

[REDACTED]

---

**From:** Joe Mollica <jmollica@greaterenfieldlandlordassoc@gmail.com>  
**Sent:** Thursday, February 07, 2019 10:42 AM  
**To:** HSGTestimony  
**Cc:** Joe Mollica; Alex Squires; An Dinh & Truong Vuong; Andre Drouin; Bill Pfaffenbichler, Jr.; Carl Segundo; Cortney Dorian; Dave Liquori; Ed Mastella; greaterenfieldlandlordassoc@gmail.com; Gretchen Pfeiffer-Hall; Jesse Page; Jim Piekos; Joe Mollica; Joe Mollica; Judy Januszewski; Kristine Gasque; Layakur Rahman; Martha Houlroyd; Meta Chen; Michael Lizée; Michele Lizée; Mike & Louise Lessard; Mike Bellerose; Paul Januszewski; Rich & Sue Simmons; Ron Morgan; Serge Lessard; Sharon Tracy; Suzanne Cristina; Tim Coleman; Timothy Lesniak  
**Subject:** Testimony on HB#5713 and SB#54

My name is Joseph Mollica. I have been a landlord since 1985 and I have been landlording full-time in Connecticut for the past 24 years. I live in Windsor and I own several rental properties in Windsor, Enfield and Windsor Locks. I am a member of the Greater Enfield Landlord Association (GELA) and of the Connecticut Coalition of Property Owners (CCOPO). In our organizations, it is commonly understood that properly screening prospective tenants is of paramount importance in ensuring a successful relationship for all parties involved. I oppose HB#5713 and SB #54 because they will greatly inhibit my ability to select desirable tenants and they will decrease my ability to help protect and to maintain a safe environment for my current tenants and neighbors.

Prior to becoming a landlord, I was a manager and I received a lot of training about hiring and developing employees. I learned that: "The best predictor of future performance is past performance". This holds true for tenants, both financially and socially. In recent years, severe limitations have been put on the types of questions that landlords can ask prospective tenants with respect to protected classes, but criminals are not a protected class! Their crimes were optional!

Going further, Bill #5713 speaks of "an offer or conditional offer of housing". I consider the advertisement of an apartment or a house for rent to fit that description. Do you? Surely I cannot be expected to spend time on phone calls, doing showings, taking applications, doing background checks (at cost) and only then to "offer" the unit to the prospective tenant and after all of that, at the last minute, to ask about their criminal history. In that case, I would be at great personal risk if I rejected a violent criminal.

Once you can assure me that the **recidivism rate is approaching "zero"**, then we can have this conversation again. I refer you to the following definition from Merriam-Webster and to a quote from some National Institute of Justice (NIJ) statistics:

**recidivism** noun : a tendency to relapse into a previous condition or mode of behavior especially : relapse into criminal behavior

## National Statistics on Recidivism

*Bureau of Justice Statistics studies have found high rates of recidivism among released prisoners. One study tracked 404,638 prisoners in 30 states after their release from prison in 2005.[1] The researchers found that:*

- *Within three years of release, about two-thirds (67.8 percent) of released prisoners were rearrested.*
- *Within five years of release, about three-quarters (76.6 percent) of released prisoners were rearrested.*
- *Of those prisoners who were rearrested, more than half (56.7 percent) were arrested by the end of the first year.*
- *Property offenders were the most likely to be rearrested, with 82.1 percent of released property offenders arrested for a new crime compared with 76.9 percent of drug offenders, 73.6 percent of public order offenders and 71.3 percent of violent offenders.*

Please note that the longer the “look back” period, the higher the recidivism rate. There should be no limit on the look-back period.

Thank you,  
Joseph Mollica