRANT: Good morning.

REP. REBINBAS: Thanks for your testimony. I want to bring your attention to, I believe you had mentioned Section 2 regarding the access to juvenile records?

STEPHEN GRANT: Yes.

REP. REBINBAS: I know that's a very sensitive area and I understand the philosophy behind the superior court wanting to know exactly what's going on in the juvenile court so everyone's communicating and hopefully going toward the same goal, and I think that would be in an ideal judicial society.

However, unfortunately, many times what's going on in the juvenile court may or may not have anything to do directly with what's going on in the superior court and is also a lot of very privileged, private, confidential information that exists in the juvenile file that very often the parents, guardians and attorneys try to protect from any other court system, whether that's criminal or superior.

So again, I understand the intent. I'm just trying to work out the practicality in my mind of exactly how that's going to occur.

Would this be limited to the parent that shows up in superior court, whether or not they have had any history in the juvenile court, or this specifically only for a juvenile that's subject of a superior court matter?

STEPHEN GRANT: Thank you for the concerns and the question. The intent here is specifically to allow probate court to have access to the information, not the superior court system of the state because of all the concerns that you've raised in that setting.

REP. REBIMBAS: So my apologizes for assuming that this was a superior court. Using my example in the probate court, is it the adult, the parents that come in before the probate court if they have had any juvenile issues with their children in the juvenile court that you were going to access it, or is it only if that child is subject of something in the probate court?

STEPHEN GRANT: It would only be if that child is specifically is subject to an action of the probate court. That's my understanding.

REP. REBIMBAS: Okay. And is it only limited if there's a pending matter currently before the juvenile court, or are you seeking to obtain information that had been, you know, a prior matter in the juvenile court with that child?

STEPHEN GRANT: My understanding is that it would be specifically, the driver of this would be if there was an action currently in the probate court.

REP. REBIMBAS: How about the action in the juvenile court? So there would have to be a current pending matter in the juvenile court at the

same time that there is a probate court pending?

STEPHEN GRANT: I would have to defer and get back to you with an answer on that.

REP. REBIMBAS: Okay. I do find that provision again, to be very concerning. There is a lot of times that you want the parents to cooperate fully in the juvenile court and they subject themselves to a variety of different evaluations, psychological evaluations, programs and testings and there's a lot of pleadings, of course, and negotiations that occur in the juvenile court that I believe may unintentionally have some negative ramifications in the probate court or again, open up these now privileged files.

Because once the probate court has it, there's a lot of other people who may have access and legal access to obtain those records through the probate court. So it's certainly probably, you know, more discussions to be had and probably see more questions I'll have in the future regarding this.

STEPHEN GRANT: And we will absolutely do the research and respond.

REP. REBIMBAS: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Thank you. Are there others with questions? Representative Gonzalez.

REP. GONZALEZ: Good morning.

STEPHEN GRANT: Good morning.

REP. GONZALEZ: And thank you. When you said about screening families that they got problems with DCF, can you elaborate a little bit about that?

STEPHEN GRANT: Particularly since Raise the Age, we have seen more and more 16 and 17-year-olds

appear before the delinquency court that have quite a lengthy history in the child protection arenas and have, either are or have been under some supervision or activity of the Department of Children and Families.

Right now we're unable to exchange information. Very often the Judicial Branch will put conditions of supervision that include treatment interventions that may be inconsistent with what the Department of Children and Families have either done in the past or are currently doing with the family.

So it's about trying to achieve a coordinated response. These families are in conflict and in chaos and sometimes when we give two different sets of marching orders, I think it just exacerbates their troubled situation.

REP. GONZALEZ: Thank you.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Chairman Fox.

REP. FOX: Thank you, Mr. Chairman and good morning, Mr. Grant and it's the first time we've had you in your new role, so congratulations on that.

STEPHEN GRANT: Thank you.

REP. FOX: I would look forward to working with you. With respect to this bill, on Section 6 you reference the issue regarding protective orders and when the judge orders that as a condition of probation.

And just so everyone's clear then, right now when someone is sentenced, put on probation and one of the conditions of probation is that they have to stay away from whoever the person is that they were involved with in this crime, that the only thing that the police can do or probation can do is arrest this person, or

violate their probation and send them back to court?

STEPHEN GRANT: Yes. That's correct and that's actually what we're trying to remedy. Whereas there is a protective order entered by a routine measure under the auspices of a family violence case, the police are able to intervene based on speedy and on-site information and actually initiate an arrest and/or other safety measures for the victim.

Whereas now, if it's a condition of probation, the only remedy is in fact to go through the process of a violation of protective order, which takes a considerable amount of time.

REP. FOX: Which can take longer, make the victim have to deal with this during the course of that process and so in this instance, the person could be arrested for violating the protective order as well as probation, could violate their probation and they'd have to deal with both of those.

STEPHEN GRANT: Yes, absolutely correct. The time, our real concern is that extends the amount of time that a victim could be in harm's way, and as you point out, the police could make an on-site arrest based on speedy information and simultaneously the probation officer will also move forward with a violation of probation.

REP. FOX: Thank you. And another question I have with respect to this bill is the, I think it was Section 8, or 7 and 8 dealing with the drug education program and the community service labor program and I see the change that you're looking to make. I have a more general question just to ask you. How is that being received, the changes that were made? Because there were a number of discussions with the Judicial Branch in implementing this.

33  
pat/gbr JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

February 24, 2014  
10:00 A.M.

STEPHEN GRANT: The changes are being received very well. Far more fits, frankly, the pragmatics of that arena and really what was occurring.

REP. FOX: Yeah, I mean, for the people that don't remember, and it wasn't that long ago, but there was the two programs that were out there. People have used them. They're not interchangeable but sometimes they'd be used interchangeably and that could create other problems.

STEPHEN GRANT: Absolutely.

REP. FOX: Okay. I'm pleased to hear it's being well received, because when you make a change sometimes you get to see how people respond. Thank you.

STEPHEN GRANT: You're welcome.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Do other members have questions? Seeing none, thank you, Mr. Grant.

STEPHEN GRANT: Thank you.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Turning our attention to the public list, first signed up on that list is Chief Anthony Salvatore.

ANTHONY SALVATORE: Good morning, Senator --

SENATOR COLEMAN: Good morning.

ANTHONY SALVATORE: -- Representative Fox, members of the Judiciary Committee. My name is Anthony Salvatore, Chief of Police for the Town of Cromwell as well as representative for the Connecticut Police Chiefs Association. I have four bills to speak on this morning.

Raised Bill 54 with regards to an MOU between boards of education and law enforcement personnel. We're not opposed, but are somewhat

SB 55

HB 5060

HB 5217



**STATE OF CONNECTICUT**  
**DEPARTMENT OF MENTAL HEALTH AND ADDICTION SERVICES**  
*A Healthcare Service Agency*

Dannel P. Malloy  
 Governor

Patricia A. Rehmer, MSN  
 Commissioner

**Memorandum:**

**TO:** Senator Eric Coleman  
 Representative Gerald Fox  
 Members of the Judiciary Committee

**FROM:** Commissioner Patricia Rehmer, DMHAS

**DATE:** February 24, 2013

**SUBJECT:** Written Testimony on Senate Bill 152

Senator Coleman, Representative Fox, and distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee: thank you for the opportunity to submit written testimony on SB 152 An Act Concerning Court Support Services.

The Department of Mental Health and Addiction Services administers the drug education portion of CGS 54-56i the Pretrial Drug Education And Community Service Program. We are writing to express our support for Sections 7 and 8 of SB 152 AN ACT CONCERNING COURT SUPPORT SERVICES that modify CGS 54-56i. We have worked in concert with the Judicial Branch to make recommended changes to this program and appreciate their willingness to include these changes in their proposal.

Providers contracted to DMHAS conduct a clinical evaluation for defendants who apply to the court for this program. Based on the evaluation, the providers then forward a report to the court and recommend an appropriate level of intervention to adequately address their drug use. The current statute provides two options for intervention for second-time users of the statute, a fifteen-week drug education program or a more intensive substance abuse treatment program of not less than fifteen sessions, but the statute provides only the former option for first-time users.

Section 8 of SB 152 adds the option of a substance abuse treatment program for first-time users of this program whose pattern of drug use has progressed to a point where a more intensive intervention is required to aid behavior change. Section 8 also replaces the old term "drug intervention" with "drug education" to be consistent with the other portions of the statute that use "drug education". Section 7 also deletes a remnant of the earlier terminology. The Branch is suggesting an amendment to the language in Section 8 of the bill and we support that change as well. Thank you for your time and attention to this matter.



**STATE OF CONNECTICUT  
JUDICIAL BRANCH**

**EXTERNAL AFFAIRS DIVISION**

231 Capitol Avenue  
Hartford, Connecticut 06106  
(860) 757-2270 Fax (860) 757-2215

**Testimony of Stephen R. Grant,  
Executive Director, Court Support Services Division**

**Judiciary Committee Public Hearing  
February 24, 2014**

**S.B. 152, An Act Concerning Court Support Services**

Senator Coleman, Representative Fox, Senator Kissel, Representative Rebimbas and members of the Judiciary Committee, my name is Stephen Grant and I was recently appointed the Executive Director of the Judicial Branch's Court Support Services Division (CSSD). It is a pleasure to appear before you today, on behalf of the Judicial Branch, to testify in support of **S.B. 152, AAC Court Support Services**. This bill is one of two that the Branch has submitted this year. It includes the language from S.B. 995, our proposal from 2013 that did not make it through the House of Representatives, as well as items that are new this session. The purpose of all of these proposed changes is to allow the Judicial Branch to function more effectively and efficiently, and to allow the Court Support Services Division to better serve our clients.

Briefly, the bill would accomplish the following.

**Section 1** would allow the CSSD to screen the families we are working with for Department of Children and Families (DCF) involvement. If this proposal passes, the procedure will be for CSSD to inquire with DCF about family involvement. If DCF indicates that the family is involved with DCF, CSSD will obtain a release from the family to allow access to DCF records and information. Currently, initial information about whether CSSD clients are DCF involved is obtained through self-reporting. The ability to verify directly whether clients have active cases with DCF will result in a better understanding of the client's and the client's family needs, thereby facilitating the provision of appropriate supervision and services.

**Section 2** amends the juvenile confidentiality statute to allow Probate Court judges and employees to access juvenile records, to the extent necessary to perform their official duties, and to allow the Take Into Custody orders to be disclosed to the necessary individuals. This second piece is a conforming change related to the proposed change in section 5, which I will describe shortly.

**Section 3** would amend language that was enacted at our request in 2012 to make Alternative Sentencing Plans confidential, in order to allow the State's Attorneys and Department of Correction access to alternative sentencing plans and community release plans. Precluding access to those entities was an oversight; the State's Attorneys and Department of Correction employees need access to this information in order to perform their duties.

**Section 4** would specifically authorize the Judicial Branch to access the Connecticut On-Line Enforcement Communication Teleprocessing (COLLECT) system in order to evaluate the suitability of applicants for sensitive Judicial Branch and contractor positions that include access to secure Judicial Branch information systems. Because they will have access to confidential information, the Judicial Branch needs to be able to screen certain categories of potential employees, and contractors' potential employees, for pending and non-disclosable cases.

**Section 5** would enable law enforcement officers to locate and execute Take Into Custody orders through the PRAWN (Paperless Re-arrest Warrant Network), a secure computer system maintained by the Judicial Branch. Currently, this is a paper process. Converting it to an electronic system will allow for more accuracy and efficiency in the service of these orders, and will help prevent the unauthorized detention of children and the misuse of sensitive information included on the paper copies.

**Section 6** would add restraining orders that are entered as a condition of probation to the criminal violation of protective order statute (C.G.S. § 53a-223), thus allowing violations to be prosecuted under that statute. Currently, when a Judge orders a protective order as a condition of probation, a probationer who violates that order cannot be arrested for criminal violation of a protective order. This proposed change will address this gap.

**Sections 7 and 8** would amend the language enacted in 2013 that merged the pretrial drug education and community service programs in order to provide a treatment option for persons who are using that program for the first time, and to make technical changes. I would like to respectfully request a further technical change to this language, as follows: