

# Mellin & Associates, LLC

P. O. Box 1115  
Redding, CT 06875  
CAM # 082  
(203) 938-3172 ☐ (203) 938-2798 Fax

March 19, 2007

Joint Committee on Judiciary  
Room 2500, Legislative Office Building  
Hartford, CT 06106

Re: Testimony In Favor of HB 7288.

Dear Committee Members:

I am the owner of a community association management company in business since 1985. My firm manages a number of large community associations in the greater Danbury, CT area. I am also Chairperson of the Manager's Council of the CT Chapter of the Community Association Institute. This group provides a forum to represent the professional interests of CT community association managers (CAMs) through services, information, and professional development opportunities.

I am providing the following Testimony In Favor of HB 7288 - AN ACT CONCERNING THE LICENSING OF COMMUNITY ASSOCIATION MANAGERS AND THE RIGHTS OF UNIT OWNERS IN CONDOMINIUMS AND OTHER COMMON INTEREST COMMUNITIES.

I believe the community association management industry needs to achieve a higher standard of professionalism. I support this legislation so long as the creation of a new commission titled the Connecticut Community Association Commission outlined in the bill is not changed.

Community association management differs from commercial property management in that a major role of the CAM firm is dealing with governance and regulation issues. The real estate industry is focused on the commercial aspects of managing property and not on community! A real estate broker's goal is to sell a property, not to educate a buyer in the more important and bothersome areas of common interest ownership.

I would ask that the definition of a "person" be reviewed. When the current statute was written, the reference to a "person" referred just to the owner of a management firm, and not the individuals who worked for a firm. The expansion of the definition of a "Community association manager" that adds "and includes any partner, director, officer, employee or agent of such person who directly provides association management services on behalf of such person;" could be confusing.

Would an employee who is part time and only does minor book keeping activities, such as entering checks into a computer, creating payment checks or calling accounts receivables, be considered as "directly providing an association management service" which includes "collecting, controlling or disbursing funds"...and therefore required to be licensed?

It would be beneficial to also to include the creation of an on-going educational requirement and a more clearly defined funding mechanism for the commission and other departments who are chartered to perform these duties.

The Connecticut Community Association Commission will be extremely valuable for dealing with issues that no other state organization has responsibility. For example, there are no statutes or commissions that regulate the fees charged by municipalities for water or sewer services.

The City of Danbury does not allow individual water meters for unit owners in condominiums, like those installed in residential home, and consequently are billed at a higher rate. The City of Danbury forces condominiums to install one larger meter per building with fees that are significantly higher (30% or more) for water and sewer usage.

Billing policies of municipal water agencies currently are not subject to any state regulations (see below attached Office of the Attorney General letter) and the City of Danbury has refused to change their discriminatory practices. I would like to see an additional section [possibly Section 14 (b)] that expands the role of the commission:

- (4) The commission shall regulate the fees charged to individual condominium unit owners for water and sewer services by towns or cities. No town or city shall charge more for water and sewer services to individual condominium unit owner users than single family residential users.***

I have also provided Testimony In Favor of HB 5518 - An Act Concerning Notification of the Due Date on Tax Bills Sent by Municipalities - Planning and Development Committee - February 21, 2007 - that requests Section 12-146 of the general statutes be amended to require tax bills sent by a municipality have a clearly indicated "due date".

This request is prompted by The City of Danbury's Water Bills which show two dates: "Bill Date" & "Pay by Date". However, the Ordinance that the Danbury Tax Collector uses to apply late penalties uses the term "Due Date". The Danbury Tax Collector interprets the term "Due Date" as the Bill Date rather than the "Pay by Date" causing confusion among all tax payers in the City of Danbury when calculating a late payment penalty.

Thank you for your time and attention to my testimony.

Cordially,



Richard E. Mellin