

Transportation Committee

JOINT FAVORABLE REPORT

Bill No.: HB-7162

Title: AN ACT REFORMING THE MOTOR VEHICLE TOWING STATUTES.

Vote Date: 3/19/2025

Vote Action: Joint Favorable Substitute

PH Date: 3/10/2025

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:

Transportation Committee

REASONS FOR BILL:

This bill will require tow companies to get authorization in writing or electronically from a property owner before towing, with exceptions made for vehicles parked illegally in accessible parking spaces, areas reserved for emergency vehicles, within 10 feet of a fire hydrant, that block access, entry to or exit from a building, a parking space, or the property or obstructing the traffic aisles, or leaking fluid that presents a hazard or threat. The bill will allow written authorization for towing as a result of snow removal for all vehicles as opposed to each one. It also requires towers to take photos for documentations purposes to show the condition of the vehicle and the reason for towing before towing. It requires additional signage by property owners at all private parking facilities and make minor changes to the content required on those signs, as well as how restricted areas within lots otherwise open to the public and individually reserved spots must be signed, with some exceptions. It requires the towing company to allow a car owner to move the vehicle if it is not connected to the tow truck, and if it is, allow the car owner to have the car dropped and pay a fee set by the DMV. The bill generally requires 24 hours written notice before a vehicle can be towed from a residential parking facility, with exceptions made if the vehicle is parked illegally in accessible parking spaces, areas reserved for emergency vehicles, within 10 feet of a fire hydrant, that block access to entrances or exits from a building, a parking space, the property or obstructing the traffic aisles, if the vehicle is not in an area not designated for parking, if parking in a permitted lot or assigned space, if there are peaking fluids that constitute a hazard, or if it's in violation of a parking ban to facilitate snow removal. The bill requires the DMV, in consultation with the Attorney General, to develop a towing "bill of rights" in English and Spanish, including a vehicle owner's rights and responsibilities if their vehicle is towed, the maximum rates a towing company may charge, a warning that towing companies can sell vehicles after certain timeframes, and information on filing a consumer complaint with the

DMV. It requires this "bill of rights" to be posted on all towing company's places of business as well as on their websites, along with copies made available to customers. Requires the DMV to establish new rates for towing and storage by January 1, 2026, reconsider the rates every three years, and have the rates reflect the reasonable operating costs of towing companies performing non-consensual towing services, as well as costs related to fuel, wreckers, insurance, and worker's compensation. The bill has separate rates for non-consensual tows, accident towing, and non-accident towing, which are to include exceptional services that might be required and allows towers to charge for services they render at the direction of police at an accident scene. It requires that credit cards be taken by towers when releasing vehicle after non-consensual towing and requires to make change, if necessary, as well allow vehicle owners to retrieve their personal property without a fee. The bill limited the towing to a 10-mile radius of the nearest towing or storage location, modifies the required hours of operation for towers to be open until 6:00 PM. It also broadens the acceptable proof of ownership to documents that include title, lease, bill of sale, or other reasonable proof of ownership. It extends the minimum amount of time that a tower must hold the vehicle before selling to 30 days for vehicles deemed worth \$1,500 or less and 60 days for vehicles deemed worth more than \$1,500 but allows the paperwork process to be begin at the 15- and 45-day mark respectively. It requires that the value of a car is to be determined on retail values as opposed to trade-in value and requires the DMV to check for consumer complaints pertaining to the towed vehicle before approving a sale by a tower. It requires the towers to sell all vehicles at public auction as opposed to those vehicles deemed worth over \$1,500, and advertise the sale in a commercially reasonable manner. It generally requires the towing companies to remit any remaining proceeds to the vehicle owner. The bill bans booting by private property owners and leases and codifies DMV regulations on investigating complaints about dealers and repairs and specifically includes investigations on violations of the non-consensual towing laws. It imposes penalties for violations of the towing laws and deems those violations consumer unfair trade (CUTPA). It imposes misdemeanor penalties for towing without written authorization or selling a towed vehicle before the minimum timeframes and increases the civil penalty from \$1,000 to \$5,000. The bill aims to strike a balance between making sure the workers of towing companies as well as the owners of car towed are treated fairly when disputes arise over non-consensual towing, highlighting the emotion and distress that arise in these situations.

SUBSTITUTE LANGUAGE:

The substitute language makes several modifications. First, it adds nonconsensual towing rate provisions. Second, it allows property owners to provide written authorization and provide the reason for the tow in writing or electronically. Third, it allows vehicle to be towed from their assigned parking spots without 24 hours' notice. Fourth, several exceptions are made to signage, written authorization and the 24 hours' notice requirements. Fifth, it required the DMV and Attorney General to develop a towing "bill of rights" Sixth, it allows unregistered vehicles to be towed after 14 days instead of a total prohibition on towing unregistered vehicles. Lastly, it clarifies that the provisions do not apply to companies that are exempt from licensure.

RESPONSE FROM ADMINISTRATION/AGENCY:

Tony Guerrero, Commissioner, Connecticut Department of Motor Vehicles

Commissioner Guerrero supports the bill, noting that the DMV has reviewed processes associated with non-consensual towing and abandonment are making changes as a result. For example, he says the Department is updating intake forms to improve reporting and notification and staff and systems have been updated to monitor cases. He says the bill will clarify the process when a vehicle is towed abandoned and then sold. He acknowledges several measures in the legislation that are aimed at consumer protection that the DMV favors.

Bryan Cafferelli, Commissioner, Connecticut Department of Consumer Protection

Commissioner Cafferelli comments that the department appreciates the intent of the bill to provide protections to motor vehicle owners whose vehicles have been towed. The agency anticipates a significant volume of complaints for these towing protections and would require additional resources to handle them not presently accounted for in the Governor's budget.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF SUPPORT:

The Insurance Association of Connecticut, The American Property and Casualty Insurance Association, and the National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies

Three individuals from the above organization submitted collective testimony in support of the bill, stating it will protect consumers from unfair towing and enhance transparency, accountability, and fairness in nonconsensual towing. These reforms will help prevent excessive fees, unauthorized tows, and disputes over vehicle damage—issues that frequently arise in claims processing and contribute to unnecessary costs and delay. The bill's standardization of towing fees will prevent price gouging and reduce the administrative burden on insurers, ultimately benefiting policyholders by stabilizing claims costs and reducing disputes. They suggest extending the bill's protections to individuals who voluntarily request a tow, such as in emergency or roadside assistance situations. This would address issues like excessive fees, damage to vehicles, and disputes over storage, which can also occur in consensual tows. The insurance industry strongly suggests key provisions to be made, ensuring a more predictable and fair towing and storage system, reducing the administrative burden on insurers, preventing fraud and abuse, and ultimately benefiting policyholders by stabilizing claims costs. They emphasize the bill's provision for towing companies to take high-resolution photos of vehicles before towing, which will help resolve damage disputes. All three parties urge the Committee to expand the bill to cover both nonconsensual and consensual tows, ensuring fairness and consumer protection across the board. This testimony was provided by:

- **Kristina Baldwin, Esq., Vice President, The American Property and Casualty Insurance Association (APCIA)**
- **Eric George, Esq., President, Insurance Association of Connecticut (IAC)**
- **Christopher Nicolopoulos, Esq., Senior Regional Vice President, National Association of Mutual Insurance Companies (NAMIC)**

Jack Boudreau

Mr. Boudreau supports the bill, criticizing the negative behavior that towing companies has inflicted on their customers, promoting unethical and unjust practices. He cites personal experiences of exploitation by companies, naming "MyHoopty" as an example, and how this company has targeted him and his loved ones at Seramonte Estates through methods such as repeatedly circling the lot at night, inflicting hear on the communities that they serve. He wants this bill to be passed so that these towing companies no longer feel enabled to impose stress and anguish on communities.

Paul Boudreau, Tenant Organizer, Hamden Tenants Union

Mr. Broudreau supports the bill because he feels it will end exploitive and predatory practices of towing companies and landlords who use vehicle removals as tools of intimidation and retaliation against tenants and workers. He says some landlords use towing a retaliatory tactic to punish tenants who speak up about living conditions and find their legally parked vehicles towed. He also cites tenants who work in jobs that have them coming home in late hours, having their cars towed because landlords failed to provide adequate, designated parking. He goes on to state that the economic impacts of a single tow to many residents can be devastating, as they are already living paycheck to paycheck, and may lose their ability to attend work. He feels the bill will address these practices and protect the most vulnerable tenants, however he wishes the bill to be amended to require full reimbursement for tenants and workers who have had their vehicles towed unfairly, mandatory compensation for lost wages and additional transit costs incurred while their vehicles were unlawfully towed, penalties for landlords that repeatedly violate towing regulations, and an expansion of the Consumer Bill of Rights for towing be provided in multiple languages including Spanish, Portuguese and Arabic among others because they feel language barriers should not be an obstacle to understanding ones rights and seeking recourse when faced with wrongful towing.

Carla Foster

Ms. Foster supports the bill.

Howard Handler, Senior Director of Strategy, Policy, and Government Affairs, National Insurance Crime Bureau

Mr. Handler supports the bill, noting that there is a great amount of evidence that suggests towing companies are engaging in predatory towing. He claims these towing companies who show up first after listening to police scanners, which have led to bystanders being injured or killed as they "recklessly" arrive at the scene. He also claims that the companies say they were dispatched by the police or an insurer. He says that after the vehicle is towed, they charge fees from gate fees hazardous waste clean-up fees that were not ordered to be issues by law enforcement, leaving car owners facing bill of up to \$5,000 or \$10,000, with this total going up for storage fees as the owners try to pay the bill. He states the bill provides important consumer protections for owners but says it should protect against consensual tows as well, highlighting tactics where towers solicit a tow from a car accident and still impose these bills and fees on the owner.

Alexander Kolokotronis, Director, Naugatuck Valley Project (NVP)

Mr. Kolokotronis supports the bill, noting the raiding and towing of motor vehicles in the state, and provides an experience of a member of NVP who had their car towed and was not immediately notified and was only able to retrieve her car through a cash payment. He claims that this behavior disproportionately impacts low and middle-income residents and workers of Connecticut, who rely on their cars for employment. Without access to a car, he says, they could lose their job and not be able to find one that's not in walking distance. He calls the fees associated with towing a "raiding of residents' savings and any small amount of equity that they may possess." When this happens, he says, they then lose the ability to afford the ever-rising security deposits and rent. He proposes an addition to impose protection for homeless individuals who are living in their motor vehicles by flagging that a motor vehicle is where a person is living in, noting the even more catastrophic consequences of losing a car in that situation.

Senator Martin Looney, President Pro Tempore, Connecticut General Assembly

Senator Looney supports the bill, noting the numerous reports of abusive behavior by towing companies and believes the bill is a comprehensive approach to help car owners who had their cars towed realize their rights. He acknowledges he proposed a bill to prevent the alleged abusive behavior.

Jeniffer Perez Caraballo, Resident, City of Hartford

Ms. Perez Caraballo supports the bill, detailing a personal experience with predatory towing in her apartment complex. She first provides context of the exorbitant fees that are associated with obtaining a car that was towed in Hartford and the disproportionate affect these high fines and fees have on the poor and working-class people for what she calls "silly mistakes" such as forgetting to pay the parking meter. Regarding her personal experience, she states she had a car towed without her consent while her apartment complex was plowing out snow. She notes that she was planning on selling the car to put a downpayment on a new car, and she details the struggle she had to even afford the car in the first place and the luxury it was for her and her family to have a car. She says the car fees accumulated so much that she lost ownership of it and the towing company sold it. She emphasizes the need for CT to be a place to protect working people and pass laws that prevent excessive fees and give car owners more rights in the towing process.

Raphael Podolsky, Attorney and Policy Advocate, Connecticut Legal Services

Mr. Podolsky supports the bill, noting that there have abusive practices in the towing industry that have a profound impact on motor vehicle owners and allows the standards of companies that are less friendly to owners to be raised, with oversight from the Department of Motor Vehicles. He states that the term retail should be inserted when discussing using the book retail values of a towed vehicle to determine the number of days before the vehicle can be disposed of. He also expressed disagreement with the receipt of three bids below book values provision, noting that it should only be used as a basis for questioning the effectiveness of the advertising.

Sandy Powell, Home Owner

Ms. Powell Supports the bill, noting a personal experience of predatory towing from the MyHoopty towing company about when her daughter's car was towed and how she was unable to retrieve the car or its contents. She emphasizes a fear that was instilled in her daughter that this company would be trolling down the parking lots waiting to tow cars in Seramonte Estates.

Jess Zaccagnino, Policy Council American Civil Liberties Union of Connecticut

The ACLU supports the bill. They believe the bill is a much-needed reform to the towing statutes and helps to prevent towing companies from selling towed cars after a short time and giving vehicles owners excessive fines. They note that these decisions disproportionately affect people of color the most and believe the bill improves accountability and oversight in towing through the requirement of having separate permission to remove a towed vehicle and requiring that towed vehicle be stores no more than ten miles from the property it was towed from. They further note that the bill could be expanded to apply to all instances of towing as opposed to just non-consensual towing.

NATURE AND SOURCES OF OPPOSITION:

Francisco Arrietor, Apartment Complex Owner

Mr. Arrietor opposes this bill, by noting that this bill allows unauthorized vehicles to stay on their property for a full twenty-four hours which will prohibit them from towing unregistered vehicles which could lead to potential fines. He argues that allowing days to remove an unauthorized vehicle, takes up property space.

Michael Baldwin, Property Manager, DM Baldwin Enterprises, LLC

Mr. Baldwin strongly opposes the bill, arguing that it would severely limit his ability to enforce regulations on his own property. He says that this legislation would incentivize unauthorized vehicles to park on his premises, ultimately leading to a situation where property owners are penalized while individuals who disregard basic property regulations are not held accountable.

Alan Barbarino, Owner, Alan Barbarino Real Estate

Mr. Barbino opposes this bill arguing that this will create chaos by allowing unauthorized vehicles up to twenty-four hours to remove their vehicle. He states that this delay disrupts the parking for tenants who pay for designated parking spots. Additionally, his property includes 55+ sections, where parking spaces are crucial for residents. If parking is occupied, they will be forced to either search for distant alternatives or wait for a space to become available, causing significant inconvenience for those who rely on these spots.

Adam Bonoff

Mr. Bonoff opposes the bill. He firmly states that managers need solutions for illegally parked cars that aren't restrictive and cumbersome.

Bob De Cosmo, Manager, CT Property Owners Alliance

Mr. De Cosmo opposes the bill because, he feels it would be frustrating for a responsible tenant to come home to find a parking space reserved for them occupied by someone who should not have parked there, and they must wait a day or longer to get that vehicle removed so they can park there. He also mentions that cars could become a blight and safety hazard if left in inconvenient areas as being a major problem as well. He feels this legislation burdens tenants and property owners alike.

Kenneth Burkamp, Landlord, Burkamp Real Estate

Mr. Burkamp opposes the bill because it would force a tenant to wait at least 24 hours to have a vehicle improperly parked in their reserved parking space removed which is not fair they say to the tenant. He also cites safety hazards, such as cars improperly parked blocking fire lanes, trash dumpsters, blocking private roads and more.

Fred Campanella, Owner, Accurate Automotive

Mr. Campanella opposes the bill because he feels it is re-writing all towing laws in an effort to persecute a single towing company in the state over trespass towing, which he feels only a minority of members of the towing association is engaged in. He views the bill as a large over-correction for minority problem. He says most tow shops strictly handle police-initiated towing, involving motor vehicle accidents or vehicles discovered to be illegally operating on Connecticut roadways. Among his issues with the legislation, he cites having to purchase a new camera and printer to comply with new regulations and the civil penalties he would incur if mandated photographs did not match the specifications in the bill. He also cites financial hits his company has taken by dealing with customers who request chargebacks when paying for towing services by credit cards, which is why he now only accepts cash for police-initiated tows. He also feels the bill as written could in some situations cause financial hardship for prior owners of vehicles he has subsequently sold, and have been towed, because proper documentation of the sale was not recorded. He states that the legislation mandates that he sells abandoned vehicles without verifying that the vehicle is operational, because the bill will not accept not having keys as a valuation tool, and he is not permitted to have a key made and to verify its operational status, instead, whoever purchases the vehicle needs to perform any and all repairs, after purchasing, including having new keys made. In essence, he finds the "commercially reasonable" standard as defined by the bid as unreasonable and burdensome. He disagrees with the limit to restrict storage of abandoned vehicles to 60 days maximum. He also argues its more frustrating for him to sell his vehicles, then get paid for the services he's already rendered, so the goal isn't to sell vehicles he's towed, its essentially the last thing he does in order to reimburse some of his expenses for rendered said services he's never been paid for. In summary, he thinks this legislation only serves to harm small business owners with unneeded legislation, all due to the actions of MyHoopty over in Hamden.

Anthony Coco, Managing Member, Maple Street Realty

Mr. Coco opposes the bill because, as a landlord in Hartford and New Britain, he says the proposal would create huge problems with responsible tenants, specifically having wait 24 hours to tow an unauthorized vehicle. He says immediately towing an improperly parked vehicle creates stability and order on their properties.

Eileen Colonese, Secretary, Towing Professionals of Connecticut

Ms. Colonese strongly opposes the bill because she says it fails to protect tenants that respect parking rules, does not address needed changes for fair compensation, and they say it discusses misinformation shared in the media. She is specifically upset with the bill not requiring the DMV commissioner to look at the costs borne by towing companies when reviewing rates and the fact that the bill adds additional regulations that would increase costs on towing companies with no additional compensation. She says the bill was drafted due to misinformation and negative portrayals of the towing industry by in the media that are inaccurate.

Maya Dias, Tenant

Ms. Dias opposes the bill because, as a tenant, she believes the proposal negatively impacts renters by making it harder to enforce parking rules. She says they rely on designated parking spaces. If unauthorized vehicles were allowed to occupy even a designated space for 24-48 hours, it will create parking shortages and potential safety risks. She also states the provision of the legislation preventing the towing of unregistered vehicles could lead to cluttered lots. She says allowing vehicles to remain illegally parked on private property without immediate consequences is unfair to tenants who obey the rules and to property owners. She views opposing this bill as preventing the rights of renters.

Robin Emond

Ms. Emond opposes the bill.

Tarima Fallon

Ms. Fallon opposes the bill because she is a tenant in a large apartment complex, and she says many of her fellow tenants ignore parking rules, take up spaces that are not theirs, and leave unregistered or abandoned cars in place for weeks. She says if this bill passes, tenants that obey rules will suffer, because the delays in towing will make it impossible to enforce parking rules, and lots will become cluttered. She says towing needs to be quick and effective to keep their complex safe.

Michael Festa, Owner, MyHoopty.com, LLC

Mr. Festa opposes the bill, which he believes was created with a false and overdramatized narrative that garnered media attention and aims to dispel and address the concerns that have raised the bill. He defends the strict parking enforcement policies because of the gradual increase in cars owned per apartment over the last few decades. He notes that towing policies from 1950s-70s were made when "less than 20% of the households had more than one car" which has grown to over 60% of households having three or more vehicles, this increase requires towing companies to work to preserve parking capacity for residents. He disputes the fact that cars are being sold by towing companies within 15 days, noting that a car that is \$1,500 can be requested to be authorized for sale by the DMV after 15 days of it being in their possession 45 days if the car is worth more than \$1,500, with acknowledge that the total DMV process can take up to 60 days. He points to his company's towing processes

as a suggestion that their parking enforcement system is fair. For example, he provides written notice up to 180 days before parking policy changes and has residents sign a resident acknowledgement. He says that this bill will reward people who break the rules, limit the ability of property owners to enforce their own spaces, and creates a potential risk of fraud in terms of releases based on title, bills of sale, or lease agreement. He notes personally how dangerous this profession is to him and his workers. He believes the bill places the "regulation of trespassers on private property under the jurisdiction of the DMV" and suggests this bill be given a comprehensive review by property owners, managers, tenants and towing companies so that a fair and effective policy can be made and enacted.

Michael Fox, Executive Director, Gasoline & Automotive Service Dealers of America, Inc.

Mr. Fox opposes the bill, believing it is an unnecessary overreach on businesses. He believes this bill and the "one big fix" as he calls it will not fit all fit within all towing companies' means and may have unintended consequences that the legislature did not anticipate. While he likes the idea of the Bill of Rights, he feels it should also be aimed at protecting towing operators and consumers, highlighting the struggles towing truckers go through and the costs that are associated on their end for doing the work they do. He states the bill's regulations may take a huge percentage out of towing companies' expenses while at the same time towing fees have not caught up to the rate of inflation. He desires this bill to be negotiated with the towing operator and the DMV so all issues can be addressed.

Carmen Graham, Property Manager

Mr. Graham opposes the bill, noting that the bill poses risks for property owners as the maintain their property's parking lots. He believes unauthorized vehicles lead to solicitation and disruptive behavior, and this bill will encourage that behavior with no consequences. The consequences will be for property owners in the form of damage to property, obstruction of entrances and garbage disposal areas and safety hazards.

Brent Hossinger, Jr., Tenant

Mr. Hossinger, Jr. opposes the bill as a tenant, highlighting how difficult it is to obtain parking anyway and how the bill will only further the struggle to find parking. He that property owners will be limited in addressing these problems as more people take space meant for paying tenants.

Paul Januszewski, Housing Provider, Greater Enfield Landlords Association

Mr. Januszewski opposes the bill, noting that the bill only restricts private properties but not higher education facilities and private properties. The 24-hour notice before enforcement is essentially inhibiting enforcement and the ability to address parking violations which impacts the safety of resident, he claims. He believes those who violated parking rules will be immune from enforcement, emboldening this behavior, and will force residents to find a new space in an impractical and unsafe ways, prevent show owners from having enough spots for customer, and allow for further congestion and violations at special events such as fairs and carnival when parking rules are not allowed to be enforced.

Mark Manfredi, Renter

Mr. Manfredi opposes the bill, noting that the bill will make it harder to make parking more available by making it harder to remove unwanted cars, and it will encourage rule breakers to continue doing so, making the lots overcrowded. He emphasizes the importance of effective towing enforcement in the lots.

Katrina Mattern, Senior Property Manager, Town of Willimantic

Ms. Mattern opposes the bill, noting that the prohibition to issue notices or fines for improper parking would be problematic as her community experience residents and guests parking in other residents' spots frequently, and issuing fines and monetary sanction is the best way to ensure that violators are compliant. She believes the bill doesn't allow her to enforce her established parking rules on her own property. She claims that it is very inconvenient and a burden for the owner of property to be physically present to sign off a form, though she stated her support of the form and believes it should be able to be submitted electronically. While she does not oppose many of the system in the bill (many of which she has already implemented), she does believe that they will add to an already time-consuming system.

Joseph Mollica, Housing Provider, JNM Property Management

Mr. Mollica opposes the bill, noting that it is inappropriate to allow a 24-hour waiting period before a towing company can move a vehicle that is unauthorized because a resident/owner should be able to have that car towed quickly that they can park in their own space. Also notes the danger associated with requiring an owner of a property to meet the tow truck in person because of space violators potentially being confrontational.

Pasquale Montesanti, Portfolio Manager, Albert B. Ashforth, Inc.

Mr. Montesanti opposes the bill, noting that many parking lots that they manage have tenant reserve parking spaces and people who violate these spaces should be immediately towed. He says that they employ a towing company to monitor lots and notes the bill would create numerous problems for him and the tenants that live in these spaces.

Tara Ramlal, Property Manager

Ms. Ramlal opposes the bill, emphasizing the importance of her ability, as the property owner, to take on the responsibility of her property and makes sure it runs smoothly. The 24-hour rule, she says, will cause chaos in her lot but delaying the towing process and limiting parking availability, and says the government should not interfere with this process.

Paul Roger, Property Manager

Mr. Roger opposes the bill, noting that the bill, in his view, would make parking enforcement ineffective and emphasized the important being able to swiftly remove unauthorized vehicles from parking spaces. He believes the bill was cause delays in the towing process, causing major frustration among all parties.

Kathy Rogers, Property Manager

Ms. Rogers opposes the bill, noting that the allowance of unauthorized vehicles to occupy parking spaces will result in limited parking is concerning given that signs are already posted on the property and that it will likely not deter further instances of illegal towing. She believes the bill will dictate how her own property can be used, increase tenant disputes and "compel property owners to accommodate trespassers." She emphasizes the need for ensuring that parking is available for those who really belong in that property.

Guy Rudienus, Property Manager, Ridgeview Terrace Condominium Association and Gentian Merolli, Property Manager

Mr. Rudienus and Merolli oppose the bill, oppose the bill, noting that the bill would prevent timely enforcement with the 24–28-hour rule, and put managers such as them in uncomfortable positions with people who do not follow the rules. They emphasize that strict enforcement is about making sure the rules apply to everyone and doesn't seek to punish any one individual.

Vincent Sacco

Mr. Sacco opposes the bill, noting that it does not do anything to hold people responsible if they were to abandon a vehicle on private property. He believes it ill disadvantage tow companies with additional fee and a lack of ability to charge a fair rate.

Kevin Santini, Landlord and Property Manager, Santini Villa and CTAA

Mr. Santini opposes the bill, emphasizing the need for property manager such as himself to be able to tow vehicles for a variety of reasons, such as to remove an unauthorized, non-registered, or a severely damaged vehicle or if performance repairs are occurring in the parking areas. He reassures that the work to find the vehicle's owner. He believes the bill will negatively affect properties and allow vehicle owner to park in spots they are not authorized to park in without penalty.

Sal Sena, Chair, Towing and Recovery Professionals of Connecticut

Mr. Sena opposes the bill, emphasizing that a working group should be developed with towing industry stakeholders to get the experience and knowledge of those who will be directly impacted by the legislation. He believes this bill will have numerous unintended consequences that are preventable with the establishment of this working group.

Kevin Silvestre, Tenant

Mr. Silvestre opposes the bill, noting that the bill would create problems and chaos for tenants like him who would be very unlikely to have parking. He thinks that tenants should be able to have a car towed immediately in another car is in their spot.

Alec Slatky, Managing Director, AAA Northeast

Mr. Slatky opposes the bill, noting that the requirement to obtain in-person, written authorization from the owner of a parking lot to tow an inoperable vehicle, as his example

details, from another lot, would be a hard and virtually impossible to do. This would result in major delays in the towing process and inconvenience towers and property owners who would have exhaustively identified and contacted to provide that written authorization. He understands the rationale for this requirement regarding nonconsensual tows, but that it should not apply to all tows. He notes several other provisions that should be clearly identified as targeting nonconsensual towing.

Felicia Synott and Donna Hassinger, Tenants

Ms. Synott and Hassinger oppose the bill, noting that this bill will allow people to break the rules and make tenants' lives harder, when all they want to live in a fair and clean environment.

Lauren Tagliatela, Government Relations Co-Chair, Connecticut Apartment Association

Ms. Tagliatela opposes the bill, noting that a 24-hour written noticed will be a huge inconvenience for responsible tenants and disrupt several operations such as snow removal. She says that requiring property managers to be with a vehicle during the towing can be unsafe as there is a risk of uncharged situations while inconveniencing property owners who would be responsible for written authorization. She believes that companies accused of participating in predatory towing should address those concerns through municipal enforcement. She advocates for requiring visible signage to display towing policies, and notes that 24-hour notices have failed to gain support.

Efrain Torres III, Property Manager, The Brown Building, Student Living, Matthew Perry, Property Manager, and Umberto Ossino, Property Manager, Marconi Enterprises

These managers oppose the bill, noting that this bill, in their view, will negatively impact parking enforcement and the management of his property by allowing unauthorized vehicles to stay on private property for 24 hours. By preventing the towing of these vehicles, they say, it may put owners at risk of zoning fines and creates unnecessary conflicts with tenants. They emphasize the importance of effective parking enforcement at ensuring tenants can park and create safe spaces for them.

Destiny Torres and Kevin Ross, Tenants

Ms. Torres and Mr. Ross are opposed to the bill, noting that the allowance of unauthorized cars to sit for 24-28 hours will block spaces for her, and the lack of towing enforcement will prevent cars from being towed properly. They do not want to compete with parkers who ignore the rules.

Jonathan Vega, Chantelle Donovan, and Jorge Collazo, Tenants

Mr. Vega, Ms. Donovan, and Mr. Collazo oppose the bill, noting that there are concerns of people being able to park whenever they want, which may leave him without a parking spot. They note that there are unauthorized vehicles in his lot all the time, and a lack of effective towing will leave him with no parking. They believe that towing is a great way to remove unauthorized vehicles.

Timothy Vobert, President, Towing and Recovery Professionals of Connecticut

Mr. Vibert opposes the bill, emphasizing the important of the towing industry of Connecticut and the lack of towing professionals that took part in the drafting process of this bill. He notes several concerns with the bill. Mandating taking credit card payments may prove problematic as violators may stop payment on the credit card and protest the charge. The 24-hour sticker, he says, will cause chaos in the parking lots by allowing a violator to park in another spot, and not really deterring behavior. He believes the DMV Commissioner should be a determination to justify a fair and just rate for the towing industry and consider cost of insurance, equipment, and labor costs, among other things. He believes the requirement to release a vehicle at all hours should be reworked to be more reasonable. He notes the notification process in the bill is flawed because the person who will be notified is the last registered owner, who may not be the current owner. Lastly, he notes that notification of non-consensual tows is supposed to be made by the police department, but notification is not current being made by the department, which is the reason why the owner is unnotified until they receive notice from the towing company.

Sixteen property managers and tenants submitted the exact same testimony opposing the bill. They believe the newest version of the bill violates the right of private property owners and will create issues with tenants and trespassers who will continue to disobey the parking rules at the expenses of those tenants. This testimony was provided by:

- **Diliana Villodas, Property Manager, Nova Management**
- **Daria Szczygiel Regional Manager, Bright Sky Managment**
- **Black Stallion LLC**
- **Bethany Sherman, Property Manager, Community Improve Association**
- **Zischa Russell, Property Manager**
- **Maria Pirulli, Property Manager**
- **Bianca Ouchana, Property Manager**
- **Fernando Moulton**
- **Paul Mayer**
- **Stan Lander**
- **Nino Giammarco, Property Manager, Belham Group,I LLC**
- **M. Erdmann**
- **Jonathan Clark, Property Manager, Parkview Zion Condo Association**
- **Sherman Bowen**
- **Fenias Bahebura**
- **Ewa Argo, Property Manager, Parkview Condo Association**

Three property managers submitted the exact same testimony opposing the bill. They raise concerns of the 24 hours' notice before towing an unauthorized vehicle, as it would create more logistical problems and the loss of control of property manager and mixed-use property-owned lots. They fear potential physical conflicts between managers and wrecker drivers and vandalism when property managers are required to attend and be present during a towing. They believe that good tenants will be inconvenienced when there are virtually no consequences as offenders can repeatedly get warnings along with the 24 hours' notice

without changing their behavior. They feel that clear posted signage should be sufficient for a valid towing of a vehicle. This testimony was provided by:

- **John Souza, President, Connecticut Coalition of Property Owners**
- **Michael Grant, Property Manager, White & Katzman Management**
- **Donna Clarkesmall, Small Property Owner**

Four maintenance workers at apartment complexes submitted the exact same testimony opposing the bill. They fear that more chaos will occur in parking lots, noting that without the ability to call a towing company, they will see cars that do not belong in the complex parking there, causing congestion and many tenants being upset when they don't have a space to park. This testimony was provided by:

- **Kyle Nadeau**
- **Oscar Palomino**
- **Juan Perez**
- **Erica Rivera**

Two property managers submitted the exact same testimony opposing the bill. They emphasize that their lots require strict enforcement by them only, without interference from the government. They believe they have the right to manage their investments on their terms and see the bill as a reward to rule breakers and a punishment for property owners. This testimony was provided by:

- **Nate Johnson, Property Manager**
- **Guihnong Gerenia, Property Manager**

Six renters and property owners submitted the exact same testimony opposing the bill. They acknowledge the negative impact that the bill will have on both tenants and property owners. They claim the bill will make it harder for owners to enforce parking rules, increase public safety by allowing abandoned or unauthorized vehicles to remain on private property for 24 hours, unnecessarily involving law enforcement, and gives the DMV control over private property, which they see as an unnecessary overreach. It also would leave property owners vulnerable to blight and zoning fines. They feel that the bill imposes a burden on owners and helps those who don't follow the rules. This testimony was provided by:

- **Donald Warren**
- **Mario Gowin**
- **Rich Pulford**
- **Eric Torres**
- **Martin Jakaj, Property Owner, Glastonbury Crossing**
- **Tiffany Howes, Property Manager, New Britain**

Eleven property managers submitted the exact same testimony opposing the bill. They believe this bill will create issues for apartment complexes and ruin their organization and efficiency. They claim it favors people who don't follow the rules and allow them to remain that space for up to 24 hours, which reducing the available parking for legal tenants. This makes it harder to enforce parking rules and encourage violations among drivers. The end by claiming the bill

will delay parking enforcement and limits the ability of property owners to manage their own lots. This testimony was provided by:

- **David Travisano, Property Owner, Westford Real Estate**
- **Cristian Quinones, Property Manager**
- **Lisa Polofsky, Manager, Beechwood Apartments**
- **Peter Niro III, Property Manager, Orin Property Management**
- **Jesus Monge, Property Manager**
- **Sharon Manns, Property Manager, Better Quality Management**
- **Ryan Hurlburt**
- **Joseph Gramando, Property Manager, Green Hub Development**
- **Mabel Cabrera, Property Manager**
- **Avis Bryant, Property Manager, Clay Arsenal Management**
- **Massiel Astacio, Property Manager, Rego Managment**

Eleven property managers submitted the exact same testimony opposing the bill. They believe the bill will create more problems and take away the rights of private property owners. This testimony was provided by:

- **Banmatie Ramlal, Property Manager**
- **Cameron Norflin, Property Manager**
- **Antonio Marrero, Property Manager**
- **Kyle Lagasse, Property Manager**
- **Cory Lagasse, Property Manager**
- **Stanley Gutt, Property Manager**
- **Paul DeCrisant, Property Manager**
- **Sarah Burnham, Property Manager**
- **Michael Batista/Rohinie Criscine, Property Manager**
- **Andrea Simmons, Property Manager**
- **Rosa Balboa, Property Manager**

Three property managers submitted the exact same testimony opposing the bill. They emphasize the importance of the ability to immediately remove unauthorized vehicles to maintain parking availability for tenants, ensuring fairness and keeping private property compliant with regulations at the local level. The requirement to allow unauthorized vehicles to remain on private property for 24-48 hours would lead to parking shortages and safety concerns. They believes the media has misrepresented towing companies and that this bill is aiming to expand government control over private property. It would also, as they say, limit parking spaces for tenant, undermine the rights of property owners, and allow the behavior of taking parking spaces to be rewarded. This testimony was provided by:

- **Justin Barkowski, Property Manager**
- **John Barbino, Property Manager, East Mountain Village**
- **N. Samina Anwar, Property Manager, Folly Brook Apartments**

Twenty-five property managers submitted the exact same testimony opposing the bill. They believe the bill will allow unauthorized vehicles to park wherever they want which will increase frustration among tenants who have nowhere to park and lead to chaos in parking lots, making it more difficult for property owners to do their jobs. This testimony was provided by:

- **Howard Williams, Property Manager**
- **Chris Weiland, Property Manager, Vision Management, LLC**
- **Liz Velazquez, Property Manager, Nova Management**
- **Barbara V., Property Manager**
- **Jacob Teller, Property Manager**
- **Simon Thurm, Property Manager, Made Management**
- **Danny Srulowitz, Property Manager**
- **Litzchok Schartz, Property Manager**
- **Abraham Rosenberg, Property Manager**
- **Dori Robinson, Property Manager**
- **Yajaira Perez, Property Manager**
- **Jukari Oanley, Property Manager**
- **Sue Miranda, Property Manager, KWK Management**
- **Nelissa Merced, Property Manager, Historic Talcott Mill, LLC**
- **Antonia Mendoza, Property Manager, Stratus Equities**
- **David Lowin, Property Manager**
- **Taquisha Ramos-Huff, Assistant Property Manager, North Hartford Housing Trust**
- **Nattuli Hollender, Property Manager**
- **Sean Collateta, Designated Broker, Maple Group**
- **Nathaly Cedenno, Property Manager**
- **Tonya Brewer, Property Manager, Clemens Place**
- **Emanuel Bucka, Property Manager**
- **Kristie Benjamin, Property Manager**
- **Tashary Alzamora, Property Manager**
- **Joseph Amaio, Property Manager**

Reported by: Patrick Riley & Alex Sferrazza

Date: 3/27/2025