

SENATOR MARTIN M. LOONEY
MAJORITY LEADER

Eleventh District
New Haven & Hamden



State of Connecticut
SENATE

State Capitol
Hartford, Connecticut 06106-1591
132 Fort Hale Road
New Haven, Connecticut 06512
Home: 203-468-8829
Capitol: 860-240-8600
Toll-free: 1-800-842-1420
www.SenatorLooney.cga.ct.gov

March 21, 2011

Good Afternoon Senator Coleman, Representative Fox and members of the Judiciary Committee. I am here this morning to testify in support of several bills on your agenda today: S.B. 1193 AN ACT CONCERNING THE DETERMINATION OF THE TOWN OF RESIDENCE OF INCARCERATED PERSONS, H.B. 6606 AN ACT CONCERNING THE DETERMINATION OF THE RESIDENCE OF INCARCERATED PERSONS FOR PURPOSES OF LEGISLATIVE DISTRICTING, S.B. 1166 AN ACT CONCERNING THE LENGTH OF PRETRIAL DETENTION and S.B. 1151 AN ACT CONCERNING PARDONS.

SB 1193 and HB 6606 address the problem of prison-based population attribution in which inmates at the various correctional facilities are counted as residents of the towns in which the facilities are located rather than the actual town of residence of the inmate prior to incarceration. In general, these inmates intend to return their original domiciles upon release. It would appear that under

Connecticut statute Sec. 9-14 and 9-14a the current practice of apportioning prisoners in the municipality in which they are incarcerated is not consistent with our law¹.

The current system adversely affects our cities. Less than 20% of the state's population lives in Bridgeport, Hartford, New Haven, New Britain, Stamford or Waterbury, but more than half of the state's prisoners come from those 5 cities. The 5 towns that contain the majority (60%) of the state's inmate population, Cheshire, East Lyme, Enfield, Somers and Suffield are the domicile for less than 1% of the state's prisoners. Various state aid formulas are derived from census based population; the towns where the prisons are located are allocated dollars for services which they will never provide because once the inmates are released, they return to their town of residence. Either the towns in which the prisons are located should provide housing and other services for the inmates upon release or the dollars should go to the released inmates' actual town of residence. The towns with state prisons already receive state PILOT funding to

¹ Sec. 9-14 Electors residing in state institutions. No person shall be deemed to have lost his residence in any town by reason of his absence therefrom in any institution maintained by the state. No person who resides in any institution maintained by the state shall be admitted as an elector in the town in which such institution is located, unless he proves to the satisfaction of the admitting official that he is a bona fide resident of such institution.

Sec. 9-14a. Electors in custody of state. Any person in the custody of the state being held at a community correctional center or a correctional institution, whose voting rights have not been denied, shall be deemed to be absent from the town or city of which he is an inhabitant for purposes of voting, notwithstanding that such center or institution may be situated within such town or city.

reimburse them for property tax dollars they would receive if the prisons were privately owned land. They should not then receive additional money based on an artificially elevated population count.

In the past, the census bureau has not released this information in time for states to choose whether to count inmates in their actual town of residence or in the town where the prison is located. This year, however, states will have the appropriate data in plenty of time to use for redistricting purposes. Director of the U.S. Census Bureau stated in his blog² "This decade we are releasing early counts of prisoners (and counts of other group quarters), so that states can leave the prisoners counted where the prisons are, delete them from the redistricting formulas, or assign them to some other locale." The Census is allowing states to experiment with new ideas to achieve a fairer redistricting outcome. We should accept this invitation to be a policy incubator.

SB 1166 creates a common sense change to the criminal justice system by requiring that a person cannot be held in pre-trial detention longer than the maximum allowable sentence for the crime of which the person is accused. The requirements of this bill are similar to those in HB 6537, An Act Concerning Speedy Trials. The ability to hold a suspect, who is presumed innocent under our system, longer than the maximum sentence for the crime creates undue

² <http://blogs.census.gov/2010/census/2010/03/so-how-do-you-handle-prisons.html>

pressure on that suspect to plead guilty in order to gain release from incarceration. This is an untenable situation that unfairly punishes those who are unable to gain release on bail.

SB 1151 would automatically convert a provisional pardon to an absolute pardon after the passing of a set number of years (3 years for a misdemeanor and 5 years for a felony) if the person had no additional encounters with the law. This legislation would facilitate productive re-entry into mainstream society for our citizens who have demonstrated sufficient evidence of rehabilitation.

Thank you for hearing these important issues.