



# CCM 2015 Testimony

900 CHAPEL STREET, 9th FLOOR, NEW HAVEN, CT 06510-2807 PHONE (203) 498-3000 FAX (203) 562-6314

Your source for local government management information [www.ccm-ct.org](http://www.ccm-ct.org)

## ***APPROPRIATIONS COMMITTEE***

February 25, 2015

The Connecticut Conference of Municipalities (CCM) is Connecticut's statewide association of towns and cities and the voice of local government - your partners in governing Connecticut. Our members represent 156 towns and cities, representing over 95 percent of Connecticut's population. We appreciate the opportunity to testify on bills of interest to towns and cities.

### **HB 6824 "An Act Concerning the State Budget for the Biennium Ending June Thirteenth 2017, and Making Appropriations Therefor and Other Provisions Related to Revenue"**

CCM is appreciative that Governor Malloy has maintained a commitment to property taxpayers by sparing towns and cities from massive cuts in critical state grants. The main (categorical) state aid grants that go to all towns and cities are protected from cutbacks: the Education Cost Sharing (ECS) Grant; PILOTS for Private Colleges and Hospitals and for State Property; the Pequot/Mohegan Grant, the Town Aid Road (TAR) Grant and the Local Capital Improvement Program (LoCIP).

However, CCM has serious concerns with the changes to the Resident State Trooper Program fee structure, which would require participating towns to pay 100% of the costs associated for each trooper.

The Resident State Trooper Program is one of the primary examples of how collaboration and service sharing can be beneficial to the State and its municipalities. Without this program the State would be responsible for providing law enforcement services at their full cost albeit from resources available at the Troop, or the community would be required to start their own department at a cost, which would well exceed available resources.

The proposed change from requiring participating towns pay 70% to 100% would impose a significant financial burden on small town budgets and the local taxpayers they serve. CCM conducted a survey of towns participating in the Resident State Trooper Program. The results revealed that if 100% is required, a \$40,000 to \$300,000 increase in municipal budgets would likely occur. For many small towns, this increase would be unsustainable. Local officials would have to decide whether to continue to participate in the program, or rely on troopers from the barracks to provide necessary public safety. If this occurs, it is unlikely that the State will benefit from the anticipated \$4 million savings this proposal forecasts, as troopers will still be required to patrol and respond to incidents in the community.

The current 70/30 split between participating municipalities and State is an equitable distribution. The current percentage allows municipalities the benefit of a State Trooper, as well as it allows the barracks the ability to strategically utilize that trooper when needed. Resident State Troopers are state employees, and the State maintains

administrative oversight in the coordination of their response to other emergencies. As several local CEOs have reported, their Resident State Trooper is often called out of town – almost 5-8 times per week – leaving local CEOs with little to no managerial influence on the assignments of Resident State Troopers, beyond their contractual agreements.

CCM understands the need for law enforcement to respond to other events, however local property taxpayers should not be responsible for covering such “state-related” costs. Therefore, CCM recommends at the very least, that the Committee consider requiring the State to reimburse municipalities, or provide credits for the time Resident State Troopers spend outside of their communities. HB 5106, which is before the Public Safety Committee, would among other things, provide for such a mechanism for reimbursement or credit. Such a proposal could curb the growing costs of the Resident State Trooper Program.

In the end, Resident State Troopers protect vital safety needs for the approximately 62 towns statewide associated with this program. Requiring these towns to pay in excess of hundreds of thousands of dollars per year to sustain the program, and therefore requiring them to explore other options for police services is not good statewide public policy.

CCM urges the Committee to oppose the recommendation to mandate small towns, and their property taxpayers, that participate in the Resident State Trooper Program cover 100% of the costs of a trooper – and instead, maintain the current local/state payment structure which more accurately aligns with the actual local/state operations of our this highly-valued program.



If you have any questions, please contact Ron Thomas ([rthomas@ccm-ct.org](mailto:rthomas@ccm-ct.org)), Bob Labanara ([rlabanara@ccm-ct.org](mailto:rlabanara@ccm-ct.org)), George Rafael ([grafael@ccm-ct.org](mailto:grafael@ccm-ct.org)) or Mike Muszynski ([mmuszynski@ccm-ct.org](mailto:mmuszynski@ccm-ct.org)) at (203) 500-7556.