



National Association of Housing and Redevelopment Officials
P. O. Box 822
Canton, CT 06019
Phone: (860) 508-4896
www.conn-nahro.org

**Testimony of
Neil J. Griffin Jr.
Senior Vice President
Submitted to Aging Committee
February 24, 2011**

SB 139- STRONG OPPOSITION

I am submitting my testimony on behalf of Conn-NAHRO, my name is Neil Griffin and I am the Senior Vice President for Conn-NAHRO and the Executive Director of the Glastonbury Housing Authority. Conn-NAHRO represents over 112 Connecticut housing authorities and other non-profit and community development member agencies. Member agencies have the responsibility of effectively managing or administering housing for 150,000 families/individuals and over 62,000 housing units in Connecticut.

Speaking on behalf of Conn-NAHRO's Executive Board and member agencies I would like to express our strong opposition to SB139. While genuine in its intent to protect our state's seniors the proposed bill is replete with issues that far outweigh any intended positive outcome.

- The request for a senior citizens bill of rights unnecessarily complicates existing tenant landlord law and elderly housing statutory requirements that already adequately protect the rights of seniors. The provisions requested are generally covered by leases and existing policies.
- The Legislation would expose the Authority to incredible liability, stemming from the maintenance of a tenant's private property, more specifically the snow removal provision.
- The Legislation would require an inordinate amount of staff time and money none of which is proposed to be funded in the Bill.
- The Legislation would result in increased insurance risk and therefore increased premiums.
- At a time we are working to reduce unfunded mandates this creates one.
- The only revenue available to the elderly properties is the rent they collect. So there is only one place to raise the revenues to pay for Senate Bill 139. We will be forced to raise our rents causing an undue hardship on our residents. This will cause many of our lowest income residents, including those that do not own cars, to have a greater financial hardship they do not deserve.

Please consider the negative consequences this will have on many of our elderly residents which will far outweigh any benefits that were intended.