

To the Co-Chairs, and members of the Transportation Committee:

Date: February 28, 2014

My name is Erl Slayton, and I am the President of CATRALA, the Car and Truck Rental and Leasing Association of Connecticut. CATRALA represents both small and large automotive Rental and Lease companies in Connecticut. I would like to register CATRALA's opinion on two bills before the committee at this time:

**Bill HB 5290 AN ACT REVISING MOTOR VEHICLE LAWS**

CATRALA supports a revision to section 19(b) of HB5290; specifically the additional language in Section 19 (b), that amends Section 14-45 in the general statutes to add the following: if such motor vehicle is not claimed within forty-eight hours, the licensee or operator of the wrecker or of the garage where such motor vehicle is stored shall immediately complete a notice of such tow, on a form prescribed by the commissioner, and mail a copy of such form by certified mail, return receipt requested, to the owner and all lienholders of record.

Notification for non-consensual towing is an issue that automotive rental and lease companies have been concerned about for a long time. We have had repeated incidences where towing/storage yards have towed one of our rental or leased vehicles, and sat on it without sending any notification to us (the owner/lienholder of record). If and when that notification comes, or we finally track down our vehicle, the tow/storage yard then charges an astronomical fee based on the days the vehicle has been sitting in the tow/storage company's possession. This occurs because there is no specific language in CT law requiring the tow/storage company to give notification within a specific timeframe, and some towing operators abuse this. Our Lease and Rental companies understand that a tow/storage company deserves to get paid for a reasonable storage charge. However, we need to be notified within a timely manner so that we can retrieve the vehicle before storage charges build up needlessly. We believe that the additional language in Section 19 (b) is a step in the right direction.

**Bill HB5292 AN ACT CONCERNING MOTOR VEHICLE REGISTRATION**

We oppose HB5292, as this bill seeks to reinstate expiration stickers on license plates in CT. This is an unwise, unneeded and expensive reversion to a practice the state did away with several years ago.

Police agencies may argue that expiration stickers give them a visual cue to pull someone over. Their argument extends to the theory that they can then use that traffic stop to see if something *really* nefarious is going on. This is a specious argument at best. At worst, it is a recipe for abuse and profiling of the public; especially people of modest means. Technology now exists where digital plate readers allow for police agencies to run a plate for validity without any such sticker being affixed. And even if a digital plate reader is not available, law enforcement now has onboard laptops to assist them in running a license plate for validity in seconds.

Expiration stickers are an outdated and unreliable way to validate the registration on a vehicle. They invite license plate theft and/or destruction, and with today's printing technology, are very easy to forge and use fraudulently. They essentially validate nothing. They also cause high administrative costs for daily rental companies and other vehicle fleet operators who have to chase down on-rent vehicles to affix stickers; especially vehicles rented outside of Connecticut. In addition, bringing back plate expiration stickers will impose an unneeded expense and administrative burden upon the CT DMV and eventually hurt taxpayers as additional revenue will be needed to support the practice.

I thank the committee for accepting this testimony.

Sincerely, Erl Slayton President, CATRALA of Connecticut