



Testimony to the Housing Committee

Submitted by LeadingAge Connecticut

February 18, 2020

Regarding concerns with

SB 109, An Act Concerning a Landlord's Ability to Consider the Criminal Record of Prospective Tenants

HB 5118, An Act Requiring Landlords to Provide Security Systems and Lighting in Rental Property Hallways

LeadingAge Connecticut is a membership association representing over 130 not-for-profit organizations serving older adults across the continuum of care, services, and supports and including providers of senior housing. On behalf of our members, I respectfully submit this testimony and offer our assistance to the Housing Committee as you consider the following bills.

SB 109, An Act Concerning a Landlord's Ability to Consider the Criminal Record of Prospective Tenants

This bill proposes to place limits on the criteria and information that a housing authority may utilize when evaluating a proposed occupant's history of criminal activity. As you consider this proposal, we want to be sure that the Committee is aware that the Department of Housing and Urban Development currently requires that public housing agencies and owners of some federally assisted housing reject applicants in three specific categories: those with convictions for methamphetamine production, lifetime registered sex offenders, and those with previous evictions for drug-related criminal activity. This prohibition is based on federal statutes and regulations.

HB 5118, An Act Requiring Landlords to Provide Security Systems and Lighting in Rental Property Hallways

LeadingAge Connecticut is very concerned with this proposal which calls for undefined security system requirements within rental property hallways. While well intended, the cost of installing a security system that would adequately cover all hallways within a rental property could be extremely burdensome and possibly unattainable for many properties. A security system may include cameras, live video, monitored video, restricted access points and/or stationed security personnel. If the requirement was to install mounted video cameras to be monitored in real time, the cost of such installation and live monitoring could be exorbitant. In addition, there would be the cost of any storage requirements for photos or recorded video. It is our belief that many housing providers could not absorb such additional costs. While we understand the desire to safeguard tenants, we cannot support this proposed mandate at this time.

Thank you for your consideration of this testimony and please consider LeadingAge Connecticut to be a resource to you on these bills and other senior housing issues throughout the session.

Respectfully submitted,

Mag Morelli, President of LeadingAge Connecticut

mmorelli@leadingagect.org, (203) 678-4477, 110 Barnes Road, Wallingford, CT 06492, www.leadingagect.org