

CONNECTICUT GENERAL ASSEMBLY

SENATE

Wednesday, March 4, 2020

The Senate was called to order at 2:17 o'clock p.m.,
the President in the Chair.

THE CHAIR:

Will the Senate please come to order. Members and
guests, please rise and please direct your attention
to our wonderful chaplain, Bonita Toussaint who will
lead us in prayer.

BONITA TOUSSAINT:

Good afternoon, Honorable Lieutenant Governor, our
Honorable Senators, our guests, our staff. My we
bow our heads in reverence to God's blessing.

Father, Lord, on your behalf, we would like say do
to no one what you yourself dislike. Give to the
hungry some of your bread and to the naked some of
your clothing. Seek counsel from every wise person.
At all times, understand that you are blessed.

Seek the path of wisdom that all your endeavors and
plans be for the greater good. This is the
beginning of a new day. We have been given this day
to use as we will. When tomorrow comes, this day
will be gone forever. Whatever you leave of today,

let it be something good. And the people will say,
Amen.

THE CHAIR: Thank you so much, Bonita. And I'd like
to invite Senator Champagne to come up and please
lead us in the Pledge of Allegiance, sir.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you.

[All] I pledge allegiance to the Flag of the United
States of America. And to the Republic for which it
stands, one Nation under God, indivisible with
liberty and justice for all.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you so much, Senator Champagne. And Senator
Duff, good afternoon, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Madam President,
does the clerk have any business on his desk?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

The clerk is in possession of Senate agendas number
one and number two dated Wednesday, March 4, 2020.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move all items on Senate Agenda's no. 1 and 2 dated Wednesday, March 4, 2020 to be acted on as indicated and that the agenda be incorporated by reference into the Senate journal and Senate transcripts.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objections, so ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Some markings for our calendar please.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar page 1 Calendar 32 and on Calendar page 1 calendar 33 I'd like to mark those items for our Consent Calendar please.

THE CHAIR:

Yes, so ordered.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. On Calendar page 2
Calendar 31 Senate Resolution no. 4 if I could mark
that item go.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, so ordered. Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page 2, Calendar No. 31 S.R. No. 4. RESOLUTION
PROPOSING APPROVAL OF AN INTEREST ARBITRATION AWARD
BETWEEN THE STATE OF CONNECTICUT AND LOCAL 3419 OF
COUNCIL 4, AMERICAN FEDERATION OF STATE, COUNTY AND
MUNICIPAL EMPLOYEES, AFL-CIO.

THE CHAIR:

Well, good afternoon, Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Great to see you
again and I'm hoping that we're in session every day
starting next week so we can finish some business.
Are you ready?

THE CHAIR:

I sure Am.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

All right. I think we have a lot -- I think I have
a consentable item here. I'll let you know at the
end of the discussion, how's that?

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, please proceed.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Okay, thank you very much, Madam President. Madam President, I move acceptance of S.R. No. 4.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. And the question is on adoption. Would you please proceed.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much. Madam President, this is an interest arbitration award different than a contract. It has already gone through the regular contractual procedures and the parties reached impasse. Arbitrated or discussed the differences and arbitrator came back with this award which is between the State of Connecticut and AFSCME Council 4 Local 3419 DCF program supervisors.

It's a four year arbitrated award that ends on June 30, 2021. It covers approximately 99 employees unless someone may have been retired in the last little bit of time. Our program supervisors at the Department of Children and Families, they unionized. They petitioned to unionize in Fiscal Year 2017. Between 2010 and 2017 had six years of zeros, 0 percent salary increases with increased cost to their pension and their healthcare essentially receiving less money than they had in 2010.

They testified that they have had six years of zeros as a result of -- between 2010 and 2017. And this arbitration award, it has the first two years both 2018 and 2019 having a 0 percent wage increases. In 2020 and '21, hold wage increases that I will talk about in a minute.

Program supervisors make what we would consider the most heart wrenching decisions. They are the people who decide whether a child stays in a home, when a child needs to be removed and when things have been resolved, whether or not a child can be placed back in the home or need another placement.

These program supervisors supervise five to six social worker supervisors who themselves oversee five social workers. Therefore, each program supervisor has between 35 to 46 employees reporting to them, covering about 400 to 600 hundred cases that are before the Department of Children and Families.

This contract includes a general wage increase retroactive to July 1, 2019 of 3.5 percent equivalent to \$343,781. Plus, a 2 percent annual increment cost in -- and that is equated to \$62,787. Plus, all receive a one-time payment of \$2000 in line with the SEBAC agreement. That cost is \$198,000. In addition to that, all of them must take three furlough days in FY 20. The savings are \$117,301.

In FY 21, a 3.5 percent general wage increase is equating to \$360,209 plus a 2 percent annual increase totaling \$61,533. In lieu of the annual increment, those employees who are at max salary receive -- will receive a lump sum payment of 2

percent of their annual salary at a total cost of \$74,057 in FY 20 and and \$85,666 in FY 21.

The estimated fringe benefit costs are \$59,910 in FY 20 and 104,250 in FY 21. The pension impact of the wage related provisions assume an average normal costs SERS rate of 5.7 percent. The total estimated retirement cost of \$31,996 in FY 20 and \$55,676 in FY 21.

The increase cost to SERS will not be recognized in the state's actuarial determined employee contribution or ADEC until FY 22. As the FY 21 contribution is set based on the June 30, 2019 actuarial valuation.

The reserve for salary accounts is where the funds that are outlined in this contract or arbitration award are the general fund account currently has \$68.8 million in it or -- so there is adequate funding to cover the cost associated with this award. I seek leave for passage of this and if there are no objections, I'd put it on the consent calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Will you remark further? Well, good afternoon, Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Good afternoon, Madam Governor or Madam President. Thank you so much for the opportunity. And as far as the Consent Calendar, I think we'd like to hold off on that for discussion before we make a decision if that's all right with the good Senator.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

But I do rise to speak a little bit about this initiative. I may have a question or two for the good Chairwoman of Appropriations. My first one would be through you, Madam President. The ability to form a union, petition the collective bargain.

If you could take me through that process because you mentioned, Senator, 2010 through 2017 there were no wage increases for this particular group of employees. Who, by the way, do a terrific job and any conversation we have here about dollars doesn't impact our feeling about the quality of work that they have to do with these children.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

I'm sorry to interrupt you. My fault for pausing there. But the 0 percent from 2010 to 2017 was a result of the -- the employees being classified as management so therefore they were not eligible for those raises from this legislature. That would be my question. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. I believe the question is how does -- how does one become a member of a bargaining unit would be the initial question.

Through you, is that the question?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Almost, yes. When you are previously classified as managers, how does one become classified to be able to be unionized.

Through you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much. So, if someone is classified as a managerial employee and the petition the State Labor Relations Board for -- as a petition saying that they do not meet the statute under -- that is 5-270(g). That outlines what it takes to be a manager. And the State Labor Relations Board takes that petition and makes a decision on -- as to whether or not that group of employees is defined as a manager by statute.

After that process, if the State Labor Relations Board says that those employees are managers than it goes no farther. If the State Labor Relations Board, as they did just the other day with a different group, says that they are not managerial employees by the statute, then they can petition to collectively bargain. And see if their unit can either accrete into another bargaining unit or become a stand along bargaining unit, depending on what those workers are trying to do.

So, then they have to have -- they can either have an election or be recognized by the administration as a bargaining unit. So, that's another process that happens. They sign cards, those cards are counted. Or they hold an election and that election is held and if people choose, if there's 50 percent plus one of the number of people that want to be in the bargaining unit then they become a bargaining unit. And then the bargaining commences.

So, they start negotiating the details of a contract from A to Z if they are a new bargaining unit. If they are accreting into another bargaining unit, they negotiate specificity to that particular group of employees and how they fit into the already negotiated or awarded contract that is available.

If the parties are mutually agreed upon on every issue, then that contract is signed and submitted to the General Assembly for approval. If there is an impasse, then the employees and the administration pick an arbitrator and they go to arbitration which can take anywhere from a year, six months to four or five years.

So, generally, that's the process. And once the arbitration award comes back, it's also submitted to the General Assembly for discussion. And we decide whether to accept that contract or arbitration awards with the -- with the decisions based on whatever the body of the General Assembly decides. Does that answer your question, sir?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Yes, thank you. That was the short answer to the question that I asked. My concern, my question really could be again as a follow up was why didn't that process take place in 2010? But we'll leave that. The fact is that they were -- this particular group was allowed to collective bargain and here we are discussing the opportunity that you very eloquently pointed out.

Now, you mentioned that this falls within the structure of the SEBAC Agreement. My understanding of the SEBAC Agreement is that it is in effect until 2027 and handles the -- the pension and health benefits for all of the labor unions. Would that be correct?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. There -- this -- the SEBAC salary agreements end in 2021. The SEBAC Health and Pension Agreement ends, the current one ends in 2027. Two different things so they're one after the other.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. So, the SEBAC Salary Agreement is separate from the SEBAC Pension and Health Agreement. 2021 which is in the effective finish date of this particular arbiter's award on the contract that we're discussing today.

And my understanding then would be that the SEBAC structure for -- for wages would be 3.5 percent annual increase for the years that would be in -- in question or discussion. This is retroactive back to June of last year or July 1 of last year. So, the raises will be accrued from July 1, 2019 currently. And then a 3.5 percent next year until the contract ends in June 30, 2021.

The additional SEBAC salary structure would include a \$2000 one time cash payment as well as those two 3.5 percent increases. And then, yeah, I guess job security would not be -- but would that -- would

that be my understanding, would that be correct, Senator, on the salary structure of the SEBAC Agreement?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. FY 21 is a 3.5 percent general wage increase, a 2 percent annual increment which I did not hear you say, and a \$2000 one-time payment. In addition, there are three furlough days incorporated into this agreement also as it was in all of the other contracts. And a 3.5 percent general wage increase and a 2 percent annual increment in FY 21.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. I was trying to get to the point, what is the difference between the SEBAC salary structure and arbiter, the -- the arbiter -- the issue that the arbiter had to decide on. And my understanding was it was 3.5, 3.5 and 2000 is the SEBAC and that the arbiter was really deciding on the annual increment of 2 percent or whatever that number. I think the -

- the state -- the state's last best offer was 1.5 percent.

So, I just want to try to bring it down to what was actually decided by the arbiter in terms of what the salary structure was. And what is covered under the SEBAC salary structure, not including health and pension.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And through you, the arbitration, the arbiter even though this contract follows the pattern of -- of the agreement, the -- the state looked at the last best offers and attempted to get a lower percentage annual increment and the arbiter said that he believed, he or she, I'm not certain who it was. But he or she was, the Senator is telling me that it was a woman and I'll take his word for it, I didn't look at the name. I was only looking at the dollars, quite frankly, Madam President. [laughter]

So, the state still tried to attempt to get a lower annual increment of 1.5 percent and the arbiter -- the arbiter agreed with the union and gave a 2 percent in the annual increment.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. So, then I guess my understanding is correct. The standard -- when we go to have contracts, we kind of say automatically they're getting a 3.5 percent, 3.5. percent and \$2000 cash award. And the only thing that -- that would be in question would be, what is the extra two, the extra percent?

In this case, the arbiter ruled in favor of the union who would ask for 2 percent over the state which had offered 1.5 percent. So, there may be some other items in the -- in the budget but it would seem to me, we're starting with that structure. And really, we're only talking about the 2 percent.

Which Madam President, if I'm adding the numbers right, we're 3.5 plus 2 plus \$2000 and what is that equal in terms of a percentage of salary given a \$60, 65, 70 thousand whatever the salary level is. That would end another three-quarters or one percent. So, we're looking at 6.5 percent annual increase for this particular award. Less whatever the furlough day comes out to be per employee.

So, I think when we talked about this in Committee, when the folks made their presentation to the Appropriations Committee, I think it was agreed on to be about 6.15 or 6.25 percent annual increase when you -- when you fashion in the furlough.

So, I think it's a fairly rich award. The total is \$653,000 through this fiscal year ending June 30, 2020 and \$1.136 for next fiscal year ending June '21 and then \$1.2 million following.

Two questions for the Senator, through you, Madam President. The furlough of \$117,000 that savings is being affected by June 30, 2020?

THE CHAIR:

Should we let the Senator answer that one so that we --

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

So, that I can remember what the second one was? Yes. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

There you go. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. And if I could just back track a little bit on a couple of the statements made by the good Senator. Quite frankly, this is not a rich contract. You still have to incorporate the fact that there were 8 years of no salary increases. This is not something where people are receiving beyond the -- beyond what they should be paid.

And I have always looked at salary increases as a way of us determining the quality of the work that they do. It's really nice to say to someone, you've

done a good job. It's much nicer to recognize what the work that they have done and seen and showing them that we appreciate that work. And providing them with a salary commiserate with the value that we have for the job.

And so, you know, I understand that -- that may be a difference of opinion. But that is my opinion here that these workers went 8 years without any pay raise at all. And over 2 years, receive a pay increase with three furlough days which drop down the first years increase because those furlough days are at no pay.

And so, I pointed out, because I think that it's important to recognize that these folks here at 3.5 percent, 2 percent, \$2000, the \$2000 is the -- the -- the -\$117,301 for the furlough days does not leave a 6 percent increase, it just doesn't.

And so, I think that we need to always take a whole comprehensive look at a job classification and see where they are. So, 8 years of no pay -- no pay increases is significant no matter where you are. And does lead workers to look at ways to keep up with their current expenses.

They have the same expenses that we all have. Their mortgage prices, their mortgage payments did not go down. The price of heating oil and electricity did not go down in that 8 years but their pay did. And I think that we have to remember that piece of it.

So, I think that these workers have followed the process and I'm hoping that we have a consentable, all joking aside, a consentable contract here. To people who went 8 years working each day in some of

the most difficult decision were made by these people in some of the hardest work that people can take on. And I'm looking forward to having this arbitration award passed through -- with a -- with a modest increase in salaries.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. And so, the answer to my question of the \$117,301 furlough coming out by June 30, 2020 is correct?

Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

That is coming out by June 30, 2020.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Formica.

SENATOR FORMICA (20TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Thank you, Senator. And -- and thank you for the explanation on the, you know, the value of giving raises to employees. In

my nearly four decades as a small business owner, I too find the value of giving raises occasionally when it's deserved or on a regular schedule. So, I understand that.

What I think the Senator is not understanding or we haven't had the information, in fairness to her, is the fact that for all those years that these folks were deemed managers, we don't know what other perks came with the -- with the benefit of the job being a manager. So, they may not have gotten financial raises but they may have gotten other opportunities, flexible schedules, other expenses being paid.

I -- I don't know, I'm just guessing. But I know that managers in the private sector often get undesignated compensations for the fact that they are deemed managers and have the opportunity to control people. So, I think it's an apples and orange comparison. But I thank the good Senator for her answers to my questions. I don't believe I'll have anymore questions for Senator Osten.

Madam President, I'd just like to make a quick comment. We can move along with the business of the day. Understanding the value of these employees is not hard to do. These benefits that are being paid coming out of the reserve for salary which is quite a bit of money this year and perhaps next.

But that \$1.2 million annually will be folded into the general fund increase moving forward in budgets. Just as all of the other raises and increases in union membership that we've seen over the last 12 months here in this chamber will increase our personal service numbers.

It seems to be, Madam President, that a lot of things are being crowded out that this money could be used to help people on Main Street, people in nursing homes, those with development disabled folks. There are many other opportunities that I think we could use this -- these dollars for while these folks are getting -- getting -- getting their due.

But that being said, I'd like to thank the Senator for her -- for her comments. I will not be voting for this today. And I don't think therefore I can ask for a consent on this particular item. But when it's time, we can ask for a roll call vote if you will. And I'm not sure if there are other conversations. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you very much, Senator Formica. And this item will not be on the Consent Calendar. Senator Anwar.

SENATOR ANWAR (3RD):

Thank you, Madam President. I rise in support also on this arbitration recommendation. I think it's important because when we start to have conversation and we look at the details, we lose the big pictures. And I think it's worthy to have a little bit of a conversation about the big picture.

The most vulnerable children in our state are overseen by the DCF. Many of the complex cases that would just break our hearts are being managed and taken care of in our -- our state agency, the DCF.

And right now, each one of these supervisors is

ultimately responsible for 400 to 600 children. 400 to 600 children are being impacted by the capacity quality of these individuals. And if based on talking to and then using the existing talking point that we can't pay, we don't want to pay, we are being conservative on saving the resources.

If we shortchange the most vulnerable children in our state, we are doing a disservice to the children who do not have an advocate right now. Except these supervisors and now also the people working for the DCF. And I think it's worthy to look at it from that perspective to begin with.

Because sometimes we are not respecting our state employees. Sometimes we are not respecting the people who have given their heart and soul every single day to take care of 400 to 600 children each, not the total number, each.

If you have kids filed, if anybody does kids work, they should actually start to look at, if you have a heartbreaking situation in your family or in any place, you would actually have to live with that pain but also help them out. But if you have 400 to 600 similar cases, how are you going to be able to survive and can we pay you enough?

And what we have done as a state is for about 8 years, we gave them zero dollar increase. And then we expect them to come here to work every single day with a zero dollar increase. And then when after giving them on an average about 1 percent increase at this time, everybody is going to say, oh we don't have enough money, let's go and save the people in the nursing homes, let's go pay and save the people of the disabled children.

Absolutely we have to do that but when the conversation happens about the disabled children and the nursing home, where is the group and people who actually want to save those children? They're not there. This is just a talking point.

Every time there is an issue, we say oh, let's say the people in the nursing home. Absolutely, let's save the people in the nursing home but at what cost. Did the cost of the children who don't have any resource? Let's be real, let's be practical, let's be honest.

We have a responsibility to take care of the children, we have a responsibility to provide the care to the workforce that has been taking care of our children. Those are our children.

And I'm not going to play politics, I'm going to actually go ahead and vote in favor of this. Because I honor the people who are working, taking care of the children who are without the resources. I want to support the people who are taking care of the children and I will be supporting this going forward. Thank you so much.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Anwar. Will you remark further? Will you remark further? Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I have a question to Senator Osten, if I could.

Through you Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten prepare yourself. Please proceed,
sir.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

My question is, what are the years of this contract?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much. 2018 to 2021, '18, '19, '20
and '21.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Why doesn't it list the other years on here? It
just has a settlement for two years.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

I'm not certain. Through you, Madam President, I'm not certain of the documents that the gentleman is looking at.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. When we look at a contract, we look at the years that the contract is valid for and those are the years that we negotiate. So, when was this union recognized, what year?

THE CHAIR:

Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. 2017 with a contract that started in 2018. And if you look at the arbitration award on page 5, discussion of the issues, there shall be no wage increase paid to any bargaining unit program supervisor for the first two contract years of 2017-2018, 2018-2019.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. For some reason, I was not given that document. So, I'm here to vote on a contract that I just guess wasn't given to me. So, that's kind of odd to me.

But either way, right now we have a two year agreement, that's what I can see on paper. And we're looking at approximately \$5000 in cash per employee with a total cost of about \$6000. And it's per employee per year. And the other is approximately \$6102 per year with all the benefits and payouts.

If I'm looking at just the two years, that's excessive. Going all the way back to 2010, you can't do that. You can't -- you can't go anywhere outside of the contract. And if these negotiations were taking place, I don't know why I -- well again, I don't have the document so I can't comment on that.

But reading on paper for the two years that are here, to me that's excessive. Because right now, the statewide arbitration award on average is 2.1 percent. That's 2.1 percent for everybody expect state employees. And when I talked to the attorneys about this, they say they have to exclude because the state employees are at a much higher rate than -- than the rest of the union workers across the state.

Which kind of, I guess causes a problem with me because we keep talking about how we don't have enough money for a lot of things. If -- if the arbitration across the state is 2.1 percent, that's what we should be starting at or looking at. Instead, we're up at well, 5.5 percent. That's --

that's where we are right now with the 3.5 and the 2.5. That's 5.5 a year. That's 3.4 percent higher than the average.

And I'm going to have issue with that because it is so much higher than the state average. And when I look at this, I look at other employees and other contracts that were settled and there are contracts that were settled with 0 percent a year because the towns didn't have the money. They were settled at 1 percent a year.

And we can't go back say well, you know, we gave them 1 percent because that's all we could afford so we should give them a much higher percent this year. It should be what is negotiated at the time and what's the -- what -- what can we afford and what can we not afford. So, thank -- thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Champagne. Senator Osten.

SENATOR OSTEN (19TH):

Thank you very much. This contract was received in the Senate clerk's office on February 7, 2020. And was heard at the -- the Appropriations Committee in a public hearing. And is bargaining from August 10, 2017 through June 30, 2021.

And -- and -- and I -- I will talk to you as we see each other, Senator Champagne. But if you look at the numbers, the contracts on the municipalities have gone up much higher than the contracts for state employees. That's just a -- a fact.

When you have people that haven't gotten a raise and out of 8 years, since 2007, you need -- 2017, you need to incorporate that into the discussion. It is not a snapshot in time. A contract is broadly defined and it does impact from 2017 to 2020.

So, I don't know what you have. I'd be happy to give you my copy of the arbitration award. Which shows the discussion that was happened -- that the arbitrator had and shows the last best offer and why the arbitrator decided on that.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Osten. Senator Champagne.

SENATOR CHAMPAGNE (35TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I wasn't expecting to respond but I will. And I'm going to disagree with what you say about the municipalities, the average that was received because we look -- I look at that on a constant basis because I've been doing contracts for years. And the average right now is 2.1 percent and it's expected to go to 2.2 percent next. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Champagne. Will you remark further on the bill? Senator Fasano.

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Thank you, Madam President. As we once say, *deja vous* all over again. Madam President, first of all I want to say that DCF Commissioner Dorante is - is just doing a fantastic job. And I want to step away from this issue and say that what she's done at -- at DCF has been remarkable.

I think the morale was low before she took over. I think the morale is starting to get better. I think the service is changing. I wish her the best of luck. She has been there for a while as an employee and to be a commissioner, I think means a lot. And she's so attentive. And her and Vinney and I want to congratulate them both for doing a great, great job. And I just want to take that opportunity to say so.

Moving to this contract. Look, DCF workers work very, very hard and what they have to do and the issues that they face are -- are pretty incredible. With that being said, the issue that's before us is what can the state do to afford what we're doing.

We have conversations in this circle that we don't have enough money to increase allowances for those folks who are on Title 19 or other care. We can't even find a million dollars in a year so they can have \$10 in their pocket.

We're not funding reinsurance program that would bring health insurance premiums down because we can't find the money. And our constituents are paying time and time again.

Social services, I heard a lot looking at some of the testimony at Appropriations and advocates around this building of wanting, I think, over 5 years,

\$460 million. These are all things that are equally important that we need to talk about.

So, I looked over since 2006 to 2018 what the growth was in various areas. And what I found is the fringe has gone up 5.1 percent, 5.1 percent. Social services, human services has gone up 1.4 percent. That's a dramatic difference, dramatic difference.

We hear UConn talking about, get us out from under this fringe. Get us out from under this animal that's crushing us, causing us problems at UConn Medical and UConn University.

These are the reasons. They want to negotiate their own contracts because they think they can do a better job. These are the reasons why this state is facing issue after issue.

If you look at the contracts that we did in the past and you add this contract, we're getting closer and closer to adding incremental costs of \$100 million, \$100 million. These people do good work, I'm not belittling what they do, they do great work.

But you've got to look at things in perspective, what we can afford and what we can't afford. Or at least make the adjustments to budgets so we can make this work. But we keep adding and adding and adding.

And what have we seen? We've seen organizations within our system going from supervisor to union. So, that they can take advantage of the 3.5 percent increase that they get every single year. That doesn't happen out in the real world and there's a reason for it.

This is, take Disneyland in here with the step in salaries and increases. It's not related to COLA's. It's not related to cost of living increases because the cost of living increases are 1.2 percent if that, maybe 2 percent at best.

It is a fake economy that we're trying to play to but it's not a COLA. It's a rate increase of 3.5 percent no matter what happens on the outside. That's not fair to the people of the State of Connecticut who's got to pay this.

Madam President, we've got to correct the right -- we've got to correct the wrong that has happened. Workers deserve the best contracts in the country are state workers. Maybe not times 10 but the best contracts in the country. And we should give increases where it's appropriate to keep with the standard of living going up.

And this arbiter in this case is the same arbiter who, by the way, a couple years back when some state employees illegally committed fraud by signing a piece of paper saying that their refrigerator was out, they wanted the food replacement. And they signed an affidavit saying they were only making X and they were making greater than X and they were arrested for that fraud.

And Governor Malloy did the right thing. He stood and said, you're fired. This arbiter said no, that's okay, it's fraud under penalties of perjury but that's okay. We will go ahead and let them come back to service. What does that tell the people of the State of Connecticut?

Madam President, this is a concern not just on this contract but every contract that we've done. We've got to look at what we're doing to this state. We've got to look out at how the fixed costs are crowding out our social services, our municipal aid and our education.

So, Madam President, I cannot support this at this time. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Will you remark further? Senator Looney, good afternoon, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Madam President, I'm speaking in support of the resolution and the arbitration award. I think it's important to recognize that -- that this is -- this is not a contract, it is an arbitration award, post contract negotiation. The state and the union were unable to agree on the terms of the new contract after which had then went to the neutral arbitrator.

And it's important, I think, to recognize as was stated earlier, I believe, that under the last best offer provisions, the two last best offers in this case were, in fact, very, very close. So, both the management offer and the union offer were very, very close.

And that the arbitrator had also found that the -- the cost differential on the two proposals was only about \$50,000 a year, representing a very small portion of the overall compensation package.

So, Madam President, I would urge that we -- that we respect the process that we have required the parties to go through in order to resolve these differences. And this is, in fact, the result of a conscientious post-contract negotiation to resolve in this arbitration award and would urge the chamber to approve it. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Mr. Clerk, kindly call the roll and announce the vote and the machine will be opened.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate. S.R. No. 4. Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on S.R. No. 4. Immediate Roll Call vote in the Senate, S.R. No. 4.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be locked. (Gavel) And the measure is adopted. Oh, pardon me, Mr. Clerk, please do announce the tally.

CLERK:

S.R. No. 4.

Total number voting	33
Total number voting Yea	18
Total voting Nay	15

Absent not voting 3

THE CHAIR:

And the resolution is adopted. Thank you, Mr.
Clerk. (Gavel)
Senator Duff

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President of the
clerk, please read the two items on the Consent
Calendar for a vote please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

CLERK:

Page one Calendar 32 S.R. No. 19, page one Calendar
33 Senate Joint Resolution No. 20.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, if you would kindly call the roll, the
machine has been opened.

CLERK:

Immediate Roll Call vote has been ordered in the
Senate on Consent Calendar No. 1. Immediate Roll
Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on Consent
Calendar No. 1, Consent Calendar No. 1. Immediate
Roll Call vote has been ordered in the Senate on
Consent Calendar No. 1. Immediate Roll Call vote in
the Senate, Consent Calendar No. 1.

THE CHAIR:

Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? Have all the Senators voted? The machine will be locked and Mr. Clerk, if you kindly announce the tally please.

CLERK:

Consent Calendar No. 1

Total number voting	33
Total number voting Yea	33
Total number voting Nay	0
Absent and not voting	3

THE CHAIR:

And the Consent Calendar is adopted.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

I'm going to yield to you.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, for a point a personal privilege please.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Last week when we gathered, the Senate held a moment of silence for Senator McCrory's father, Isaac McCrory. And today was the viewing and the funeral of which many Senators came to as well. So, we just -- I just wanted again, just pay my respects to a man who I did not know, obviously but who really gave a lot to the Harford community. Somebody who is an entrepreneur and somebody who loved his family.

So, I'm going to yield to Senator Fasano but again, just wanted to make a general indication as to why Senator McCrory is not here today. But also, more importantly, to say that we learned a lot about a man who escaped, well left the deep south, came up to Connecticut to raise his family and was someone who had a great impact on his -- on the neighbors, the neighborhood where he lived. I'd like to now yield to Senator Fasano.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Duff. Senator Fasano, do you except the yield?

SENATOR FASANO (34TH):

Yes, I do. Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, for those of us in the circle who had the unfortunate of losing their father, I know it's very difficult to lose one's dad. I did not know Senator McCrory's dad but I do know Senator McCrory as we all know. Knowing the qualities that Senator

McCrorry has, his father had to be a remarkable man to pass those qualities on down to Senator McCrorry.

And I did attend the funeral this morning to greet the family and pay my condolences. And I would now like to yield to Senator Looney.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Fasano. Senator Looney, do you accept the yield, sir?

SENATOR LOONEY (11TH):

Yes, I do, Madam President and thank you to Senator Fasano for the yield. Yes, as Senator, as our majority leader Senator Duff, Senator Fasano said many of us were at either the viewing and/or the service this morning. And those of us who were there for the service heard the -- just the wonderful loving eulogy that Senator McCrorry gave for his dad.

As was said, he was born and raised in Columbus, Georgia and at the age of 19, married right out of high school and he and the Senator's mother had a loving marriage for over 62 years until his father's death. They came ultimately to Hartford and his father was an entrepreneur in the grocery business.

Owned a number of stores over the years and began a legend in the north end of Hartford. Providing services for kids, building a playground near his store thinking not only of his own children but -- but neighborhood children as well. And always was an inspiration to his children to get an education

and to have a sense of commitment and involvement and responsibility to the community.

So, it's no surprise that a man like that had a -- had a high achieving son like Senator McCrory. Who was very conscious of his father's legacy, as he said today, in -- in everything that he -- that he does.

Mr. McCrory was again, one of those enterprising people who -- who left the -- the oppressive segregated south in the late 1950s seeking a new life and found it here in Hartford. And he was a strongly contributing member to this community.

He also believed in lifelong learning. And Senator McCrory said his father, at the age of 70, began to attend classes at Manchester Community College and -- and spent -- and also later on at Capital Community College. So, he was a life long learner, committed to reading. Read many newspapers every single day and always both exhorted and challenged all around him to be informed, be aware, be involved. And that is the kind of legacy that he spread not only to his own family but throughout the community that was blessed by his presence for so many years. Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator Looney. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President, I yield for any other points of personal privilege or announcements, please.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Haskell.

SENATOR HASKELL (26TH):

Thank you very much, Madam President. Just want to announce that the Higher Education and Employment Advancement Committee meeting scheduled for tomorrow has been cancelled. We'll be in touch with Committee members about finding a new date.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir. Any further points? Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President, that ends our business for today. I move that we adjourn subject to call of the chair.

THE CHAIR:

We are adjourned. Go forth and govern.

On motion of Senator Duff of the 25th, the Senate at 3:55 p.m. adjourned subject to the call of the chair.