

STATEMENT FROM LARRY KUCHARSKI (Vice President/General Manager for Enterprise Holdings, managing Enterprise, Alamo and National Car Rental for Connecticut) ON RAISED BILL NO. 5458, AN ACT CONCERNING MUNICIPAL AUTOMATED TRAFFIC ENFORCEMENT SAFETY DEVICES AT CERTAIN INTERSECTIONS.

MONDAY MARCH 12, 2012

Thank you very much Representative Guerrero, Senator Maynard and members of the Transportation Committee.

My name is Larry Kucharski and I am the Vice President/General Manager of Enterprise Holdings here in Connecticut. On behalf of the 850 employees that work at over 77 locations throughout the State of Connecticut I wish to express my concerns on House Bill 5458 and the use of cameras at certain intersections within certain municipalities throughout the state.

While I will not offer any arguments that the intent of the bill is to keep our streets and intersections safe from those that willingly break the law, and I appreciate the efforts on the part of the Committee to allow motor vehicle renting and leasing companies to not be held accountable to the infractions committed by it's customers, I strongly suggest that the Committee consider amending the language of the present bill. Of specific concern is the time line established in section (h), subsection (2) where it describes a rental or lease timeline of "a period of not more than sixty days". Many of our customers today rent for long periods of time, particularly if they were involved in an accident that requires a lengthy repair or if they are in the process of relocating to the area. A good portion of our Truck Rentals last 6 to 8 months at a time, particularly to those customers that operate as independent over the road logistic companies. Most if not all Lease companies will only provide leasing of a vehicle for a period of not less than one year. Having this timeline in the bill will put undo hardship and financial burdens that renting and leasing companies cannot afford and as such this timeline should be eliminated from the bill.

I also am concerned of the timeline established once a violation occurs. In the case of a car rental company such as ours, I am believe that 45 days to address such a violation that occurred by one of our customers (section f, subsection 7) will not be enough time to process the information requested by the municipality in adequate fashion. We will attempt to provide as much information on the violator as expeditiously as possible, however we do not feel that we should be limited to 45 days after the initial violation. To further illustrate this concern, it has at times taken as long as 3 months to receive a violation resulting from an infraction by our customers with parking and toll violations from certain states and municipalities. Given the limits that most municipalities have keeping their personnel in line with budget constraints, I am not convinced we would receive violations in a timely fashion so that our processes can be completed within such defined time limits.

In closing, while I support the efforts to make our streets and intersections safer, I must ask that HR 5458 be looked at more closely and even perhaps tabled until the language and timelines addressed in the bill be reviewed to the satisfaction of the rental and leasing industry.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Sincerely,

Lawrence J Kucharski

Lawrence J. Kucharski  
Vice President/General Manager  
860-627-8080 office

[Lawrence.J.Kucharski@ehi.com](mailto:Lawrence.J.Kucharski@ehi.com)