

Public Safety and Security Committee JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No.: HB-6851

AN ACT CONCERNING PURPLE PROPERTY BORDERS AS WARNING TO

Title: TRESPASSERS.

Vote Date: 3/18/2025

Vote Action: Joint Favorable

PH Date: 2/11/2025

File No.:

***Disclaimer:** The following JOINT FAVORABLE Report is prepared for the benefit of the members of the General Assembly, solely for purposes of information, summarization and explanation and does not represent the intent of the General Assembly or either chamber thereof for any purpose.*

SPONSORS OF BILL:

[Rep. Patrick S. Boyd, 50th Dist.](#)
[Rep. Craig C. Fishbein, 90th Dist.](#)

REASONS FOR BILL:

To provide an alternative to previous trespassing signage laws. HB 6851 would allow property owners to paint purple lines at property boundaries rather than post signs or install fences which can be removed or damage. The average cost of installing a backyard fence in Connecticut is about \$2,860. Depending on the material the cost can range from about \$1,650 to about \$5,355. This price does not account for extraneous costs such as working around underground utilities, land leveling, tree or stump removal, and permits for erecting fences.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

None Expressed

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

[Executive Director Elizabeth Gara, Connecticut Water Works Association](#)

Elizabeth Gara supports the bill because she represents CT Water Works Association which is a trade organization that represents municipal, regional, and private water utility companies. She states that many companies in the association have had issues with people trespassing on public water supply watershed property. Director Gara states that the ability to paint demarcation of prohibited areas will further the protection of Connecticut watershed lands which are vital to producing clean and safe water for the state. She also states that

Alabama, Arkansas, Arizona, Idaho, Illinois, Indiana, Kansas, Maine, Missouri, Montana, North Carolina, Pennsylvania, South Carolina, Tennessee, and Texas, all have purple paint laws to indicate property boundaries.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Francis Pickering, Executive Director Western Connecticut Council of Governments

Mr. Pickering states that the Western Connecticut Council of Governments appreciates the Committee's intent to provide support to property owners. However, he opposes HB 6851 because the organization is concerned that it lacks language to address many potential issues. Firstly, there is no language indicating how to inform the public of the change in law. Second, he points out that the bill does not address where and how the purple paint should be applied to property boundaries. Lastly, he mentions that many municipalities and organizations manage and maintain multi-use recreational hiking trails that make use of color markers. He cites state statute 53a-110a, which states that an individual must "knowingly enter" an area to be considered a trespassing and that even "without intent to cause harm" an individual can still be charged with an infraction. This means that a person who is not aware of the changes in the law can still be punished for the lack of awareness.

Samuel Gold, Executive Director Lower Connecticut River Valley Council of Governments

Director Samuel Gold opposes this bill states that the Lower Connecticut River Valley is home to a significant collection of open conserved spaces much of which is used as public hiking trails. Directors Gold is concerned that the public will be confused with the purple paint and will be wrongfully accused for trespassing. He suggest that the paint not replace signage but can be added in addition to the other signage. Lastly, the Director indicates that they are concerned about the longevity of the paint alone and is worried that in certain open or more scenic area that the wear of the pain over time will become unsightly.

Reported by: Geva Tinker

Date: 3/27/25