



# Senate

General Assembly

**File No. 503**

January Session, 2015

Senate Bill No. 1068

*Senate, April 7, 2015*

The Committee on Planning and Development reported through SEN. OSTEN of the 19th Dist., Chairperson of the Committee on the part of the Senate, that the bill ought to pass.

## ***AN ACT CONCERNING REGIONAL BLIGHT.***

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

1 Section 1. Section 7-148cc of the general statutes is repealed and the  
2 following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective October 1, 2015*):

3 (a) Two or more municipalities may jointly perform any function  
4 that each municipality may perform separately under any provisions  
5 of the general statutes or of any special act, charter or home rule  
6 ordinance by entering into an interlocal agreement pursuant to  
7 sections 7-339a to 7-339l, inclusive.

8 (b) Each municipality seeking to enter into an interlocal agreement  
9 to jointly perform blight enforcement shall each have adopted an  
10 ordinance pursuant to subparagraph (H)(xv) of subdivision (7) of  
11 subsection (c) of section 7-148 having the same language for regulating  
12 blight as any other municipality entering into such interlocal  
13 agreement.

14     (c) As used in this section, "municipality" means any municipality,  
15 as defined in section 7-187, any district, as defined in section 7-324, any  
16 metropolitan district or any municipal district created under section 7-  
17 330 and located within the state of Connecticut.

This act shall take effect as follows and shall amend the following sections:		
Section 1	October 1, 2015	7-148cc

**PD**     *Joint Favorable*

The following Fiscal Impact Statement and Bill Analysis are prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and do not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose. In general, fiscal impacts are based upon a variety of informational sources, including the analyst's professional knowledge. Whenever applicable, agency data is consulted as part of the analysis, however final products do not necessarily reflect an assessment from any specific department.

---

**OFA Fiscal Note**

**State Impact:** None

**Municipal Impact:** See Below

**Explanation**

The bill requires municipalities that enter into interlocal agreements for blight enforcement to have identical blight-related ordinances.

The impact of the bill can vary based on the municipality, the blight ordinances the municipality currently has in place, and the ordinances the municipality is required to adopt as a result of the bill.

For example, if two municipalities entered into an interlocal agreement and 1) one municipality currently levies fines of \$500 per violation of a blight-related ordinance, and the other municipality currently levies fines of \$100 per violation; and 2) they each agreed to replace their current fine structure with a single fine of \$300 per violation in order to standardize their blight ordinances, then one municipality could experience a revenue loss, and the other could experience a revenue gain.

**The Out Years**

The annualized ongoing fiscal impact identified above would continue into the future subject to changes in municipal blight ordinances.

**OLR Bill Analysis****SB 1068*****AN ACT CONCERNING REGIONAL BLIGHT.*****SUMMARY:**

The law allows each municipality to enforce anti-blight housing regulations by itself or in cooperation with other municipalities under an interlocal agreement (CGS §§ 7-339a-7-339l). Either way, a municipality that chooses to enforce such regulations must adopt an implementing ordinance that, among other things, defines blight, requires owners and occupants to be notified about a violation, and gives them a reasonable amount of time to correct it (CGS § 7-148 (7) (H)(xv)). This bill requires municipalities that enforce anti-blight housing ordinances under an interlocal agreement to adopt identical implementing ordinances.

EFFECTIVE DATE: October 1, 2015

**BACKGROUND*****Interlocal Agreements***

The law allows municipalities, special taxing districts, and other municipal bodies to perform jointly any service or function they can perform individually. Those that choose to do so must enter into an “interlocal agreement,” which by law must include all mutually agreed upon provisions and specify a process for amending, terminating, or withdrawing from the agreement. The agreement must also be approved by each participating municipality’s legislative body, after a public comment period (CGS §§ 7-339a-7-339l).

**COMMITTEE ACTION**

Planning and Development Committee

Joint Favorable

Yea 10 Nay 9 (03/20/2015)