



CONNECTICUT POLICE CHIEFS ASSOCIATION

342 North Main Street, West Hartford, Connecticut 06117-2507

(860) 586-7506 Fax: (860) 586-7550 Web site: www.cpcanet.org

592

Testimony to the Committee on Judiciary

March 14, 2006

Chiefs Anthony Salvatore and James Strillacci, Connecticut Police Chiefs Association

We Oppose R.B. 307, AN ACT LIMITING LAW ENFORCEMENT ACCESS TO RECORDED INFORMATION IN "BLACKBOX" EVENT DATA RECORDERS IN MOTOR VEHICLES.

Representative Lawlor, Senator McDonald and members of the Judiciary Committee, thank you for the opportunity to provide you with our position regarding the above proposed raised bill.

The Connecticut Police Chiefs Association opposes this proposed legislation, as it would restrict our ability to investigate certain motor vehicle accidents.

Under Connecticut General Statute 14-108a, the police are required to investigate motor vehicle accidents in the cases wherein the person is killed or injured or in which damage to property of any one individual, including the operator, is in excess of \$ 1,000.00. You may believe that it is relatively simple to get a search warrant issued by Superior Court. In truth, police cannot get a warrant unless there is probable cause that a crime was committed. Many serious crashes result from conduct which is not criminal, so no warrant will issue. The alternative is to get consent to examine the device, which may not be possible if the owner was killed or seriously injured in a crash.

Nevertheless these boxes hold information that aids us in investigating motor vehicle accidents. The data assists us in determining if there is operator error or mechanical failure, as stated in Connecticut General Statute 14-108a, which requires the police to determine cause of accident as part of our duties. To not use all available investigative resources would be a disservice to the public we serve.

Therefore, until we can resolve specific problems in obtaining pertinent data in a fatality or serious injury accident, the Connecticut Police Chiefs Association urges you to reject this proposal and allow us to continue to obtain the information as currently permitted.



Connecticut **Business & Industry** Association

TESTIMONY
BEFORE THE
JUDICIARY COMMITTEE
LEGISLATIVE OFFICE BUILDING
MARCH 14, 2006

My name is Eric George and I am Associate Counsel for the Connecticut Business & Industry Association (CBIA). CBIA represents approximately 10,000 businesses throughout Connecticut, the vast majority of which are small companies employing fewer than 50 people.

Thank you for the opportunity to testify before you on various proposed changes to Connecticut's corporate statutes. With that, I urge this committee to oppose **SB 547 An Act Concerning the Duties and Responsibilities of Directors and Officers of Business Corporations and Nonstock Corporations**. CBIA's greatest concern with this legislation is that we have not heard any compelling reason to change the statutes governing Connecticut corporations. These corporations are familiar with these statutes and understand how to comply with them. CBIA has not received any comment from our member companies that these statutes are in some way deficient, onerous or otherwise in need of modification.

While CBIA has not received any complaints about Connecticut's existing corporate statutes from its members, we have heard from certain of them that at least two of the proposed changes would be problematic. First, in line number 155, SB 547 defines "material relationship" to include "familial, financial, professional, employment or other relationship." We believe that the language "or other" is extremely broad. In order for companies to comply with their governing statutes, the language should be as clear as possible. Conceivably, with the benefit of 20/20 vision, any prior decision could be called into question under this expansive language.

Second, in lines 445 and 446, SB 547 includes in the definition of "related person" an "aunt, uncle, niece, nephew, or spouse of any thereof" with respect to the

provisions governing director's conflicting interest transactions. Again, this language is extremely broad and would be burdensome for a company to ensure compliance.

As CBIA has not heard from any of our members that Connecticut's corporate statutes are in some way deficient, but has heard several concerns regarding the proposed changes to these statutes within SB 547, CBIA urges you to oppose SB 547. Thank you for your consideration.