



WEEKLY UPDATE:

BILLS PROPOSING NEW STATE MANDATES ON MUNICIPALITIES 2007 GENERAL ASSEMBLY

(Report as of May 25, 2007)



TABLE OF CONTENTS

	<u>Page #</u>
MAJOR MANDATE – HB 6956 (File 45 and 734).....	2
Section I: Bills Referred to the Senate.....	3
Section II: Bills Referred to the House	9
Section III: Bills Currently In Committee	13
Section IV: Mandate That May Be Added As An Amendment	14

The following is a select list of pending bills that propose new state mandates on towns and cities, which have been reported out of committee to the respective chambers for consideration. Some of these bills would have a significant fiscal impact on municipalities and their residential and business property taxpayers.

##

Please call Gian-Carl Casa, Ron Thomas, or Bob Labanara at (203) 498-3000 if you have any questions.

Please note that many of these proposals have good public policy goals. However, when the General Assembly mandates municipal expenditures without reimbursement it drives up the cost of local government, forcing municipalities to choose between raising property taxes, curtailing other local services, or both. If the State decides such mandates are good policy, it should pay for them.

Vote **NO** on **HB 6956**

HB 6956—one of the *most destructive state mandates on municipal budgets ever proposed* — was amended and favorably reported out of the Planning & Development Committee on May 14th and is on the House floor.

The original mandate—which would grant police officers and firefighters special workers’ compensation presumptions for cancer, H&H, and infectious & contagious diseases without requiring they show the work-relatedness of their illnesses—*was amended to also grant volunteer and municipal EMS personnel these same special, costly benefits*—again, without requiring that they show their illnesses are job-related.

HB 6956—Still Bad Public Policy:

- ***Other amendments to this mandate*** which focus solely on heart disease, and create a fictitious “liability account” with arbitrary amounts of funding ***are misleading***.
- ***There are no funds in the state budget that will pay for the costs*** of these unprecedented benefits. ***Make no mistake***—residential and business property taxpayers will be left with the price tag, being forced to pay for the increased amount of cancer claims and heart and infectious disease claims for this select group of people—*for years to come!*

Know The Facts!

- HB 6956 would ***negate much of the property tax relief initiatives proposed this session***—*relief that would go toward paying for local public safety, education and transportation services.*
- HB 6956 is ***not necessary*** — currently, if there is a correlation between the job and a particular illness, public safety officers ***already receive workers’ compensation benefits*** — they just have to demonstrate the job-relatedness of the illness.
- By mandating that towns pay for the costs associated with these illnesses – ***the number of cases will increase***, as a result, local governments’ ***insurance premiums rates will*** rise too, compounding the effect of this mandate.
- HB 6956 would ***negatively impact municipal bond ratings*** due to GASB Statement #45 accounting and financial reporting standards.
- Proponents are wrong — the costs to municipalities would be enormous — HB 6956 would dredge up more than ***\$30 million per year in heart disease mandated costs***. (Source: OFA)
- On top of that—***infectious & contagious disease*** claims can cost towns between ***\$750,000 and \$2.5 million per case!*** While a single ***cancer*** claim could ***exceed \$1 million per case!*** (Source: OFA)
- Proponents of the nation-wide campaign to grant these benefits ***have not produced any credible medical justification*** for these special entitlements.
- ***The H&H mandate is alive and well*** - towns and cities already continue to pay millions of dollars each year, and will for at least the next 20 years, until every police officer and firefighter hired before 7/1/96 retires.
- ***The bill ignores a compromise*** reached in 1996 that maintained the H&H entitlement for all employees as of that date, but provided that new employees would not be eligible.
- HB 6956 would turn the workers’ compensation system on its head. It’s not fair and not right.

Please call Ron Thomas, or Bob Labanara, Gian-Carl Casa at (203) 498-3000 if you have any questions.

BILLS REFERRED TO THE SENATE

<p>HB05729 File#: 412 Sen. Cal#: 564 Hse. Cal#: 340</p>	<p><u>Notice & Hearing for Municipal Properties</u> . Would require (1) municipalities to provide notice and hearings on any sale, lease or transfer of municipal real property prior to conducting a vote on any such sale, lease or transfer and (2) that such notice be published in the local newspaper at least twice and (3) notice of such sale, lease or transfer be posted "conspicuously" on the site.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>
<p>HB06776 File#: 875 Sen. Cal#: 628 Hse. Cal#: 541</p>	<p><u>Waterfront Real Estate Owned by Commercial Lobster Fishermen</u> . Would provide for a special classification, similar to PA 490, for certain waterfront real estate owned by commercial lobster fishermen, and used for commercial purposes. While the language does include fairly strict criteria that a property owner must meet in order to qualify, this is still an unfunded mandate on all affected municipalities.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>
<p>HB07017 File#: 291 Sen. Cal#: 486 Hse. Cal#: 262</p>	<p><u>Democracy Education in Elementary Schools</u> . Would require elementary schools to include a program on democracy in their fourth or fifth grade curriculum.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>
<p>SB00041 File#: 510 Sen. Cal#: 405</p>	<p><u>Uniform Procurement Code</u> . Among other things, would a establish a uniform procurement code and mandate that it be adhered to for expenditures “by municipalities that receive state funds.” As all cities and towns in Connecticut receive some amount of state funding, this bill would include all municipalities.</p> <p>. In addition, would require a cost benefit analysis to be completed prior to entering into any privatization contract of \$500,000 or more - These costs could negate any potential savings. It also places various wage and other contractual requirements on such contracts.</p> <p>. Also, Section 8 would severely hamper a municipality’s (or any other contracting authority's) ability to contract with an outside entity. The threat of a third party, who was uninvolved with the contracting process, having the authority to review or terminate a contract or procurement agreement would significantly discourage a contractor from bidding on a project.</p> <p>. Municipalities should not be forced to go through a state procurement process as they already have systems in place for such activities.</p> <p>. <i>Municipalities should not be mandated to abandon their current procurement process for a state one</i>, especially since it is untried and is not assured to meet the expectations it is intended to.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>

<p>SB00167 File#: 560 Sen. Cal#: 449</p>	<p><u>Eminent Domain</u></p> <p>Would make several substantive and technical changes to eminent domain laws, including (a) requiring local legislative bodies to approve the taking of property on a parcel-by-parcel basis with a 2/3-majority vote. Towns must publish in newspaper the results of such vote; (b) prohibiting towns from acquiring property “for the sole purpose of increasing local tax revenue”; (c) making significant changes in what must be included in development and redevelopment plans; (d) allowing property owners to buy back property if property is not used for the purpose for which it was acquired, or for a public use. Sets out the criteria to ensure that property owners are able to buy-back property; (e) requiring towns to provide two appraisals of property, and that the town must go with the higher appraisal; and (f) updating the State Uniform Relocation Assistance Act to ensure that it reflects the varying needs of displaced property owners and fully compensates them for relocation costs.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>
<p>SB00540 File#: 473 Sen. Cal#: 355</p>	<p><u>Tie Vote in a Primary</u></p> <p>Would mandate that the resolution for a tie vote in a primary would be determined by holding a run-off primary, rather than a determination by lot, as current law requires. This could cost municipalities in the range of \$13,000 to \$45,000 each.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>
<p>SB00542 File#: 486 Sen. Cal#: 395</p>	<p><u>Public Agencies - Posting of Information</u></p> <p>Would expand the posting requirements for public agencies of information open to the public.</p> <p>While the OLR analysis for this bill indicates that it would only expand the posting requirement for state entities, CCM is concerned that the language is vague enough to be interpreted to mean all municipal boards and commissions as well. "Public agency," as defined by 1-200, does indeed include municipalities, which are also defined in statutes as being political subdivisions of the State.</p> <p>The language should be clarified to specifically exclude municipal entities.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>
<p>SB00601 File#: 806 Sen. Cal#: 252</p>	<p><u>Paid Sick Leave</u></p> <p>Among other things, this bill mandates that municipalities provide paid sick leave to all employees and does not distinguish between part-time, full-time staff, or seasonal employees.</p> <p>This bill is problematic in its potential costs of requiring paid sick leave for such employees as interns, temps, substitute teachers, etc.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>

<p>SB00845 File#: 82 Sen. Cal#: 135</p>	<p><u>Light Duty Work</u></p> <p>Would mandate that light duty work under the Workers' Compensation Act to be offered during days and hours comparable to those worked by the injured employee at the time of the injury.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>
<p>SB00847 File#: 869 Sen. Cal#: 56</p>	<p><u>Discretionary Workers' Compensation Benefits</u></p> <p>Would extend the maximum number of weeks of discretionary workers' compensation benefits that may be awarded for partial permanent disabilities (PPD). Under current law, these discretionary benefits (CGS 31-308a) are limited to the statutory duration of the claimant's PPD benefits, or 520 weeks, whichever is less. This bill would remove a workers' compensation commissioner's obligation to choose the lesser of the two options, thus authorizing a commissioner, at his/her discretion, to award up to 520 weeks of discretionary workers' compensation benefits.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>
<p>SB00977 File#: 760 Sen. Cal#: 576 Hse. Cal#: 642</p>	<p><u>Special Education</u></p> <p>Would require local boards of education to establish procedures concerning restraints and seclusion of special education students, including (1) notifying parents when such children are placed in seclusion, (2) recording of restraints and training staff in the use of physical restraint, and (3) seclusion of at-risk persons.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>
<p>SB01032 File#: 386 Sen. Cal#: 314</p>	<p><u>Retrofit of Diesel Schools Buses</u></p> <p>Requires towns and school boards to retrofit diesel school buses with emissions-reducing equipment as long as the appropriate amount of funding is available through DEP to reimburse municipalities for such retrofitting. <i>Senate A took the funding language out of the bill.</i></p> <p>However, <u>Section 5(c) of the bill would prohibit the registration of diesel school busses after 9/1/10 without a certificate that the retrofitting has been completed.</u> This section <i>does not provide any allowances if the needed funding is not provided to DEP to cover reimbursements.</i> This section would make this bill an UNFUNDED MANDATE.</p> <p>Section 5 of this bill should be <u>deleted</u> prior to any action.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>

<p>SB01054 File#: 387 Sen. Cal#: 325</p>	<p><u>Eminent Domain</u></p> <p>Would present a host of new mandates, requirements and unreasonable and unworkable hoops through which municipalities must jump to exercise reasonable eminent domain authority, including (a) barring the exercise of eminent domain to encourage private commercial development and jobs, (b) requiring a two-thirds majority vote of the local legislative body to acquire property, (c) defining the terms "deteriorated" and "deteriorating" and in that way limit the exercise of ED, (d) requiring property be taken within 5 years or, with an extension, within 10 years, (e) introducing a new limitation on the taking of any owner-occupied property. It is unclear what this excludes other than property, even commercial or industrial property, that is not occupied in some way by the owner (whether a person or company). Arguably, this is not limited to dwelling units but could include property occupied by the business owner; (f) requiring the development, redevelopment or implementing agency to offer the property to the person from whom it was acquired if the property is not used as planned or if the agency ever "sells" it, (g) forcing the agency to pay for the property owner's appraisal and then relying on the state's Ombudsman to determine which appraisal will be used to set compensation, and (h) requiring towns to compensate businesses for loss of "good will".</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>
<p>SB01087 File#: 389 Sen. Cal#: 327</p>	<p><u>Affordable Housing</u></p> <p>Would mandate that municipal assessors configure formulas so that owners of affordable housing property have lower property tax assessments (this will cost \$2 million to Bridgeport alone). The well-intentioned but ill-advised bill would result in a significant revenue loss, thus "punishing" some municipalities that already have affordable housing, while discouraging others from siting affordable housing.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>
<p>SB01127 File#: 685 Sen. Cal#: 530</p>	<p><u>Student Health Coverage</u></p> <p>Section 6 of this bill is problematic as it would require that (1) each local and regional board of education identify all students within their jurisdictions without health insurance, and (2) each local and regional board of education provide information to the parents of such students regarding various state-sponsored health insurance programs for children, including providing application assistance for such programs. While CCM is sympathetic to the intent of this section, we are concerned with both the administrative burden and costs associated with these requirements.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>

<p>SB01146 File#: 145 Sen. Cal#: 166</p>	<p><u>Mandated In-Service Training for Educators</u></p> <p>Would require local boards of education to provide in-service training for the teaching of humane treatment of animals and people.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>
<p>SB01311 File#: 513 Sen. Cal#: 407</p>	<p><u>Audits of New Voting Technology</u></p> <p>Would mandate an audit process to be conducted at each and every election in which the new optical scan voting technology is used. This would place a huge administrative burden on local election officials and would be an unfunded state mandate.</p> <p>Local election officials are already burdened with the majority of election responsibility. The state should be solely responsible for funding a "new" process to provide assurance to the voters that the state selected a reliable technology.</p> <p><i>The Secretary of the State's office has said that they would seek to amend the bill to specifically state that HAVA money will be used to pay for all costs associated with the audit provisions over the next two years.</i></p> <p>But that would leave an <u>unfunded mandate</u> for the years beyond this biennium.</p> <p>CCM urges (1) that the bill be clear that towns not have to undertake the mandate in any year unless the money is provided by the State (either through HAVA or otherwise) or (2) have the audit requirement sunset after the 2008 election.</p> <p>Either amendment would allow for the audits to be conducted over the next two elections cycles, see how they works, determine if they are still needed, get an accurate cost, and put pressure on the Secretary of the State's Office to fund their continuance.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>
<p>SB01312 File#: 494 Sen. Cal#: 402</p>	<p><u>Registrars of Voters Attending Conferences</u></p> <p>Would, among other things, mandate that towns pay full salary to registrars of voters who attend state conferences, as well as pay for fees and hotel accommodations associated with the conference.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>

<p>SB01339 File#: 620 Sen. Cal#: 514</p>	<p><u>Automatic External Defibrillators</u></p> <p>Among other things would require all local public schools and newly constructed public buildings to provide and maintain at least one automatic external defibrillator.</p> <p>CCM supports the intent of SB 1339. However, it raises significant questions of liability for municipalities and without a full fiscal analysis, it is difficult to determine the full fiscal impact. The bill should eliminate any cause of action resulting from implementation of this mandate.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>
<p>SB01373 File#: 191 Sen. Cal#: 203</p>	<p><u>Electric Rate Relief</u></p> <p>Similar to SB 1374 would make various changes in the electric industry structure and other energy related programs that could affect rates paid by the state and municipalities.</p> <p>Section 20 would require a property tax exemption for certain solar heating systems or geothermal energy resources.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>
<p>SB01374 File#: 192 Sen. Cal#: 204</p>	<p><u>State Energy Initiatives</u></p> <p>Similar to SB 1373, would make various changes in the electric industry structure and other energy related programs that could affect rates paid by the state and municipalities.</p> <p>Section 14 would mandate "green building" standards for certain new or significant renovation construction projects (including school buildings projects) costing at least \$5 million, if at least \$2 million comes from the state.</p> <p>Sections 17 and 18 would mandate property tax exemptions for certain renewable energy systems.</p> <p>Section 23 would require the state building code to be incorporate a LEED standard mandate into any (1) new building construction, other than a residential building with four or less units, costing \$5 million or more - or - (2) renovation to a buildings, other than a residential building with four or less units, costing \$2 million or more.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Senate Floor</i></p>

BILLS REFERRED TO THE HOUSE

HB06956
File#: 865
Hse. Cal#: 96

Major Mandate: Special WC Benefits for Heart, Infectious & Contagious Disease, and Cancer

Identified by the non-partisan Office of Fiscal Analysis (OFA) as a "STATE MANDATE" - OFA states this bill's added costs to municipalities would be "significant." Would be the biggest proposed unfunded state mandate on municipalities in many decades. This mandate would:

(1) Grant a special workers' compensation (WC) presumption for police officers, and firefighters, and Emergency Medical Services (EMS) Personnel who contract (a.) heart disease, or (b.) certain types of infectious & contagious diseases, and,

(2) Grant a special rebuttable presumption benefit under WC to firefighters and EMS personnel who contract and diagnosed with certain types of cancers. According to OFA - a single H&H claim could exceed \$1 million (this alone could cost municipalities well over \$30 million per year), while a single cancer claim could also exceed \$1 million. Single infectious disease claims already range between \$750k to \$2.5 million.

HB 6956 is bad public policy. The system should not be jerry-rigged to benefit any type of employee.

The \$50 million fund established in the bill (1) is not in the Appropriations Committee budget and (2) is inadequate. Currently, towns and cities are paying upwards to \$30 million per year for the H&H mandate alone, and (3) there are no assurances that the fund will not fluctuate from year to year.

Make no mistake- despite claims by the proponents, this bill is a huge unfunded mandate--changing the presumptions under workers compensation would clearly increase local costs significantly.

The dedication of public safety officials is not at issue here. What is at issue is whether towns and cities - and their property taxpayers would be forced to pay millions for a state-granted special benefit -- a benefit that, when warranted, is already covered under the current workers' compensation system.

Current Location: House Floor

<p>HB07000 File#: 830 Hse. Cal#: 446</p>	<p><u>Municipal Ethics</u></p> <p>Would, among other things, mandate a cookie-cutter approach to municipal ethics by requiring that all municipalities (1) adopt a code of ethics at least as stringent as what is outlined in the bill and (2) establish an ethics commission.</p> <p>Over the last several years many proposals have been put forth with regard to municipal ethics. Each one of these proposals has included heavy-handed, onerous requirements on municipalities.</p> <p>CCM has repeatedly testified on these bills and asked that the legislature not mandate a cookie-cutter approach on municipalities with regard to municipal ethics and to allow municipalities to adopt and set in place that which best meets their local needs.</p> <p>The results of a Fall 2006 survey, conducted by CCM, show that 92 municipalities have adopted a code of ethics which best meets the needs of their community. These codes were adopted through a public process that included a public notice and public hearing. These towns should not be required to go through this process all over again, incurring additional costs, to change their code to comply with a state mandate.</p> <p>Another proposal, SB 145, would create a task force to thoroughly examine the whole spectrum of the municipal ethics issue. This would be a much more sensible approach and would allow for the best program to be crafted.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: House Floor</i></p>
<p>HB07096 File#: 735 Hse. Cal#: 563</p>	<p><u>Pesticide Use on School Grounds</u></p> <p>Would extend restrictions on the use of lawn care pesticides at public and private elementary schools to <u>ALL</u> public and private schools – and – require regulations to be adopted to require public and private schools and preschools to use cleaning and maintenance products that minimize adverse effects on the environment and children's health.</p> <p>This bill is not needed. Two bills, already passed by the House, address the issues outlined in this bill and were negotiated agreements between proponents and opponents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> * HB 5234 would expand the ban of pesticides to schools serving up to eighth grade and allow the use of Integrated Pest Management Plans to 2009. * HB 6396, originally drafted to affect schools and state buildings, would ban the use of cleaning products that do not meet certain guidelines or environmental standards to clean inside state-owned buildings beginning October 1, 2007. The intent with the narrowing of this language was to see how effectively such a requirement could be implemented before considering passing down a mandate to other entities. <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: House Floor</i></p>

<p>HB07098 File#: 863 Hse. Cal#: 198</p>	<p><u>Green Buildings</u></p> <p>Would extend the “green building” requirements to (1) state-funded school construction and housing projects and garages and certain other structures costing \$ 5 million or more and (2) state-funded renovations of state facilities and state-funded school and housing projects costing \$ 2 million or more.</p> <p>In addition it would increase, by two percentage points, the reimbursement rate under the school construction grant program for projects subject to the green building requirements.</p> <p>It is important to understand that the pool of professionals – architects, contractors, project managers, etc – knowledgeable with “green building” standards is slim. An increased demand for such professionals, spurred on by incentives for project owners to use these standards, will create a larger pool. This will help to expand the application of green buildings across Connecticut.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: House Floor</i></p>
<p>HB07122 File#: 569 Hse. Cal#: 475</p>	<p><u>Special Property Tax Break for Privately Owned Golf Courses</u></p> <p>Would mandate a special property tax break for privately owned golf courses that are open to the public by mandating the property be assessed as open space.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: House Floor</i></p>
<p>HB07281 File#: 676 Hse. Cal#: 534</p>	<p><u>MME Exemptions</u></p> <p>CCM is working with OPM to ensure that the language of the bill does not inadvertently eliminate the requirement that owners pay property tax on manufacturing machinery and equipment during phase-in of state reimbursement, (see OLR note, File 676) and to tighten language concerning circumstances under which the OPM Secretary could modify reimbursements.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: House Floor</i></p>
<p>HB07320 File#: 780 Hse. Cal#: 598</p>	<p><u>New Municipal Employee Health Insurance Pool</u></p> <p>Would create a new “Connecticut Insurance Pool” which would include all municipal employees who work at least half time. Municipalities would be mandated to participate and the new pool would provide “the same coverage provided to state employees” by statute and collective bargaining agreements.</p> <p>Such a program could be helpful to municipalities, due to savings in the cost of administration and economies of scale, but such a program should (a) be voluntary, (b) involve municipalities in negotiations over the level of benefits, and (c) prohibit negotiations for benefits above those provided in the state plan.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: House Floor</i></p>

HB07354 File#: 743 Hse. Cal#: 568	<u>Safe Internet Instruction</u> Would require local school districts to develop and implement a new curriculum that would provide instruction to those in grades 3 through 5 on the safe use of the internet. <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: House Floor</i></p>
SB00846 File#: 5 Sen. Cal#: 51 Hse. Cal#: 404	<u>Workers' Compensation Administrative Burden on Employers</u> Would create an unnecessary administrative burden by shifting responsibility and requiring that all employers covered by the Workers' Compensation Act provide employees injured on the job with a workers' compensation claim form (Form 30C), either in person or by mail, within two business days of being notified of the injury by the employee. This puts an unfair and unmanageable responsibility on employers to perfect an employee's workers' compensation claim against that employer. <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: House Floor</i></p>
SB01036 File#: 857 Sen. Cal#: 176 Hse. Cal#: 579	<u>Workers' Compensation</u> As amended would, among other things, increase the period of time (from 10 to 15 days) workers have to request a hearing on workers compensation discontinuances or reductions. This would unnecessarily increase costs to municipalities. <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: House Floor</i></p>
SB01094 File#: 268 Sen. Cal#: 267 Hse. Cal#: 581	<u>Penalty for Not Establishing a Policy on Bullying</u> Would penalize municipalities that have not yet adopted a bullying policy by withholding between \$2,500 and \$10,000 from their state education funding. <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: House Floor</i></p>

<p>SB01110 File#: 492 Sen. Cal#: 390 Hse. Cal#: 626</p>	<p><u>School Security</u></p> <p>Would provide several grants from the Department of Emergency Management and Homeland Security for the purposes of reimbursing local school districts for certain costs associated with: (1) conducting security assessments of school buildings, which is <i>required by this bill to be done at least every four years</i>; (2) purchasing security equipment and training; and (3) security infrastructure.</p> <p>CCM is appreciative that the Appropriations Committee budget currently includes \$10 million for these purposes. However, we are concerned that the funding may not continue to be available in the final negotiated budget.</p> <p>Therefore, CCM asks that this bill be amended to (a) provide grants up-front to municipalities for security assessments and needed changes resulting from the assessments and (b) clarify that such undertaking is only mandated as long as the grants are funded.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: House Floor</i></p>
<p>SB01447 File#: 595 Sen. Cal#: 471 Hse. Cal#: 682</p>	<p><u>Family and Medical Leave Mandate</u></p> <p>Would require municipalities to comply with the state FMLA, except under certain circumstances.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: House Floor</i></p>

BILLS CURRENTLY IN COMMITTEE

<p>SB01292 File#: 689 Sen. Cal#: 534</p>	<p><u>Alternative Base Period</u></p> <p>Identified by OFA as a "STATE MANDATE" on municipalities - among other things, this bill would eliminate the 4-year time period, and make permanent the alternative base period for determining unemployment compensation benefits. According to OFA - the portion of alternative base unemployment claims made by municipalities (2.0%) is estimated at \$48,993 in FY 08 and \$65,323.</p> <p style="text-align: right;"><i>Current Location: Judiciary Committee</i></p>
---	--

SB01432

File#: 828

Sen. Cal#: 404

Mandated Property Tax Exemption

As currently drafted, **would mandate that municipalities provide a property tax exemption** for certain hybrid and fuel efficient vehicles.

Often, new technologies seek to be exempt from Connecticut's antiquated property tax system to help their industry take hold. While hybrid and fuel-efficient vehicles may be rare now, in a short time they will be the norm.

Any local property tax exemptions should be left to the discretion of the municipality to determine if and how it should be implemented.

CCM urges that this bill be amended to make this unfunded mandate a local option.

SUGGESTED AMENDMENT LANGUAGE

Strike lines 89 through 93.

After the last section, insert the following:

Sec. 301. (NEW) (Effective January 1, 2008) Any municipality may, by vote of its legislative body or, in a municipality where the legislative body is a town meeting, by vote of the board of selectmen, provide for the abatement in whole or in part of personal property taxes on a (1) hybrid passenger vehicle, as defined in subdivision (115) of section 12-412 of the general statutes, (2) motor vehicle which is exclusively powered by a clean alternative fuel, as defined in subdivision (67) of section 12-412 of the general statutes, or (3) passenger vehicle that has a United States Environmental Protection Agency estimated highway gasoline mileage rating of at least forty miles per gallon.

Current Location: Finance Revenue and Bonding Committee

MANDATE THAT MAY BE ADDED AS AN AMENDMENT

⇒ To amend Connecticut General Statute Section 12-81 to make the real property of a charitable corporation exempt from property taxes, even if it is used for profitable purposes.