

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

PA 16-37

SB76

Senate 458-462, 1713, 1835-1836 8

Environment 141-142, 153, 155, 178-181, 356, 360-362 12

House Transcripts have not been received. They are available on CGA website, but are not the Official copy. Contact House Clerk for assistance (860) 240-0400 **20**

Transcripts from the Joint Standing Committee Public Hearing(s) and/or Senate and House of Representatives Proceedings

**Connecticut State Library
Compiled 2017**

S - 692

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2016**

**VOL. 59
PART 2
356 - 678**

je/mc
SENATE

33
April 13, 2016

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I would like to refer this item to the Joint Committee.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Again, going in order as we marked our Calendar, if the Clerk can now call Calendar page 4, Calendar 72, Senate Bill 76.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 4, Calendar 76, Senate Bill Number 31 -- take that back.

THE CHAIR:

Yes please.

THE CLERK:

On page 4, Calendar 72, Senate Bill Number 76, AN ACT CONCERNING CONNECTICUT'S FARM TO SCHOOL PROGRAM.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon, Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

je/mc
SENATE

34
April 13, 2016

Good afternoon, Madam President. I move adoption of amendment of this bill. I'd like to ask the Clerk -

-

THE CHAIR:

Excuse me. The motion is on adoption --

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

I move adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Of the bill.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

On the bill.

THE CHAIR:

Of the bill. Thank you very much. The motion is on adoption. Will you remark further?

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Yes, Madam President. The underlying bill --

THE CHAIR:

I'm sorry, do you want to call the amendment first?

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Yes. The amendment is LCO 3612 --

THE CHAIR:

je/mc
SENATE

35
April 13, 2016

Mr. Clerk.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

I'd like the Clerk to call that and ask just to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 3612, Senate A, offered by Senators
Kennedy and Chapin.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kennedy.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Yes. Just to summarize, again --

THE CHAIR:

You would like to move adoption of the amendment,
sir.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

I move adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on adoption. Will you remark now,
sir?

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH):

The amendment adds language to the bill to clarify that the bids in this farm to school program must follow all state and local bid processes including selecting the lowest cost bidder.

THE CHAIR:

Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment? If not, I will try your minds. All those in favor of the amendment please say Aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed. The amendment passes. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, I would like to refer this item to the Education Committee.

THE CHAIR:

je/mc
SENATE

000462
37
April 13, 2016

Seeing no objection, so ordered sir. Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If we can now call
Calendar page 13, Calendar 222, Senate Bill 301.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 13, Calendar 222, Substitute for Senate Bill
Number 301, AN ACT MODIFYING THE STAND FOR MANDATORY
REPORTING OF ENVIRONMENTAL SPILLS, favorable report
of the Committee on Commerce.

THE CHAIR:

Good afternoon, Senator Hartley.

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Good afternoon, Madam President. Madam President, I
move acceptance of the Joint Committee's favorable
report, Madam, and passage of the bill please.

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on acceptance and passage. Will you
remark, ma'am?

SENATOR HARTLEY (15TH):

Yes, indeed. Thank you, Madam President. Madam
President, the proposal that we have before us is a

S - 696

**CONNECTICUT
GENERAL ASSEMBLY
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS
2016**

**VOL. 59
PART 6
1704 – 2057**

/je
SENATE

10
April 29, 2016

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 32, Calendar 72, S.B. No. 76, I'd
like to place that item on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 39, Calendar 402, S.B. No. 349, I'd
like to place that item on our Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

On Calendar Page 41, Calendar 463, H.J. Resolution
No. 37, I'd like to place that item on our Consent
Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. And if the Senate -- if
Mr. Clerk, if you can start with Calendar Page 75 --

/je
SENATE

132
April 29, 2016

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. If the Clerk can now please call the items on the Consent Calendar, followed by a vote of the Consent Calendar, please.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Calling from today, Consent Calendar No. 1.
Calendar 75, S.B. No. 81. Page 5, S.B. No. 248.
Page 5, S.B. No. 379. Page 7, S.B. No. 142. Page
32, S.B. No. 76. Page 39, S.B. No. 349. Page 41,
H.J. Resolution 37.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, will you please call for a roll call vote and the machine will be open with the Consent Calendar.

THE CLERK:

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

THE CHAIR:

If all members have voted? All members have voted?
The machine will be closed.

Mr. Clerk, please call the tally on the Consent Calendar.

/je
SENATE

133
April 29, 2016

THE CLERK:

Total Number of Voting	36
Those Voting Yea	36
Those Voting Nay	0
Absent and Not Voting	0

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar passes. (Gavel) Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. Madam President, is the Clerk in possession of Senate Agenda No. 2?

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Yes, Madam President, the Clerk is in possession of Senate Agenda No. 2 dated Friday, April 29, 2016.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk -- I mean -- sorry, Senator Duff.

SENATOR DUFF (25TH):

Thank you, Madam President. I move that all items on the Senate Agenda No. 2 dated Friday, April 29, 2016 be acted upon as indicated by -- and

**JOINT
STANDING
COMMITTEE
HEARINGS**

**ENVIRONMENT
PART 1
1 – 575**

**2016
INDEX**

tell me where we -- where we are?

AMY BLAYMORE PATERSON: By best estimates, we're approximately -- so I'm going to back up before I answer that exactly.

So the state has its goal of 21 percent, and of that 21 percent, the state of Connecticut is to conserve 10 percent and others, which would be towns, land trusts and water companies, would be conserving 11 percent.

So focusing on the state's portion of it; because the numbers for the 11 percent are not very -- they're not clear. But looking just at state's portion, that 10 percent, we're approximately 73 percent there. But the amount of -- which sounds good, but it's going to take -- I think the number was -- is Karl still here? It's going to take I think over 8,000 acres a year to even come close to meeting that goal, and that is just not possible.

It's just not possible in terms of our track record, and in terms of the funding; and staff, for that matter.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH): Any further questions?
Seeing none, thank you for your testimony, Amy.

AMY BLAYMORE PATERSON: Thank you very much.

REP. ARCONTI (109TH): Henry Talmage followed by David Sutherland.

HENRY TALMAGE: Good afternoon, Senator Kennedy, Representative Arconti, Members of the Environment Committee. My name is Henry Talmage. Excuse me. I'm the Executive Director of the Connecticut Farm

8B76
SJR 5

Bureau, a non-profit membership organization representing 5,000 families dedicated to farming and the future of Connecticut agriculture.

I come here before you today, and submitted written testimony on two bills; RB76, AN ACT CONCERNING CONNECTICUT'S FARM TO SCHOOL PROGRAM, which I won't spend time on, but we favor that. And then SJ5, the constitutional amendment, which you've heard a lot about so far, and I'd like to reiterate a few -- a few points there; and you can see my written testimony as well.

With regard to the issue of the preamble, and especially as it relates to agricultural conservation easements where the state holds a -- a very limited bundle of rights that goes with that, whereas the property owner retains the property rights that go with it.

There's -- there is some concern about that language and how it might be construed some day to -- to kind of interfere with -- with those types of personal property rights, as well as the right-to-farm rights that have been spelled out in -- in the past. And -- and in our mind, also, we wonder whether it's necessary at all in the -- in the language.

The other thing we'd like to say is that I think there's a distinction that should be drawn between state-owned properties that may have conservation value, and state-owned properties and easements that were acquired with a specific cause and reason in place; meaning things like farmland preservation, like open space, using programs that frankly rely pretty heavily on the public's trust that that process is going to result in permanent protection, and that there may be a reason to distinguish

The Friends fully support the two-thirds majority vote of the membership of the General Assembly to approve a conveyance of public lands, but recommend each property conveyance be considered in separate bills so that undesirable proposals are not tied to those that are of significant benefit to the public or sensitive resources.

FCSP has worked diligently to support the state's acquisition of significant properties and has been increasingly frustrated by the constant assault on the lands we hold dear and worked tirelessly to preserve.

FCSP thanks you for your support of this concept, and hopes you move forward to help ensure that conveyances of public lands are always the exception, and not the rule. Thank you.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH): Thank you, Pam. There, you made it under the bell, God bless you. We're all grateful. Questions from the -- from the Committee? Well, thank you so much for all that you do to protect our state parks.

PAM ADAMS: Thank you.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH): I guess Margaret Miner, she, I think testified earlier, unless she wants a second chance at bat. Gordon Gibson followed by Maria Kayne.

Again, we're continuing to hear testimony on SJR5.

GORDON GIBSON: Senator Kennedy, Senator Chapin, Members of the Committee, I'm Gordon Gibson from Vernon. I'm the legislative liaison for the Connecticut State Grange. And I'm speaking today in

SJR5
SB 76
HB 5150
HB 5151

testimony on the three other bills that we are supporting today. Bill 76, the farm-to-school program, 5150, the notice on trees and shrubs, and 5151, the authority of the animal control officers.

Two minutes and 57 seconds.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH): Thank you, Gordon. Thank you very much. And thank you for all that you do to preserve and protect the environment here in our state. Do I hear any questions?

If I could just -- while you're here, I know you're here to testify primarily on SJ5, but you did mention the farm to school.

GORDON GIBSON: Yes.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH): Could you just elaborate and talk to us for just a minute about why you think it's promoting Connecticut-grown farm products into our school system?

GORDON GIBSON: The Grange has long supported local farms, local food for our people. We have also supported very strongly providing our children with adequate nutrition in the schools. If they are not adequately fed, they're not going to learn when their stomachs are empty and they are hungry.

We want to see them get quality food. We want to see our farmers selling local products, and just as we feel, people are willing to pay a little bit more for quality, local-grown food. So the schools should see what they can do to buy local food to serve in the schools.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH): Thank you. Questions from

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH): -- for coming to testify on the farm to school.

LUCY NOLAN: Right. Thank you, Senator Kennedy, Senator Chapin, Representative Arconti, Members of the Environment Committee. My name is Lucy Nolan. I am the Executive Director of End Hunger Connecticut, which is a statewide anti-hunger and food security organization. We do a lot of advocacy outreach and technical assistance with our school -- schools on the child nutrition program.

So I'm here today to speak in favor of raised Bill 76, AN ACT CONCERNING CONNECTICUT'S FARM TO SCHOOL PROGRAM. This bill reinforces, coordinates and prioritizes a state policy that serves our students, our schools and our farmers. It's also part of the USDA has decided in 2016 that they want 15 percent of the child nutrition programs to have locally sourced food in them.

So, we are -- we -- we think it reinforces this -- our Connecticut grown. It's already -- and it is already happening in Connecticut. Because it's a farm to school, I brought some show and tell with me, and these are a couple posters that we're doing with on already farmed -- local farm to school program with food corps and other -- other -- with the food service in schools.

So, it allows -- so it reinforces what's already going on. It also allows for the -- a better bulk preparation by the farmers. When these are larger -- the large companies, the food management companies, to put in a plan, would allow for farmers to plan, therefore they make more money when they sell directly to a distributor, as opposed to going

to farmers' markets, because it's less time, it's -- it's -- it's all right there.

But it also allows for greater coordination between the schools, the school food service director and the companies that are giving, so they can plan lessons and curriculum around what's -- about local food.

It also really plays an active role in our -- in our local purchasing. And giving contracts that are equal, but have something about locally grown preference, is really a great idea. I think it helps push the needle a little bit over to say let's do -- let's make sure that we're -- we're concentrating on Connecticut grown.

And I don't think it's a hardship for the companies. They have to put something in there. Many of them already do it. In fact, in the United States, a third of the locally grown food in schools comes from -- through Cisco. So, they're -- they may be already doing it.

So, I think that's about -- I -- to sum it up, I think it's a great bill, and I hope that you pass it.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH): So, your -- your testimony is that there's already large vendors to our public school system; a company called Cisco that's already doing this very thing, is that -- is that what you're telling us?

LUCY NOLAN: I -- yeah. The USDA reports -- in a report from the USDA, that Cisco does it. There are a number of other large companies. There's Whitsons and Sodexo and I have heard anecdotally that it is

hard to break -- locally grown farmers to break into those contracts. And this would be a way for those locally -- local farmers to grow -- to get into those contracts.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH): Well thank you, Lucy. I'm -- I'm obviously really interested in learning more about how we can facilitate more Connecticut farmers selling their food products to our local schools. That's the point of this exercise, and to identify what kind of bureaucratic or administrative barriers may preclude that from happening. So, I look forward to speaking to you further about --

LUCY NOLAN: Right.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH): -- you know, how to -- how to improve that system. Questions from people on the Committee? Representative Miner.

REP. MINER (66TH): Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

So, is the idea that it's through the development of regulations, the state Board of Education says that the Litchfield school system shall provide at least 10 percent of what it serves in its cafeteria from locally grown farmers? Is that -- is that the intention of this bill?

LUCY NOLAN: I -- I don't see that in here anywhere.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH): If I could answer that question --

REP. MINER (66TH): Oh, I'm sorry.

LUCY NOLAN: All right.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH): If I could answer that question. This is not -- this is not stipulating that a certain percentage of food be required -- local school districts would be required to purchase. It -- it -- it simple says that all things being equal, if a food service company that's bidding for the contract in a local school district, if -- to add that as an added criteria that could be considered as a plus, if you will, if -- you know, in favor of that large contractor that has agreed to purchase locally grown food in Connecticut.

So it doesn't require actually anybody to do anything, okay. It simply says that these contracts for these school districts are very competitively priced, and you have, you know, RFPs going out all the time to provide the food. So, it -- it enables this to be an extra little, you know, thumb on the scale so to speak, for -- if -- if you get two proposals, both of them are -- are, you know, equal, both of them cost the same thing, it allows the local school district to put a slight premium on the -- that food service contractor that is using locally grown food for that school district.

That's my understanding of the intent of this legislation.

LUCY NOLAN: And if I may, Representative Miner, what I said is -- where you may have heard the percentage, is that the USDA is committed to having 15 percent of the food in the child nutrition programs locally sourced. But that's really just a USDA commitment; that they want to make it happen. That doesn't mean it's mandatory in any way.

SENATOR KENNEDY (12TH): Thank you.

pg 9, line 13



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

February 19, 2016

Submitted by: Henry N. Talmage, Executive Director, Connecticut Farm Bureau Association, a statewide nonprofit membership organization representing 5,000 families dedicated to farming and the future of Connecticut agriculture.

Senator Kennedy, Representative Albis and members of the Environment Committee,

S.J. No. 5 - RESOLUTION PROPOSING AN AMENDMENT TO THE STATE CONSTITUTION CONCERNING THE ENVIRONMENT AND NATURAL RESOURCES OF THE STATE.

The Connecticut Farm Bureau generally supports the concept of making it more difficult for the state to dispose of land or easements that were acquired with specific conservation purposes or programs. However we believe the language contained in S.J. No. 5 to be too broad and ambiguous. The first three sentences in Sec. 21 assigns specific citizen rights that could be interpreted to conflict with private property rights including those retained by fee owners of protected farmland and other rights such as those outlined in CT right-to-farm law. We therefore recommend that the first three sentences in Section 21 and the corresponding wording outlined in the proposed ballot language be deleted.

We are also concerned with the language "Any state land or easement held for conservation purposes shall not be used for other purposes or otherwise disposed of except by an act approved by a two-thirds vote of the membership of the general assembly following a public hearing on such act" should be changed to "Any state land or easement acquired with a specific conservation program or a specific and defined conservation purpose declared at the time of acquisition shall not be used for other purposes or otherwise disposed of except by an act approved by a two-thirds vote of the membership of the general assembly following a public hearing on such act". (The corresponding ballot language should be changed as well). Without this change virtually any land the state has a real estate interest in and manages for a conservation purpose would require the 2/3 approval to change its use or dispose of even if that land was not originally acquired for a conservation purpose. Therefore we encourage this committee more narrowly define which specific state land or state easements this Constitutional Amendment would apply to and remove the ambiguity of the current language.

R.B. No. 76 AN ACT CONCERNING CONNECTICUT'S FARM TO SCHOOL PROGRAM.

The Connecticut Farm Bureau supports this Bill as it requires food service management companies that respond to a request for proposals posted on the State Contracting Portal for local or regional board of education's school education school nutrition program provide detailed information as to whether or not the bid facilitates the purchase from local farmers. Without this requirement it is impossible to determine if the provisions established in section 22-38d of the general statutes which requires that all other factors being equal, that preference is given to the purchase of products from local farmers.

Pg 10, 124

TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF RAISED BILL 76, AN ACT CONCERNING CONNECTICUT'S FARM TO SCHOOL PROGRAM

FEBRUARY 19, 2016

I am Gordon Gibson of Vernon, Legislative Liaison for the Connecticut State Grange, submitting testimony today in support of Raised Bill 76, An Act Concerning Connecticut's Farm to School Program. This bill will require that the regulations concerning food for school breakfast and lunch programs be amended to promote the purchase of food products from local farmers. The Grange has long supported adequate breakfast and lunch programs in our public schools so the students will have adequate nutrition for their school day. The Grange, being an agricultural organization, also supports programs that will improve and enhance the markets available to farmers. The Grange therefore supports Raised Bill 76 as it supports two of the Grange's long standing policies as it creates a win/win situation for both our children and our local farmers.

The Grange also goes on record today in support of Raised Bill 5150, An Act Concerning Tree Wardens Notices on Trees and Shrubs Prior to Removal, Tree Removal Along State Highways and Cleanup by Public Utility Companies Following Certain Tree Removal and Raised Bill 5151, An Act Concerning the Authority of Animal Control Officers in Common Interest Communities but is not offering any testimony on either of these bills.

Thank you for your consideration of my testimony.

Gordon F. Gibson, Legislative Liaison
Connecticut State Grange
836 Hartford Turnpike, Vernon CT 06066

p. 9, line 6



**WORKING
LANDS
ALLIANCE**

A Project of American Farmland Trust

STEERING COMMITTEE

Joseph Bonelli
University of Connecticut

Bonnie Burr
University of Connecticut

Jeff Cordulack
CT NOFA

Amanda Freund
Freund's Farm

Gordon Gibson
Connecticut State Grange

John Guskowski
CME Associates

Eric Hammerling
CT Forest & Park Association

Lisa Holmes
CitySeed

Terry Jones
Jones Family Farms

Llyn Kaimowitz
West Hartford

Kip Kolesniskas
Manchester

Henry Lord
New Haven

Elisabeth Moore
Connecticut Farmland Trust

Lucy Nolan
End Hunger CT!

Amy Paterson
CT Land Conservation Council

Richard Roberts
Halloran & Sage

Jim Smith
Cushman Farm

Melissa Spear
Common Ground

Keith Stechshulte
Farm Credit East

Kevin Sullivan
Chestnut Hill Nursery

Henry Talmage
CT Farm Bureau Association

STAFF
Lisa Bassani
Director

**Testimony to Environment Committee on Senate Joint Resolution 5
and Raised Bill 76**

Submitted by: Lisa Bassani, Working Lands Alliance
February 19, 2016

Senator Kennedy, Representative Albis, and Committee members:

The Working Lands Alliance appreciates this opportunity to submit testimony on
Senate Joint Resolution 5 and Raised Bill 76.

The Working Lands Alliance is a broad-based, statewide coalition dedicated to preserving Connecticut's farmland, and includes such organizations as American Farmland Trust, Connecticut Forest & Park Association, CT Farmland Trust, End Hunger CT!, Connecticut Farm Bureau, CT Land Conservation Council, among many others. Our efforts focus on increasing the pace of farmland preservation and advancing agricultural viability in Connecticut.

Our coalition strongly supports the concept of Senate Joint Resolution 5; and believes that our conveyance process needs greater transparency when it comes to proposals to sell or otherwise convey lands of conservation and agricultural value. Seemingly each year proposals come up that would sell or transfer lands that the general public assumes are "protected", as was documented last year in the report issued by CEQ, "Preserved but Maybe Not: The Impermanence of State's Conservation Lands". Our state's conservation and agricultural lands deserve greater protections, which would be afforded by a much-needed constitutional amendment.

However, our coalition has a few concerns with the bill as currently drafted. First, this bill limits the protection to "any state land or easement held for conservation purposes" – without properly defining what would or would not fall under such a category. We respectfully encourage the Committee to amend the language to specifically include agricultural, recreation, and conservation lands in this bill, but to then also limit the scope to lands under the custody and control of the Department of Energy and Environmental Protection and the Department of Agriculture. By limiting the scope to lands held under these two agencies, the constitutional amendment would appropriately focus on the lands needing greater protections.

Second, we are also concerned how the language as currently drafted in the first sentence of Section 21 would impact issues surrounding the right-to farm. We urge the Committee to consider the impact of the language on the state's agricultural community – in particular on the ongoing efforts of municipalities around the state to promote and pass right-to-farm ordinances.

Our coalition also supports the suggestions offered by our colleagues at Connecticut Forest & Park Association on ways to strengthen this bill. This includes adding language that would require separate bills be considered by the General Assembly when public lands with agricultural, conservation, and recreational values are proposed for conveyance. We also concur that compensation be required even for lands that are simply given away and not sold.

In short, our coalition believes that Connecticut should follow the lead of states in the region (Massachusetts, New York, and Maine) that already have similar constitutional amendments in place. We believe an effort to provide greater transparency for any such conveyances or transfers is needed, but that the bill as presented requires some adjustments to properly address the issues with our current conveyance process.

Our coalition also supports Raised Bill 76, which will amend regulations governing procurement of food for school breakfast and lunches, helping to facilitate purchases from our local farmers. As this Committee knows, the future of our farms depends on their economic viability. As such, these farm businesses would benefit from an overall effort to make regulations governing food procurement by our local and regional Boards of Education align better with the reality of agriculture in Connecticut. This bill requires the food service companies to document how their bid is consistent with the farm-to-school program, thereby making these companies consider ways to more fully utilize Connecticut-grown products and giving preference to those proposals that achieve higher levels of local sourcing.

Thank you for the opportunity to present testimony on these two bills.