

Legislative History for Connecticut Act

**PA 14-215**

SB457

House	6672-6721	50
Senate	2387-2399, 2449-2450	15
Judiciary	3269-3281, 3292, 3293- 3296, 3319-3320, 3327- 3328, 3329-3330, 3361- <u>3379, 3586</u>	44

**109**

**H – 1200**

**CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
HOUSE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2014**

**VOL.57  
PART 20  
6540 – 6911**

the Chair.)

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

All right, all right, all right, all right, all right, all right. Thank you, then.

Will the Clerk please call the Implementer.

THE CLERK:

I would, Mr. Speaker, but I don't have it yet.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

I'm in charge. Right?.

Will the Clerk please call Calendar Number 522.

THE CLERK:

Calendar Number 522, Favorable Report of the joint standing Committee on Insurance and Real Estate, Substitute Senate Bill 547 -- excuse me -- 457, AN ACT CONCERNING REVISIONS TO THE COMMON INTEREST OWNERSHIP ACT.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Representative Alvis -- Albis, you have the floor, sir.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's good to see you up there.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Aren't you a little young to be on the dais, sir?

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

It could happen to you; too, sir.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Mr. Speaker, I move the acceptance of the joint committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

The question is on acceptance of joint committee's Favorable Report and passage of the bill. Representative Albis, you have the floor.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this bill makes minor changes to the Common Interest Ownership Act to help unit owners with their operations and -- and association boards with their operations as well.

The Clerk also has an amendment. It's LCO Number 4776. I'd ask that the Clerk please call that amendment and I be allowed to summarize.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Will the Clerk please call LCO 4776, which was previously designated Senate "A."

THE CLERK:

Senate "A," LCO 4776, introduced by Senator  
Doyle, et al.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS (99th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, this -- this amendment just makes  
technical changes to the way that board elections are  
conducted.

And I do move adoption.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

The question before the Chamber is on adoption of  
Senate Schedule "A." Will you remark on the  
amendment? Will you remark on the amendment?

It's Representative Rebimbas of the 70th. You  
have the floor.

REP. REBIMBAS (70th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. Good afternoon, and it's  
good to see you up there.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Good afternoon.

REP. REBIMBAS (70th):

Mr. Speaker, I do rise in support of the

amendment before us. And I just wanted to quickly just thank Senator Doyle, Representative Nafis, Representative Albis, and also Representative O'Neill for working on the legislation that's before us. And I do support it, and I know that Representative O'Neill is going to articulate a little bit more about the amendment that's before us.

But I did want to seek this opportunity, Mr. Speaker, to personally thank you for your assistance in my ability of making it, being elected and making it up here but then most importantly for your guidance and friendship once I was up here. And I certainly look forward to our reunions, outside this Chamber. So it's a pleasure to see you up there, and thank you, again, for everything that you have provided, not only for the residents of obviously your district, Watertown, but the State of Connecticut.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, madam, and the feeling is quite mutual.

Representative O'Neill of the 69th; you have the floor, sir.

REP. O'NEILL (69th):

Yes; thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker -- that's a nice sound; doesn't it? It's a pleasure to see you there and it's also a pleasure to see this amendment on the board, and the bill as well. This is a piece of legislation which hopefully clarifies something we did last year that makes it clear about how elections and votes will be taken on the budgets in condominium complexes.

And -- and in some ways, this is a piece of legislation that almost lasts, has lasted as -- as long as -- as your career in the Legislature, from inception to completion. It has been an enormous pleasure to serve with you and to watch your development as a Legislator during your years here with us. And I'm going to miss you greatly, because I was hoping that we would spend a number of years in the future working on various things and enjoying -- enjoying the row back here that we share and the work that we share on the various things we do here, as well as the jokes that we share that we can't repeat now, in front of everyone on camera. But thank you very much, for the years you've given us and hope to see you come back and maybe visit us often.

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir.

And there's no better gentleman in this Legislature than you. You have taught us so much about process, about how to interact with individual Legislators on bills, and I, the feeling is quite mutual well as well.

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further?

Representative Klarides of the 114th; you have the floor.

REP. KLARIDES (114th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

So I'm used to you being behind me, not in front of me; it's throwing me off a little bit.

You know, I remember the day when the former-Representative Flaherty, who you announced earlier today, told us he wasn't running.

And, well, who do you have? And you know, there was this whole issue between you and possibly somebody else, and -- and so when it ended up being you, we're like, Well, he's a kid; I mean, you know, what does he know?

And as Representative Cafero tells time and time again, you are like his fourth child. He's had more

father/son talks with you than -- than his own kids.  
And -- and I've lived through them, so -- so I'm aware of it. But I have to say that although I'm still angry -- and I'll get through my anger, I guess -- for you not running, you have certainly grown into a great guy, a great Legislator, and a good friend.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, madam, and I feel the same way about you. I can't thank you enough for all of your friendship over the years. And the good news is we have many more years to come of friendship, so thank you.

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

Representative Candelora of the 86th.

REP. CANDELORA (86th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I can't think of a more exciting bill to comment on.

I -- exactly -- I want to congratulate you on your years of service here and wish you well in the future.

Coming into the Chamber, I hadn't served on any committees with you, and I think my first exposure to

you was when there would be a committee meeting going on and all of a sudden you'd hear an announcement, a sudden announcement of a caucus and our Minority Leader running down the stairs to go into a room to deal with some kind of episode or struggle that was going on, particularly with the Energy Committee. And so I quickly was intrigued about who this Representative was in -- in our, on our side of the aisle.

And as I look around the room, I see a lot of people with gray hair, and I have a hunch that probably most of them didn't have gray hair before you came into this Chamber. And I say that, you know, very fondly and with the utmost respect.

We talk so much about family in this Chamber, and I have to say that you were one of the few individuals that has everybody's back. You're a very loyal person. You stand up for what you believe in, and when there's somebody that needs help, you're right there, up until midnight of the sine die. And I think it's a trait that's going to serve you well in the future. I wish you the best of luck, and we are certainly going to miss you. God bless.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir, and thank you for your friendship over the years. I know that you'll be doing great things for the state. I hope that you one day have to serve on the Energy Committee, so you can experience the same thing that I did there. So thank you, sir.

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

Representative D'Amelio of the 71st; you have the floor.

REP. D'AMELIO (71st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment before us but more importantly to -- to bid you a fond farewell from this place. You know, you're -- what an achievement to the youngest person to be elected to this, to this beautiful establishment, at the age of 21.

And I remember you were the butt of a lot of our jokes in the beginning of your tenure here. I remember one afternoon we were having a caucus and weren't in there yet. And everybody was, like, Where's Sean? And I remember John Frey saying, Don't worry; he'll be here. He's finishing his paper route.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

He'll be here all weekend.

REP. D'AMELIO (71st):

You know, I -- I gave you the nickname "Hollywood" because, you know, here you are, this tall, handsome guy with being single and being in this place. And, you know, you were living the Hollywood life; what could I say?

But, you know, what an, what a tremendous Legislator you've become. You've become friends to -- to mostly everyone in this place. You, both sides of the aisle respect you immensely, and that's not surprising. You have -- and you know, if you stayed here longer, I just could imagine where that would have taken you, but I, we all understand. When you start in this business young, you have a great opportunity for your future, and we're so proud and happy for -- for that.

But your friendship with me will remain life-long. I can't thank you enough for all you've done. I know the constituents back home adore you and love you; they would have voted for you. I don't think you ever were -- I -- I don't think you ever were opposed in an election because of who you are. But God bless you. All the best to you in the future, and keep it

going.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir.

And if I had to create a definition of a friend, Tony D'Amelio, you would be right there in the definition. You're such a decent and loyal person, and I'm going to miss you dearly. But the good news is we have many more years of friendship together, as I told Representative Klarides. So, thank you, sir.

Will you remark further?

Representative Hovey of the 112th; you have the floor.

REP. HOVEY (112th):

Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of you -- I'm not sure about this bill yet -- and I know that you are standing up there, kind of starting to sweat a little bit, worrying about what I might say. But I'll just say this, because I know your mom is watching CT-N; she can call me and I will give her the dirt on you.

As one of the women here who has been an older woman, surrogate mother, you've turned into an awesome man. Congratulations.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, madam.

And as Representative Cafero said, you wear your heart on your sleeve, and you just displayed it. I can't thank you enough for all your friendship over the years, and I look forward to many more.

Will you remark further?

Representative Berger of the 73rd; you have the floor.

REP. BERGER (73rd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker; support of the amendment before us.

I just want to thank you, sir, for your service to your district and the State of Connecticut. It's been an honor and privilege to serve with you.

You know, as you know, our districts abut each other, the Bunker Hill area, obviously, into Watertown, and we have somewhat many of the issues that are important to both of our districts that affect all of our citizens. And you've always been there in support of Waterbury issues, in support of issues that obviously affect your district and issues that affect the entire State of Connecticut.

Again, you've always been thoughtful. You've listened. You've been very, very helpful. Certainly

in my Chair, Chairmanship of eight years in the Commerce Committee, you've been very, very helpful, supportive in working in bipartisan legislation and, in fact, that some legislation that is -- is true to Democrats. And you've been, again, very instrumental in helping that go through.

We know you're moving on to bigger and better things, but you'll always be remembered in this House as a friend on both sides of the aisle, a friend that's admired and respected.

But just one thing; with some of this free time that you're not -- now going to have, it's hopeful that your -- your restaurant tab at Roma's will not exceed the limits.

Thank you, sir.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir.

And I think that if I were to tell somebody, and it was the freshman in our caucus, about building a relationship with somebody on the other side of the aisle or from a city, I would certainly reference our relationship. It's been a pleasure to work with you and look forward to many more years of good things to come from you as well.

Thank you, sir.

Will you remark further?

Representative Sawyer of the 55th; you have the floor.

REP. SAWYER (55th):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

One of the things I learned the other day at -- at my visit to where you are right now was, you know, when they talk on the phone up there, one of the things I learned was that they said is the next bill, is it clean. I had no idea what that meant. So I asked and it meant does it have an amendment on it or not; so it's clean if it has no amendment on it.

So, Mr. Speaker, you got one that's not so clean, but it is a great amendment and I'm just going to say that so I can stand for just a moment more and say thank you so much for your service

You know, as some of us know, when he's got something to say, he's not shy about saying it. He can give you a clear and concise description of what's in the bill. He can narrow it down to plain speak so you know what's going on, and certainly with some of the energy issues, that was more than essential.

But he's also been known to take on some of the

tougher issues, take on some of the tougher committees. Certainly Finance, Revenue and Bonding, where you have been an outstanding Ranking Member, I came on as a -- a freshman this term. It was a new learning curve, and I just wanted to thank you, sir, for all of your help on all those committees; and, my friendship to you, sir.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, madam.

And thank you for being such an effective den mother to not just myself but to so many in our caucus. You've helped to guide us and temper us every once in a while when we needed to be tempered. And some of us need that, so thank you very much.

Will you remark further?

Representative Kupchick of the 132nd; you have the floor.

REP. KUPCHICK (132nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

While we haven't served for the whole time of your term, just four years, I have to say I really appreciate your friendship, as many people in this Chamber today spoke about what a good friend you are. And you were a good friend to me, Sean, coming and

helping me out when I needed help or didn't understand the process and taking the time to really be there to have my back. And I'm hearing that today that you had a lot of people's back. And I wish you would, were going to stay, but I do appreciate your friendship and your loyalty.

Thank you so much, Mr. Speaker.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, madam.

And that may be the one thing I would hope somebody said about me is that I had people's backs, so I appreciate that you recognize that and others have as well.

Will you remark further?

Representative Davis, on the 57th.

REP. DAVIS (57th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I stand in great support of this amendment, and that's all I have to say, so -- no.

No, that's not true.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir.

REP. DAVIS (57th):

I -- I stand here as well to thank you

personally. I would not be here today without you; I think that's -- that's definitely clear. You're one of my best friends, both here and outside the Chamber, and -- sorry; getting a little choked up about it, but -- and hate to do that to you.

But what I have achieved here and what I will achieve here is because of you. And you just mean the world to me, and I look forward to continuing our friendship outside of, outside of our service here.

So thanks, again, Representative Williams.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir.

And you have an incredibly bright future here, as everyone who sits in this Chamber knows. And I look forward to watching all the great things for, to come for you.

So thank you so much.

Will you remark further?

Representative Zupkus of the 89th; you have the floor.

REP. ZUPKUS (89th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of this amendment.

But I also rise in support of you; I always knew

I would see you standing up there. And I, too, like Representative Davis, because of you am here. And I thank you for your mentorship, your encouragement for a long time, your wisdom, your knowledge, and all the things -- even though you're a lot younger than I am, I look up to you -- and for all the things that I have learned from you and will carry through as I'm here.

So thank you.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, madam.

And it took us a long time to get you here, but I'm so thrilled that you are, and the people of the State of the Connecticut are better off as a result. So thank you for your kind words.

Will you remark further?

My colleague from the Town of Woodbury, Representative Miner of the 66th; you have the floor.

REP. MINER (66th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

We're just -- so everyone's clear, I live in Litchfield not Woodbury, but that's all right; people still think I'm 66 now because of my other good friend, Representative Klarides.

I rise in support of the amendment, I hope.

And I wanted to say that, Sean, over these many years that we've served together, you' been very helpful to me, especially in the southern part of the district.

For those that you don't know, the 66th District goes from Warren all the way down the Woodbury, and not like it's a hundred miles, but it is a bit different. And I think the connection that you have in Watertown, Oakville, Waterbury, greater-Waterbury area has helped me serve the people of Woodbury better.

I was having a conversation with one of our colleagues here, someone's whose been, I would say an institution on the Finance Committee, having never held an office in the Legislature, I think she commands a lot of respect in this building about not only you but Representative Candelora and myself, and kind of brought us to Larry Cafero. And she was telling me a story about having gone to visit Larry after I was his choice to serve on Finance and then visiting Larry again after I was taken out of Finance and Representative Candelora was put in. And I'm not sure if she visited when you showed up, but as I understand it, she's been back a couple of times since

you've been there, and she didn't disclose to me exactly what that reason was.

I have no doubt that your future is bright. Certainly your work here in the Legislature on behalf of industry, on behalf of the people that you serve will be remembered. I know that when I am in Woodbury, more often than not someone has wonderful things to say about your work here. I think you do represent many people, Republicans, Democrats, and Independents in your thinking, and I wish you a very bright future.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir.

And that individual from the Finance Committee is far wiser than I, so I assume that those meetings, Representative Cafero, were productive and helpful in the cause. And to you, sir, I can think of no more thoughtful colleague to serve with on issues that are of import, not just to the town that we share but to the people of the State of Connecticut as well. You lack some of the things that are -- are bad in politics. Right? You lack all the hysteria and all the partisanship, and you really excel at the substance. And you've become a subject-matter expert

in anything that you do, and that's why everyone here looks to you for guidance and wisdom on issues, especially in our caucus. So thank you for providing that to me over the years.

Will you remark further on the bill?

Representative Widlitz of the 98th.

REP. WIDLITZ (98th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in support of the amendment also.

But, you know, Mr. Speaker, it's getting so friendly here, I have to be honest. It scares the hell out of me to see you up at that podium. And already, if you notice, my nine nonpartisan staff of the Finance Committee has already moved to the other side of the aisle, in your honor.

But, Sean, it's been a lot of fun working with you, except when I'm driving home and I hear this voice on the radio with all of the wisdom. I'm wondering, was he at the same meeting that I was just at? But I think that's probably come to an end.

But we've -- we've had a great time together. I know we were be -- we would be buddies as soon as you were a "Sopranos'" fan and a "House of Cards" fan --

and my son-in-law is an actor in -- in those series, and so Sean was really taken with that -- so that -- that made me coast a little while as a new Chair of the Finance Committee, because that was kind of fun to share.

And you've -- you've been a great partner and friend in the Finance Committee. And I was a little worried, you know, when I found out you would be the Ranking Member in my first term as chairing the Finance Committee, because you were kind of feisty before that on the House floor. But you've been very respectful and I think we've worked well together to have a really nice relationship.

So I do want to wish you well in your new career, but I have to tell you, if I ever see you in the cockpit of one of those airplanes, then I'm getting off.

But it's been great; thank you so much.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, madam.

And for those of you who don't know, Representative Widlitz has not seen the "Sopranos" or "House of Cards," in which her son-in-law is, so now that you have some time on your hands, I hope that

you'll watch both of those shows; they're really great shows.

Representative Widlitz, you have been such a pleasure to work with. You know, we may have different personalities, but I think we have the same heart. I think we're, our hearts are in the right place. We come at things, sometimes from different perspectives, but you have been an incredible pleasure to work with. You're respectful. You're dignified in the way that you conduct yourself as the Chair of the Finance Committee. It has been a real pleasure for me to actually serve with you and to be able to actually work some things out with you, based on that mutual respect that we have for each other. So great pleasure; thank you so much, for your kind words, and good luck to you as well. And watch the "Sopranos."

Will you remark further?

Representative Noujaim of the 74th.

REP. NOUJAIM (74th):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I have served, I have the honor and the privilege to serve with many Speakers before. All of them stood the dais with a great deal of dignity and respect, including former-Speaker Moira Lyons.

You're standing at the dais, leaning down like this, drinking water. Have some dignity up there, Mr. Speaker.

It's an honor, Sean. I have known you. It was a pleasure for me. It was a privilege to go campaign for you, work with you; I was honored to be on the polls the day that you were elected the first time. And the night that -- that you won the election down in -- in Watertown and you came to this beautiful House, you were the youngest. And then I became the second-youngest after you arrived. It's been an honor and a pleasure to have you as my friend.

Politics come and go; friendship stays forever. God bless you. I love you dearly.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir.

And thank you for those kind words. You have demonstrated your ability to work across the aisle. You represent a district that is heavily dominated by Democrats, and you're able to get elected and not by being partisan but by being effective and working with people on the other side of the aisle, and that serves you well, I'm sure, for the coming years.

So thank you very much, for your kind words.

Representative Smith of the 108th; you have the floor.

REP. SMITH (108th):

Mr. Speaker, thank you.

You know, you and I are, have a little bit difference in age, and I've always been -- I'm getting used to the position of being able to advise and counsel with my practice as a lawyer. And I must say that I was quite surprised in having to deal with you in how -- how much I have learned from you. It's not often that a young man like yourself can be as strong, as forceful, and guide other people.

I came into the Chamber knowing nothing. I leave, and when I leave I will think back upon you in many ways. I will think of all the stuff that you have taught me about politics, how to get along with the other side, how to form relationships, how to not blow my top on the Labor Committee. I thank you for all of those.

You've taken me aside many times, and, again, I think that's -- it was kind of reversal of roles for me. And I was initially taken aback, but I must say I am so pleased that you did.

I will miss your guidance. I look forward to

your words of confidence, your words of wisdom for such a, what I consider a young man. I -- I know you will be successful. You are a true gentleman, hard to find. God bless.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir.

And I'll be sure to text you as I'm watching the Labor Committee on CT-N in the future; I wish Representative Tercyak were here to hear that.

But your thoughtfulness and patience sometimes through tough times is extremely admirable and that's what gets you through those difficult situations, and I'm sure that's what will benefit you in the future.

Thank you very much, for your kind words.

Will you remark further?

Representative Cuevas of the 75th; you have the floor, sir.

REP. CUEVAS (75th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I rise in support of this amendment.

I just want to tell you a quick story, Sean. Twenty-seven years ago -- you know I coached for 27 years -- you used to see me on the baseball, basketball courts for 27 years, all over the state of

Connecticut. I've touched three, four, five, ten thousand lives of young kids, and I never forget.

I won my election. I came here on the inauguration night, and I see your dad in the hallway. Right? And I remember seeing you as a little kid, playing sports. I coached against you; your dad was the coach. I coached and I -- I used, I remember you back then. And then you grew up and then your brother came along, and your dad was still coaching and I was coaching. And you went off to the sunset, to college and -- and had a successful career.

But I did not know that you were in the Legislature. So on the first night I was here, your dad is outside, and I seen him with his famous cigar. Right?

So I said to him, I said, Mr. Williams, how you doing?

He goes, Hey, Vic, how you doing? He says, Congratulations on your victory.

I said, Thank you. I said, So -- so are you here to see me?

And he -- seriously, right -- and he goes, No, Sean is here.

And I said, Sean, your little Sean?

He goes, Yeah, he's -- he's a Representative.

I said, No way. I said, Wow, it's true that the world comes round and round and round. Right?

Everywhere you go, somewhere -- somewhere our lives touch, and then we come back and -- and touch together.

And I'll tell you, so far what I see you do, done here in the past year and a half that I've been here, I'm impressed. You're an articulate young man. God bless you. You have a great success ahead of you, and -- and your family is great. And tell your family they're great and that your dad did a great job. God bless you.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir.

I'm surprised it took you this long to tell me that story, but I'm so glad to hear that. I know my dad and my dad watches more CT-N than anybody I know, so I'm sure he's going to see this before I have the chance to tell him. But thank you for those kind words.

And you're somebody to watch in the future here in the Legislature. You're doing a great job representing your district. I know people of

Waterbury feel very strongly about that, so congratulations to you.

And thank you for your kind words.

Representative Srinivasan of the 31st; you have the floor.

REP. SRINIVASAN (31st):

Good afternoon, Mr. Speaker. It's great to see you here, and I hope seeing you here gives us all the energy that one of us will be there for some time to come.

Mr. Speaker, I rise in strong support of all that you've heard from my colleagues, both sides of the aisle, and endorse all that have been said about you very enthusiastically. I want to thank you for your guidance over the past four years.

When I came in, into the Chambers and was, one of the committees that I was assigned to was Finance. I was very apprehensive, because that was an area that I felt I was not very comfortable with.

And I still remember my conversation with you when you took me aside and said, Don't worry; I'm there. I'm the Ranking Member, and I will make sure you are aware of what's going on in the committee. That was four years ago, Mr. Speaker, and through

those four years, maybe I've become a little more comfortable with that committee and with all that we do there in the committee, but I know I can always count on you for your support if I'm not aware of what is happening there.

Your key sentence -- and I'll never forget -- when I asked you, Can I ask this question -- it seemed so foolish; it seemed so stupid -- and you said, Dr. Srinivasan -- you -- you were getting used to calling me "Representative, " because you were saying, Dr. Srinivasan, no question is stupid. Ask the question if you feel that there's a question, and I'm sure there will be somebody answering you for that.

Recently, Mr. Speaker, you have taken me under your fold and have become and involved me extensively in the negotiations on important issues that are facing us here in the Chamber. I want to thank you for the confidence that you have in me as to be a part of our team here, representing our caucus in these various discussions and negotiations we are having.

You are being my mentor, and I look across you; you are younger than my kids. And here you are, this young man, younger than my own kids, my mentor. We will always learn from each other, regardless of age

is what I was told, and you have proven that.

Thank you for your support, and I will, I will miss you.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir.

And to have someone with your record of success in life and your level of education say that about somebody like me is incredibly humbling. You are going to do great here; you already are doing great here. You have the respect of people on both sides of the aisle, and you're actually having an impact on legislation and on the people of Connecticut. So I look up to you for that, as well.

Thank you, sir.

And will you remark further on the amendment?

Representative Ritter of the 1st; you have the floor, sir.

REP. RITTER (1st):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I do rise in support of the amendment.

And, Sean, you're the man. You're a great guy. I appreciate all the advice you've given me. I go to bills from Harvard that you hate, that I know you'll vote against, but you have such a keen intellect and

understanding of this place that your advice is very helpful to me.

I remember a couple years ago we did a talk show on a Sunday morning, on Valentine's Day night -- my wife just loved that -- and they asked us a bunch of questions, waiting for the fists to fly, the accusations to start. And it was, it was really nothing bad said; I think Dennis House refused to ever have us back on the show. It was the perfect example of how two people can get along despite not agreeing on issues. So our friendship is genuine; it has nothing to do with this place. It will last for a long time. I appreciate what you've done for me, and I wish you a lot of luck in the future.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir. :

It obviously was not sweeps week when they had us on "Face the State," because there was no, no first-to-cuffs that day.

And thank you for everything that you've done for the State of Connecticut. I've known you since before you were elected to the Legislature and watched you progress. You're doing a phenomenal job here; and, again, you as well will have an impact on people for

years to come. I look forward to our friendship continuing as it has in the last few years.

Thank you, sir.

Representative Becker of the 19th; you have the floor, sir.

REP. BECKER (19th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

Mr. Speaker, I'm undecided on this amendment, so I'm going to listen to the rest of the debate.

But while I'm undecided on this amendment, I'm not undecided about you. It's been a pleasure serving with you on the Energy and Technology Committee and the Finance Committee. You're a great guy. And although -- although I do have to say, hearing that you've had these father/son talks with Representative Cafero, that kind of explains a lot.

But seriously, you know, you're a young man and perhaps you'll choose to run again, hopefully to sit on our side of the aisle the next time around. And if you do, we'll welcome you back, so just want to wish you all the best of luck.

Thank you.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir.

And thank you for those nice comments. You're a pleasure to serve with. You certainly ask a lot of good questions. You pay attention to the issues. You get into the issues; you don't just vote without having given good consideration to what's before you, and I have a ton of respect for you for that.

Thank you, sir.

Representative Hoydick of the 120th; you have the floor, madam.

REP. HOYDICK (120th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker. It's wonderful to see you there.

I rise in support of this amendment.

And I also rise in support of you. I think we've heard that often, and as we've had the -- the friendship develop over the last four years, I'm going to tell you a couple things. First, speak more into that microphone, which I never thought I would have to tell you. And, second of all, if you change parties, we will kill you.

You and I have a lot in common. We are both special-election winners, and that was our first connection. The second one was when I sat with you through an evening-long debate on energy, and little

did I know that as -- as you were talking and debating and going through -- I think it might have been hundred-page documents, which are typical of energy -- you were leading me down the path to take your place as Ranking Member. So you were slick then; you're slick now, and we still love you.

You taught us a lot of great lessons, especially me. You taught me how lobbyists are our friends, which is a little ironic, since now you are one on a national level. But you, the -- the reasoning behind that was that they had a semblance of knowledge that we wouldn't have just from the vacuum of this Chamber and just from the staff that we have working at the Capitol, so I thank you for that as well.

When I became Ranking, thank God I had -- Larry gave me you and Penny, too -- help with that first two-year, two years especially when the Co-Chairs tried to limit our debate during committee meetings. And you two rallied around and got the troops and, as Larry said, fired them up; light -- light up the board. And we kept that debate going forever.

So, Sean, it's been a great four years sitting next to you. You are a mentor, as Doc said. It's hard to believe since -- but thank God, my kids aren't

as old as you so I can, I can take a little relief in that. But your compassion, always the time; you put things down to listen to somebody. It doesn't matter, that it has to be Republicans; Democrat too. Anybody who needs your help, you've always been there. And you've just really set a great example.

You've learned from Larry, and since this last job that you've had, you've grown so much, and it's been a pleasure to watch. And I'm going to take your words and say, "You're freakin' awesome."

Thank you.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

That was "freakin'." Right? Thank you, madam.

And thank you so much, for your friendship over the years. Sitting next to you can be a very calming influence on me as well. You are a very loyal friend, a very decent person. You're serving your district honorably.

Representative Bacchiochi and I may have given you a little boost when you were the Ranking Member on the Energy Committee in your first term, but you have done a -- a marvelous job, ever since then. You have respect on both sides of the aisle, and I'm envious of the fact that you'll be here for many years to come

and continuing to do such a good job.

So thank you.

Will you remark further on the amendment?

Representative Butler of the 72nd; you have the floor, sir.

REP. BUTLER (72nd):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

And I'm closing out the comments from the Waterbury delegation. I think it's only appropriate, because when I first saw you, it was in Waterbury. And being on the Board of Alderman, traveling around political circles, I'd come to see you from time to time.

And I was saying, Well, who's that young guy? I seen him, you know, a few different occasions.

And somebody said, Oh, that's Sean Williams; he's running for state representative.

I said, state representative? He's a little young to be running for a state representative, isn't he?

They said, Yeah, but -- but he is.

I said, Well, what district?

And they said, The 68th.

I say, Well, that's not in Waterbury.

They said, Of course it's not; it's in Watertown.

And I just said, Whew. Because I was hoping to become a state representative some day, and I said, I don't want this young guy to be in a seat that I'll never be able to get into before he retires.

But at any rate, I just wanted to wish you the best, Sean. You've always been around Waterbury and working on a lot of issues, both there and here. It's been a pleasure working with you. I wish you the best. And we're going to just make you an honorary member of the Waterbury delegation.

Thank you.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir.

And thank you for your dedication to Waterbury. We certainly share a lot of the same interests. Me being from Greater Waterbury, I've always believed that so go the city, so go the towns, and your passion for your city is -- is incredible to watch. And it's been a pleasure to work with you. I know you'll continue to have that same passion for many years to come, and the citizens of Waterbury will benefit from it.

So thank you very much.

Will you remark further?

Representative Yaccarino of the 87th; you have  
the floor, sir.

REP. YACCARINO (87th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I support this amendment.

But, also, I support you. Been here for almost  
four years, and I've got to know you so well. And I'm  
you at home; I'm used to mentoring people or giving  
advice, my children only a few years younger than you.  
But being here for the first night of session, almost  
four years -- three years ago, three-and-a-half years  
ago -- you would, gave me such sound advice. And I'd  
be apprehensive many times about getting up to speak  
or about a policy, and you, twenty, over twenty years  
younger than me would give me sound advice, and it was  
comforting.

And I consider you such a good friend. I had  
such a pleasure getting to know you, and I'm going to  
hopefully continue to be -- have a relationship with  
all of us in the future. But you're just a great guy  
and very fortunate, and I think it has a lot to do  
with the, just the Chamber, itself, and Larry as a  
leader. But it's a pleasure and it's an honor, and I

wish you the best of luck.

Thank you.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir.

And thank you for your comments. You've come a long way. You're doing a phenomenal job for the people in North Haven. You're engaged in the issues that you care about, and I appreciate your kind words.

Will you remark further on the amendment?

Representative LeGeyt of the 17th; you have the floor, sir.

REP. LEGEYT (17th):

Thank you, Mr. Speaker.

It's a privilege to rise and speak to you this afternoon. I've two things I'd like to say to you. One, I never generated so much respect for somebody so quickly as in my first term, when just about this very same time in the session, you went the whole evening, toe-to-toe with Representative Nardello on an energy bill, while the rest of us were able to take power naps, one, two, four, seven, eight, ten. And Sean was there, question after question. That amazed me, sir, and I'm -- generated so much respect for you.

The other thing I wanted to tell you is that

right from day one when I, when I got here, I couldn't get over your voice. And not that you don't have opportunities ahead of you, but if -- if there's ever a little window where you're not sure what to do, you could be the next Joe Scarborough, mister. I appreciate that.

Thank you, for everything.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir, for your thoughtfulness in representing your district, and I really appreciate your kind words. You're doing great and I look forward to watching you for many years to come.

Will you remark further on the amendment?

Representative Bacchiochi of the 52nd; you have the floor.

REP. BACCHIOCHI (52nd):

Well, thank you, Mr. Speaker.

I just want to also add my comments of how proud I am to have known you here in the Chamber. Our eleven-year friendship has meant a lot to me. I've enjoyed your -- your time and your friendship, both here in the building and outside of this building.

And I realized a couple years ago that the time

had passed for me to ask you if you had a note from your parents to stay out past midnight. I realized one day when I looked down, that that line was no longer appropriate, that you were now a man in your own right --

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Madam, are you speaking to Senate "A?"

REP. BACCHIOCHI (52nd):

Absolutely, this is all about Senate "A."

Representative Williams, you have made such a mark on us, so many of us here, and we wish you well.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, madam.

And as quasi-classmates -- I came in a year after you did, in a special election -- but we've been together a long time. And we've been through a lot together, and I'm a better person for having worked with you and look forward to many good things from you to come in the coming years.

So thank you.

Will you remark further on the amendment? Will you --

REP. ARESIMOWICZ (30th):

Mr. Speaker? Mr. Speaker, I rise to call the

question of whether, of whether Representative Cafero or I was going to go first; that was my question. I think it's quite fitting that I let Larry go at the end, so there really is no question. .

And, of course, I'm rising to speak on Senate Amendment "A."

Sean, two people influenced me very much when I first came here, and offered me advice. And it really was the opposite side of the spectrum; it was Senator Billy Ciatto and it was you. And we had mutual friend, even though from different sides of the aisle, so I immediately was intrigued and wanted to figure out what gives. How was, you know, this guy from Watertown friends with all my buds in Waterbury, the labor movement and other folks. And I just had to figure it out, so I spent some time talking to you. And there was many times that I would come over to that side of the aisle and sit in the chair next to you, and we'd sit and chitchat.

And I remember one day your exact words to me. "Joe, just remember, this building is temporary. Don't let it change who you are. You know who your friends are and you know how to act. You're going to be moving up the ladder, maybe someday; just stay

.  
.  
.  
.

true. Work with us over here and we'll have great relationships." Sean, that was your exact words; I remember it to this day.

Now that I'm in this particular position, I -- I hope I've listened well. I hope you look over here with a little sense of pride. Because if you didn't know it, you're the one that helped me act the way I do over here, and I'll be forever grateful for that.

But I'm also kind of grateful that -- that you're leaving, Sean, because -- because -- Sean, really -- because a couple of debates -- I knew, I knew Larry was talking about going -- and I said, all right, at least two years over here, I'll have a little easier time; I don't have to follow him all the time. And then last year you're standing up, and you're doing the forget-about-it and the hand like this, and I'm, like, oh, here we go, stage two. So -- so seeing you go, although sad -- and I'll miss you, my friend, and I'm going to see you around and I hope still you'll offer me advice -- your mentor, Representative Cafero taught you well, and I'm just glad I'm not facing round two of Larry. But I'll miss you and I -- I hope to spend more time with you, away from here.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir.

And I do remember those conversations that we had. And, you know, part of your success, a large part of your success is that you're a real guy and you've never changed. You're a real person. You've always been real. You've always been authentic with people.

I believe there's no substitute for authentic communication, and you're somebody who looks the person you're talking to in the eye, who listens to what they say, who processes what they're talking about, and who cares about what they think, and so it's a -- a great pleasure for me to be your friend. Forget about being a colleague, to be your friend is a great honor for me.

So thank you, sir.

Will you remark further? Will you remark further?

If not -- one of our Deputy Speakers, who's sitting here, said he's always wanted to do that.

Representative Cafero, you have the floor, sir.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

Mr. Speaker, I don't think I care for your tone.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

That's not the first time you've said that to me.

REP. CAFERO (142nd):

It sure isn't.

You know, I've talked to a lot of teachers of grade school kids, and they always tell the story about how unfair it is for some kids who are in a certain classroom, whom might be taller than the rest of the kids. And they say as a teacher, as much as they try to steel against it, because a child might be physically bigger than the other kids in the class, they have higher expectations of that child. And it's not fair because they still are -- whether it's 9 years old in a class of 9-year-olds or whatever -- they're a 9-year-old kid, and yet because of their physical presence and their height, sometimes even the best of teachers can't help but have a higher expectation of them.

Mr. Speaker, you came into this Chamber as a 21-year-old, young man. You had a deep, baritone voice. You were very confident in your walk; some said you had a swagger. And because of your maturity, your presence, which -- and your wisdom -- which was well beyond your years, people had certain impressions of you. And I would always say to people, As good as he

is -- and he's good -- he's still a 21-year-old kid. He had more in common with some of the younger members of the staff and the interns than he did with the old fuddy-duddies, like myself and others.

And yet you have performed magnificently. Yes, I -- I agree; Sean was my fourth child. I believe it was opening day. Both his parents were here, and I grabbed them and I hugged them both. And I said, We raised him well, didn't we?

I think of all those learning experiences, these father/son chats, the good times, the laughs, but most importantly -- and as corny as it sounds -- I remember watching you grow and how you excelled; excelled in committee; excelled on the floor of the House; excelled in caucus; excelled with your relationships on both sides of the aisle; how you got things done; how you -- as has been said so many times -- were a mentor to people twice your age. And as this pseudo-father, whatever, my buttons burst, my heart swell with pride.

Obviously you and I talked long and hard about the opportunity you were presented, and I was so thrilled and proud for you. And I know how well you're doing and how well you're going to do. And

it's just the beginning, Sean. There is nothing you cannot do. You are going to have a long, long, wonderful career. You are going to do so many remarkable things. And I get to say -- when all the hair is gone, half of which you caused to leave my head -- when I'm on Golden Pond, in some rocker, I'm going to say, I knew him when.

I love you, buddy. I'm so damn proud of you.  
Good luck to you.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Thank you, sir.

What else can I say then, than what's been said before about you? You are undoubtedly the best teacher, mentor, and friend. And I think, you know, combining all three of those together is something that is extremely rare in this world, to have somebody who's all three of those things. We've had a lot of laughs together, a lot of laughs. We've had a lot of talks, lot of talks, and they've been incredibly productive to me in making me a better person and a better Legislator, most importantly, a better person.

Everything that was said about me here today was so appreciated. I appreciate everything everybody said, but it's so much a result and a product of what

you did with me, and so for that I will be forever grateful to you.

Will you remark further on the bill -- on the amendment? Will you remark further on the amendment?

If not, I'll try your minds. All those in favor, signify by saying Aye.

REPRESENTATIVES:

Aye.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

All those opposed, say nay.

The ayes have it; amendment is adopted.

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

Will you remark further on the bill as amended?

If not, will staff and guests please come to the well of the House. Will the members please take your seats. The machine will be opened.

THE CLERK:

The House of Representatives is voting by roll.

The House of Representatives is voting by roll. Will members please report to the Chamber immediately.

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

Have all the members voted? Have all the members voted?

Will the members please check the board to

determine if your vote has been properly cast. If all members have voted, the machine will be locked, and the Clerk will take a tally.

The bill passes in -- in -- oh, I'm -- Mr. Clerk, would you please announce the tally.

THE CLERK:

Mr. Speaker, it's a pleasure.

Senate Bill 5 -- excuse me -- 457 as amended by Senate "A," in concurrence with the Senate.

Total Number Voting	147
Necessary for Passage	74
Those voting Yea	147
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	4

REP. WILLIAMS (68th):

The bill passes in concurrence with the Senate.

(Deputy Speaker Godfrey in the Chair.)

DEPUTY SPEAKER GODFREY:

House will come back to order.

We need to do a few housekeeping motions and then do a Consent Calendar, so if you'd all pay attention.

And I'll call on the distinguished majority

**S - 676  
CONNECTICUT  
GENERAL ASSEMBLY  
SENATE**

**PROCEEDINGS  
2014**

**VOL. 57  
PART 8  
2311 – 2667**

either every year or every other year for court support services. Senator Coleman did a commendable job in listing off the laundry list of things that the bill does.

Essentially much of what the bill does is make sure lines of communication are open and clearly delineated, such that the free flow of information can help court support services do their appropriate mission. And for those variety of reasons I'm happy to support the bill.

Thank you.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, Senator.

Will your remark further on the bill? Will your remark further on the bill?

Senator Coleman.

SENATOR COLEMAN:

I move the bill to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Is there objection to placing the bill on the Consent Calendar?

If not, so ordered.

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

Page 43, Calendar 405, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 457, AN ACT CONCERNING REVISIONS TO THE COMMON INTEREST OWNERSHIP ACT, favorable report of the Committee on Judiciary. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Coleman.

SENATOR COLEMAN:

Thank you, Mr. President.

May I yield to Senator Doyle?

THE CHAIR:.....

Senator Doyle, do you accept the yield?

SENATOR DOYLE:

Yes I do, Mr. President. }

I move acceptance of the joint committee's favorable report in passage of the bill.

THE CHAIR:

On acceptance and passage will you remark, sit?

SENATOR DOYLE:

Yes, thank you, Mr. President.

This bill is another one -- each year we have -- the Judiciary Committee deals with condominium issues. This is one of our condominium bills that deals with a number of issues. The file copy deals with -- over the your people come up with issues during the operation of many of our condominiums. The file copy has a number of issues. It clarifies when executive boards take official votes. The minutes have to reflect what the actual votes were and how members of the board voted.

It also clarifies in a resale certificate when a person is to sell the condo that a statement disclosing the fiscal -- that disclosing an official audited certified public accountant report is -- the figures from it are added to the resale certificate that one gets when they purchase a condominium.

It also increases the penalties for a condo association or community association managers

when they violate their trust. Their fines are increased from 500 to a thousand dollars. It also deals with the declaration of a condominium to clarify that all declarations have to define what the ratio between a lease and owner-occupied condominiums are.

It also clarifies for private transfer fees, which are a prohibited practice, meaning condo associations cannot charge a person to sell a condo. It just clarifies however, that dues or any other fines of the ongoing condo association are not considered a private transfer fee.

And the bill also just clarifies -- our statutes have a particular focus towards one condominium association. It just clarifies that the voting procedures there, that actually have to be voting.

In addition to that, Mr. President, the Clerk has an amendment. LCO 4776. May the Clerk please call and I be allowed to summarize?

(The President in Chair.)

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 4776, Senate "A," offered by Senator Doyle, et al.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE:

Yes, thank you, Madam President.

I first move adoption of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Motion is on adoption of the amendment. Will

your remark, sir.

SENATOR DOYLE:

Yes, thank you, Madam President.  
This amendment strikes two of the file copies.  
That's why I didn't reference them, and it  
inserts new language. This amendment does  
primarily two things. It deals with -- to  
clarify that when directors and officers are  
voting in a situation where you have more than  
two candidates you don't need a majority. You  
just need a plurality.

These are technical issues that arose over the  
year, over the past year of so regarding  
elections in condominium associations. So just  
clarifying that you don't need a majority if  
there's more than two candidates.

Section 7 is a new section that deals with a  
situation of a master association that has -- a  
large master Association that is narrowly  
focused, that has a weighted vote. And if 25  
percent of the board of the master association  
decides to dissolve the master it permits them to  
do this in this particular narrowly tailored  
association. So, therefore, I would ask the  
chamber to approve the amendment before us.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good evening, Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much, Madam President.

Just a couple questions through you to the  
proponent of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much.

First of all, I'd like to commend Senator Doyle for all his hard work on all common interest ownership interest act issues over the years. He's been one of the handful of individuals who have been excited to tackle some of these difficult problems. And we on the committee very much appreciate his expertise regarding these things.

Regarding the issues delineated in the amendment, I'm just wondering if they are in response to specific problems that have arisen in various associations throughout the state of Connecticut. And if the amendment is the product of discussion and compromise.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE:

Yes, through you Madam President.

The answer is, yes. The first section, I should say section 2 in this amendment deals with a certain association, that this is a pre-existing language for an association that has some issues concerning voting. So it's basically negotiated between the parties there.

And section 7 also deals with an issue. In another unit were trying to focus on that and to try to find a way to achieve a resolution of issues between the existing particular association.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kissel.

SENATOR KISSEL:

Thank you very much.

One of the things I've learned over the years -- and I have no further questions for Senator Doyle. One of the things I've learned over the years is that these issues can be somewhat intractable. And unfortunately what we've seen is that while there was a halcyon era where condominiums were all the rage.

Over the years it turns out to be a handful of individuals that really want to participate in governing those condominium associations, but they may have a lot of absentee owners. They may have a lot of renters. And so it's difficult to get quorums. It's difficult to get majorities and sometimes the problems are trying to get enough folks to participate in raising funds to maintain these condominium units.

And so there's a lot of frustration out there. Sometimes a handful of individuals really try to dictate to the majority of other individuals as to how things are going to go. And unless things boil over and there's some meeting that's flooded with individuals nothing really takes place. So these are not easy issues to resolve. I commend Senator Doyle and Senator Coleman for their hard work on this as well as our colleagues in the House and I'm happy to support the amendment.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark? Will you remark?

If not, Senator Coleman.

SENATOR COLEMAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

I didn't want the opportunity to go by without thinking Senator Doyle for his perennial work on the common interest ownership community bills that come through the committee. And as always, Senator Kissel is a help, most of the time.

THE CHAIR:

Nice, 99 percent of the time.

SENATOR COLEMAN:

So I don't know if there are any further remarks. And I don't know -- Senator Doyle, do you want this move to --

THE CHAIR:

This is Senate "A." Right?

SENATOR COLEMAN:

I'll sit down.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you, sir.

At this point if there's are no other comments I will try your minds.

All in favor of Senate "A" please say, aye.

SENATORS:

Aye.

THE CHAIR:

Opposed?

Senate "A" passes.

Will your remark further on this bill? Will your remark further on this bill?

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Good evening, Madam President.

I rise for the purpose of an amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

The Clerk is in possession of LCO 4602. I'd ask the Clerk call the amendment and I be allowed to summarize.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

LCO Number 4602 Senate "B," offered by Senator Kane.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

I move adoption.

THE CHAIR:

The motion is on adoption. Will you remark, sir?

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President. I will.

A year ago, we in this chamber, thanks to Senator Doyle and Representative O'Neill and others, we fixed a problem in a condo association in my district as pertaining to voting on budgets and the way they were happening prior is that if -- a non vote was considered a yes and that change was made a year ago to allow this particular condo association to fix that and give the ability to count the votes of those who participated, rather than just every single condo in the association.

So I've had a couple of constituents ask me to help them in this same regard with their condo association and I was hoping that it could apply to theirs as well.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will your remark?

Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE:

Thank you, Madam President."

With all due respect to the good senator, I'll be honest. Senator Kissel referenced that there's a lot of work involved with these condo laws and they're very complicated. And at the present time without having more time to thoroughly go over this proposal, with all due respect, I would ask -- I would have to oppose this amendment and I would ask for a roll call vote on the amendment, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

A roll call vote will be had.

Will your remark? Will your remark?

lgg/rd/cd  
SENATE

234  
May 2, 2014

Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

I stand for the purpose of a question to the  
proponent of the amendment.

THE CHAIR:

Please proceed, sir.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

Senator Kane, it's my understanding that it's  
fairly common practice that if you don't show up  
to vote, sort of like if you don't show up to  
vote for State Senate or Governor or whatever,  
your vote doesn't count.

Is that common practice in condominium bylaws?  
And furthermore, is that common also in even  
voting as a stockholder for a corporation?

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Senator Kane.

SENATOR KANE:

Thank you, Madam President.

I thank Senator McLachlan for the question.  
You're correct that in an election like you  
mentioned, whether it be State Senate, or  
otherwise, the votes are counted of those who  
participate.

And in budgets of condominium associations,  
typically they are -- votes are counted even as a  
yes, as a matter of fact, not just counted, but  
as a yes if no one shows up. And the concern is

about owner-occupied units. Those units who are away or travel or you know, the term snowbirds, as it were, people who summer -- or winter in Florida. Those individuals their vote would be cast as a yes vote even though they didn't participate in the budget process. So that's the hope in this, in this fix.

Through you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Sorry. Senator McLachlan.

SENATOR MCLACHLAN:

Thank you, Madam President.

Thank you, Senator Kane. And I'm familiar with Heritage Village in Southbury. I have two family members who are property owners there and live there, one of whom is only there part of the year. And I remember having a discussion with him about he doesn't really participate much in the condo association meetings. Although he's friendly with the officers of the condo association, doesn't attend the meetings because of, well, I guess lack of interest, frankly.

Checks in, reads their newsletters, but admitted to me when we were talking about this topic over the last several years that he wasn't there to vote but he commented to me also that his absence didn't mean that his unit wasn't counted as a vote. So I think you're raising a very good point and I would agree with you and I urge adoption.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Thank you.

Will you remark? Will you remark?

If not, Senator Doyle?

A roll call vote has been -- I'm sorry, so sorry.

Mr. Clerk, will you call for a roll call vote on Senate "B"?

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the Senate. Immediate roll call on Senate Amendment Schedule "B" has been ordered the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

If all members have voted -- all members have voted. The machine will be closed.

Mr. Clerk, will you please call the tally?

THE CLERK:

On second Amendment schedule "B."

Total Number Voting	34
Necessary for Adoption	18
Those voting Yea	13
Those voting Nay	21
Those absent and not voting	2

THE CHAIR:

The amendment fails.

Will you remark? Will you remark further?

Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE:

Yes, Madam President.

Without objection, I refer it to the Consent Calendar.

THE CHAIR:

Seeing no objection, so ordered, sir.

Mr. Clerk.

Okay. The Senate will stand at ease for a moment.

(Chamber at ease.)

THE CHAIR:

The Senate will come back to order. Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, if we mark as the next go item, calendar page 37, calendar 198, Senate Bill 357.

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk.

THE CLERK:

On page 37, Calendar 198, Substitute for Senate Bill Number 357, AN ACT CONCERNING REVISIONS TO ENERGY STATUTES, favorable report of the Committee on Energy and Technology. There are amendments.

THE CHAIR:

At this time, Senator Linares.

SENATOR LINARES:

Thank you, Madam President.

lgg/rd/cd  
SENATE

287  
May 2, 2014

Page 43, Calendar 387, Senate Bill 432.

Page 43, Calendar 399, Senate Bill 152. Also on  
page 43, Calendar 405, Senate bill 457.

On page 6, Calendar 328, House Bill 5125.

And on page 8, Calendar 337, House Bill 5131.

On page 19, Calendar 460, House Bill 5057; and on  
page 20, Calendar 462, House Bill 5472; and on  
page 25, Calendar 501, House Bill 5578.

THE CHAIR:

Mr. Clerk, please call for a roll call vote on  
the Consent Calendar. And the machine is open.

THE CLERK:

Immediate roll call has been ordered in the  
Senate. Immediate roll call on the Consent  
Calendar Number 2 has been ordered in the Senate.

THE CHAIR:

Have all members voted? All members voted. The  
machine will be closed.

Mr. Clerk, will you please call the tally.

THE CLERK:

On today's second Consent Calendar.

Total Number Voting	34
Necessary for Adoption	18
Those voting Yea	34
Those voting Nay	0
Those absent and not voting	2

THE CHAIR:

The Consent Calendar passes.

Senator Looney.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, would request suspension for  
purposes of immediate transmittal to the House of  
calendar page 37, Calendar 198, Senate Bill 357.

THE CHAIR:

So ordered, sir.

SENATOR LOONEY:

Thank you, Madam President.

Madam President, yield the floor to members for  
announcements or points of personal privilege or  
upcoming committee meetings.

THE CHAIR:

Are there any points of personal privilege or  
upcoming meetings?

Senator Linares.

SENATOR LINARES:

Thank you, Madam President.

THE CHAIR:

Good morning, sir.

SENATOR LINARES:

Good morning. Happy Saturday to you.

THE CHAIR:

I don't know about that sir, but go ahead.

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**JUDICIARY  
PART 7  
2884 – 3360**

**2014**

discussion as well because that's important.

So --

AILEEN KEAYS: I'd be happy to provide any assistance.

REP. G. FOX: Okay. That's great. Well, thank you and thanks for being here today.

Attorney William Ward.

I'm sorry. I just actually --- Bill, I'm sorry. Your next.

Anna Maria Fornino. Okay. I'm sorry. But you are next, Attorney Ward, so don't go anywhere. Okay?

ANNA MARIA FORNINO: Good afternoon. We are here with regard to Raised bill 457. And the three of us will be combining our testimony together.

REP. G. FOX: Sure. And if you could just make sure you state your names and then just please proceed. Okay.

My name is Anna Maria Fornino and I have resided in my condominium unit for 40 years and five months. In 1973 and persuant to all legal documents been filed by the declarant the construction of the condominium community commenced. A total of 468 condominium units were to be built as well as the clubhouse with an indoor pool, meeting rooms and other outdoor recreational facilities that included an in-ground outdoor pool and tennis courts, et cetera. The first building to be occupied occurred in July 1973 with one owner in that building.

The survey map recorded the town clerk's office show a total of 25 associations, one master and

24 sub associations, each owner of record is a member of the master association as well as owning an equal voting percentage in this master association. Also on file are the declaration and bylaws of the developer and the laws that reference weighted votes per associations.

Late in 1974 Hartford National Bank commenced a foreclosure action against the developer. The owners living there at that time, approximately 50 families retained legal counsel to represent their interest with Hartford National Bank to pursue a new developer. Once a new developer was selected in 1976 it was required to first complete construction of the three remaining original association buildings as well as the clubhouse at all outdoor recreational facilities.

The developer complied with the terms and thereafter changed the name of the community. It then proceed with construction of 326 units as an expandable form of condominium ownership association. The developer elected to keep the 326 units as one association, rather than breaking it down to the original 18 smaller associations added to the existing six associations, totaling 24 associations with the one master association as the 25th.

The combined 136 owners in the original associations have a 30 percent vote, but do not have a voice when it comes to their equal interests due to the weighted vote of the newer association which carries 326. This procedure has delayed many annual budgets and other major motions of importance. The master association is duly referenced in all legal documents and it requires the vote of all 462 unit owners. With the word "weighted" presently in full force and effect in a declaration and bylaws

there is absolutely no way the present declaration and bylaws can be changed due to the requirement of a vote, and it's a weighted vote.

This cannot be accomplished unless the CIOA be changed to indicate the word "weighted" shall be prohibited from any existing condominium master board associations. In its stead, we ask that it read that all votes on any master board association shall be of equal value, one vote per director, per association, not as a weighted vote. Your vote to stop this unequal and unfair representation of unit owners is desperately needed as we have no other course of action to take.

Thank you.

SB 457

NANCY THOMAS: My name is Nancy Thomas. I'm the elected master board secretary and the official representative of Association 24 to the Master Board of Glen Oaks Condominiums in Newington, Connecticut.

My remarks were turned in their entirety. We're just going to do a portion of it. This latter association, the new section which Anna Maria has referred to, has since its creation totally dominated Glen Oaks delaying annual budgets and having the final word on all major decisions related to the maintenance, budgets, awarding of contracts for services, use of the clubhouse, recreational facilities and roadways.

In addition, for over 30 years the 6 original associations have been routinely forced to subsidize services and projects that solely or primarily benefit only the new section, or it uses its majority vote to obtain a greater share of community resources than their

70 percent entitles them to. This weighted voting arrangement means that things we need to have done are frequently delayed or voted down by this larger association, while those that directly benefit them are pushed through by use of the majority vote.

The current arrangement literally enables a single individual with a handful of supporters and a fistful of proxies obtain from unit owners who can't be bothered with attending meetings to literally run Glen Oaks like a fiefdom and decide the conditions under which 462 residents will be assessed and which services or contractors we have access to. Even if the six original associations could afford to spend tens of thousands of dollars in legal fees to sever this relationship, which we do not, we cannot even begin such a process without the permission of the very association which holds the 70 percent vote. While the current law was surely well intentioned at the time it was created, it leaves residents of our six associations at the total mercy of new sections.

And we have one more person.

BERNADETTE FERRY: My name is Bernadette Ferry and I served for two years on the Glen Oaks master board. As a former new section director and elected representative to the master board, I personally witnessed the effect of the weighted vote wielded by the new section, by the Glen Oaks new section.

As the newest member of the master board at the time of my election I was absolutely appalled to learn that my role was that of the ultimate decision maker. For example, because I held the majority vote, the 70 percent vote that both of these ladies refer to, even in

SB457

instances where the directors from all of the other six associated associations voted no on a motion, but I voted yes, my vote determined the outcome each time.

If I was unable to show up for a meeting there was no quorum and therefore a meeting of the master board could not be held. In essence the persons who is a new section rep to the master board controls the entire voting process and basically holds the other six associations hostage. The current weighted voting allows a single individual to determine how the community is run, what items would be paid for, whether budgets can pass, which contractors are selected and even when or if meetings of the master association can take place.

Limiting those who are elected to the master board to a single vote per association represented versus the weighted vote could ensure a more equitable and fair distribution of community resources.

Thank you.

REP. G. FOX: Senator Doyle.

SENATOR DOYLE: Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

Well, ladies, a few months ago Representative Nafis and I met with you at Glen Oaks. And today, we spoke today at length. And today I had a meeting with some legislators outside trying to sort it out.

It's certainly not an easy or simple solution to this problem because if we were to simply eliminate weighted voting the problem is it really gets to the fundamental issue of representative democracy. But the problem here is because the new section is so much bigger

than the rest. So it's really like a fundamental unique problem to Glen Oaks.

So we were meeting, trying to brainstorm, tried to come up with some ideas that could make it a more fair approach. And we don't have any now, but it's our goal to continue to pursue it. As I mentioned earlier, I was working with the LCO lawyer a few -- about a month ago and he could not come up with an immediate solution to it, because it's such a complicated and unique problem. But we're going to look into it further. Representative Albis does lot of work in condos over there, so I'll enlist his help also. So we're going to come to a resolution. But rest assured, it's not easy. It's a complicated area of the law, but Representative Nafis and myself -- and I'm recruiting Representative Albis to try to assist us to achieve some resolution.

But some of the solutions we talked about today were very broad. And I'll be honest, we're in a short session and it may not be achievable this year, but we're going to look into it further. It's not that easy.

But just to quickly get some background, you've laid out that this one person basically runs the show. But just to show the impact, the one person, it's my understanding is that one person missed votes, would go to meetings -- so there would be no quorum, and also, which led to you not passing a budget on time. Could you just provide details to the committee about the impact on the budgetary process?

ANNA MARIA FORNINO: We -- our fiscal year runs July 1st through June 30th. And in 2013 due to this one weighted vote, nothing was accomplished until December of 2013 because they kept voting down what the other

associations deemed to be the responsible dollar figure required to operate the master association clubhouse and recreational facilities and maintain the roadways which are in dire need of repair.

And on the same thing at present is happening right now as we speak about going forth with this years budget, again most of the other associations do agree on a certain number that is required to maintain everything, and this one association would not consider voting on several of the things that came up at the meeting. So again, the budget we think will not make -- while not pass prior to July 1st.

And the sad thing is the individual associations do have their own budgets to maintain the buildings in their association. When we have to send our proposed budget out to the unit owners we cannot do it unless we know what the master budget is going to be because that figure has to be incorporated into our budget. So it definitely delays our annual budget meeting the last several years.

SENATOR DOYLE: Please come to the mic.

NANCY THOMAS: This is very important. Because we've been operating at a deficit for more than six months in order to meet our incoming bills we were not getting enough revenue to do it -- we've had to liquidate or draw down the reserves that the master board had in order to do capital projects and other things. And we got down to only about \$80,000 that was left out of \$400,000 in the past three years while we were trying to get them to approve a budget to allow a vote to go to unit owners on what we would use for the coming year. And that money did not start to come in until January of this year.

SENATOR DOYLE: Through you, Mr. Chairman, did the new section or the big person with the greater than majority vote, did he miss meetings? I know we voted no, but did he miss meetings also?

NANCY THOMAS: He was elected in March of last year. He did not attend any board meetings until June. He had an alternate that was attending the meetings. The June 13th meeting was the one at which we were to adopt the budget. He walked in and said he wanted two years worth of back bills and whatever. He wanted an auditor to do an audit of the amount of money because he thought that there's -- something funny was going on.

Then he promised within 30 days if he got those documents he'd be able to vote on a budget, so that would have been mid July. Mid July we were supposed to meet as a board. He canceled the meeting, that he said we would not have a quorum because he would not be in attendance. So the dragged on month after month after month. Each time we would come together as a group he would say he wasn't ready yet. Now he wanted more bills. Now he wanted more proof.

So I believe it was finally December before we had a budget in place and people didn't actually start paying the money until January, which is why we had to draw down the reserves.

SENATOR DOYLE: All right. So to follow this up, now you've characterized this person that has the votes for the new section or the biggest section to be negligent. And in the spirit of democracy, why doesn't his 70 percent members throw him out?

ANNA MARIA FORNINO: They don't attend the meetings.

We have 462 units so we have over a thousand unit owners and due to a conflict with contractor, snowplow contractor and towing, at the previous meeting prior to the one last week there were about 80 people at our clubhouse for the meeting, screaming, yelling, cursing, cursing at the entire master board. They totally belittled the manager of our management company, swore at her. And then and this meeting eight of them showed up.

So it's like you can't force unit owners to attend the meeting, and because of the animosity that is going on throughout the entire community you can't get people to volunteer to become board members. I've been on the board on and off for over 30 years. I'm tired. The same with Nancy. And Bonnie was on for two years and you heard her speak. She was just appalled at what her responsibility entailed.

SENATOR DOYLE: Thank you. Well, I Representative Albis and I will do some work on this, but I can't make any easy promises. It's a complicated issue. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

BERNADETTE FERRY: We appreciate your time.

REP. G. FOX: Thank you.

Oh, Representative Albis. Ladies, there's a question.

REP. ALBIS: Sorry to keep you up there. Senator Doyle, thank you very much for recruiting me on this issue. You know how I love these complicated condominium issues. So I just wanted to ask, so Anna Maria, in your testimony you said you've been in this association for forty years. Is that true?

103  
rgd/gbr JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

March 24, 2014  
12:00 P.M.

ANNA MARIA FORNINO: Forty years and five months.

REP. ALBIS: In the past have you encountered an issue like this with a director of the 70 percent that doesn't show up or is obstructionist in any way?

ANNA MARIA FORNINO: No. I would say that this really became a burden starting in 2008 when some of the members elected to that particular association's board of directors came on with the attitude that we now control all of you. And at every meeting we literally hear from whatever representative, other than Bonnie, I have 70 percent of the vote and that one particular meeting in 2009 that representative was not only a director on -- a representative on the master board, she was also president of the master board and also president of the new section association.

So she had three great powers in her hands and she announced at that meeting that the other associations were no longer to benefit from some of the gifts that were -- not the gifts. Some of the terms that we had done in a working agreement of all the seven associations for the prior years. So she threw it all out and we had no choice. The other six associations just scrambled, went out, interviewed management companies. We had to hire a management company to represent us and do the things for us, our collection of fees, everything. We had to retain legal counsel to go out and do a search of title and to review all our bylaws and declarations and give us a legal opinion on it.

So were forced to expend quite a bit of money at the hands of this one individual. That one individual is no longer -- was no longer involved after their term, but the incoming latest one is acting the same way as that

original person and more so. And now we just learned that that one individual has been nominated and elected to the new section board and it's possibly their intent to put that person back on the master association board, which will put us back to 2009.

REP. ALBIS: And I think Senator Doyle kind of asked you this question, but the unit owners in that large Association, they don't see that this is going on, or they feel powerless to act upon it?

ANNA MARIA FORNINO: They don't care because if you're a unit owner that has no issues, no problems, and you don't want headaches, you're not going to attend these meetings nor are you going to volunteer to be a director or an officer. So, you know, unless their board specifically gets to them to say, come to the master meeting, they don't come.

And I will say this, and it's knowledgeable through a lot of associations, Akron Oaks, their board does not operate right now correctly under the CIOA Act and some of the latest laws.

NANCY THOMAS: And another point I would make is that the female person who left the board in 2010 for the last three years has operated a blog which appears to be the official voice of Glen Oaks in which information is given to people in her association which actually is incorrect. And we had two or three situations last year when budget meetings were set up in whatever, and she said out countermanding information that it was a different date. So our management company had to incur the cost of sending additional mailings out to people to ignore the misinformation because it was incorrect. So it's been an ongoing problem.

So part of it is because the people are getting information that's incorrect and they're believing what they're hearing. So it's making it difficult.

REP. ALBIS: So the budgets for the six other associations are impacted by these decisions, but is the budget of the larger Association impacted as well? It seems to me if it is being in a negative manner that the unit owners would want to do something about that? And you know, I've had issues in my district where we have associations where the boards are acting improperly and folks have been successful if they are able to mobilize and notify some of their fellow unit owners about some of the inequities that are happening. So I was just wondering if you tried any of those options.

ANNA MARIA FORNINO: I do. I sent out e-mails after meetings. I literally delivered notices to unit owners in my association condo 1, apprizing them of what is going on. I try and do as much as I can myself. And I'm out there walking while I talk to people.

However her blog, her website that she put out there actually conflicted -- she actually named it so close to our community website that we had to take ours down because everyone was going to hers and that was another issue.

NANCY THOMAS: To clarify your issue with regard to the condo fees, a certain amount is paid, say, \$240 a month or whatever. Of that my association and Anna Maria's keeps about \$60. The rest of it goes to the master board and that covers snowplowing, insurance for the complex, landscaping, whatever. So there's a certain amount that we get to keep which goes into a reserve fund for the upkeep of our -- in

my case two buildings. Anna Maria has seven.

When we set the budget for the year for the master board and we know what the insurance, landscaping, snow removal, et cetera, will cost, we then can determine if we're going to add \$3 or \$5 or whatever for our smaller association needs, but when we go six months into the budget year and we don't even have a budget there's no way that we can set that amount of money in for our own residents and so it's screwing everything up financially.

REP. ALBIS: Thank you for those answers. I certainly don't envy your situation. It sounds like a Catch-22, but you've got a great state senator and I know that we'll work diligently to try to find a solution for you.

Thank you.

REP. G. FOX: Thank you.

Next is Attorney Bill Ward. Good afternoon.

WILLIAM WARD: Good afternoon, Chairman Fox, chairman Coleman and distinguished members of the committee. For many years you've had multiple proposals about some sort of alternative dispute resolution program of community associations and I am here today to fully support Raised Bill 5590, which is a pilot program created for two years.

It is -- the intent is to be able to resolve, hopefully, owner-to-owner disputes, disputes that an owner might have with the Association, disputes an association might have with an owner or an interpretation of condominium documents or state law. The past proposals were only one way. It was a unit owner could

117  
rgd/gbr JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

March 24, 2014  
12:00 P.M.

that at all.

REP. G. FOX: Okay. Well, thanks a lot for your testimony. It's good to see you.

SCOTT SANDLER: Thank you. You too, sir. Thank you all.

REP. G. FOX: Harold Ellis.

If Mr. Ellis is not here, Karl Kuegler.

KARL KUEGLER: Good afternoon, Senator Coleman, Representative Fox and members of the committee. Thank you for this opportunity to provide testimony on behalf of Imagineers. My name is Karl Kuegler. I serve as the directory of property management for Imagineers. We serve about 188 common interest communities in the state of Connecticut comprising about 170,500 homes.

Imagineers is submitting testimony today on both Raised Bill 5590 and Raised Bill 457. I've submitted written testimony on both. Imagineers believes that Raised Bill 5590, AN ACT ESTABLISHING A PILOT PROGRAM FOR THE MEDIATION OF CONDOMINIUM-RELATED DISPUTES, would create an opportunity to resolve not only differences between association members and their association, but also between unit owners.

We would like however to ask that the General Assembly consider revising the bill to address the following concerns. The way the bill is written right now, it leaves out that the mediation could apply for discrepancies between interpretations regarding the declaration. It lists bylaws and rules and regulations, but it leaves the most important document in the governing documents of the declaration out of

that. So we'd ask that that be included.

A fine point, the term "condominium" tends to be used generically when it talks about different laws and the way it's used in different laws. But also attorneys that are involved in the mediation should also be familiar with other types of common interest communities, not limited to cooperatives and planned unit developments.

One of the other concerns we have is that there's a 30-day response date in which a board needs to reply as to whether or not it would like to participate in the mediation. Our concern is with a lot of the provisions in the Common Interest Ownership Act, for the board to meet, to have the time to formally decide upon that decision they may need greater than the 30 days that's provided. So we just ask that some consideration be given to those points and we support the bill.

We also believe that Bill Number 457, AN ACT CONCERNING REVISIONS TO THE COMMON OWNERSHIP ACT, would be beneficial to our clients and to those owning condominiums in the state of Connecticut. It helps clarify some of the terminologies and references that were used in the sweeping changes that were put in place for CIOA back in 2009.

Since these revisions went into effect some errors and unintended effects of the language have been discovered. By correcting the various sections the true intent of the law can be more easily understood and accepted. We would ask, however that the General Assembly consider some revisions to the bill as is presented to remove in section 1, subsection B, subsection 8, the provision for a rollcall vote. We have no problem with the minutes

121  
rgd/gbr JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

March 24, 2014  
12:00 P.M.

REP. ALBIS: Okay. Thank you for that answer and I hope that we can discuss this going forward. Thanks again for your testimony.

Thanks, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Are there other members with questions? Seeing none, thank you, Karl.

KARL KUEGLER: Thank you very much.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Pam Heller?

PAMELA HELLER: Good afternoon Senator Coleman, Representative Fox and distinguished members of the committee. Thank you for the opportunity to speak today. My name is Pamela Heller and I'm an attorney at the Connecticut Fair Housing Center representing homeowners facing foreclosure. I'm here to express the Center's strong support of Senate Bill 490, AN ACT PROVIDING FOR THE CONTINUED OPERATION OF THE FORECLOSURE MEDIATION PROGRAM. My colleague Jeff Gentes has just submitted written testimony as well.

Your work in creating the foreclosure program, the foreclosure mediation program in 2008 has helped, according to the report we've attached, more than 12,000 homes be saved. Given all of the problems that Connecticut borrowers face when they're dealing with foreclosure and trying to work with their mortgage companies, problems that we at the center hear about every single day. We know that many of these homeowners would have lost their homes if mediation was not available. Because there are tens of thousands of homeowners still facing foreclosure we need to keep the mediation program well beyond it's June 30th sunset date and we thank you for raising this bill.

They're getting rejected. When they up their numbers a little bit in terms of the applications, then we'll be able to see if there's a problem and that there is a problem.

But right now, we're sort of, you know, it's kind of shooting blindly here, because again as the numbers that Ms. DelPrete Sullivan attached to her testimony show, so few applications are being made. So you know, the effort needs to be made. I have full confidence the state's attorneys office could get more granted if they made the obligations. And if not, then I think there's a problem.

REP. G. FOX: Okay. Well, thank you.

MOIRA BUCKLEY: You're welcome.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Any others with questions or comments? Seeing no other inquiries, thank you very much.

MOIRA BUCKLEY: Thank you very much.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Robert Farr. Gail Egan.

SB 457  
HB 5590

GAIL EGAN: Senator Coleman, Representative Fox, members, good afternoon. And at the risk of being somewhat optimistic, happy spring. My name is Gail Egan and I represent the Connecticut Condo Owners Coalition, known to many as CCOC. We're not lawyers. We're not management companies. We're volunteers. George Gombossy and I share this load with an advisory board consisting of three attorneys, a CPA, and an individual who's been on her board of directors for over 30 years.

We work closely, especially over the past two and half years with Kim McClain and Scott Sandler from CAI and while we may not agree

100 percent on every issue, we do have one common goal and that is to better the lives of those individuals residing in common interest communities.

We have also been fortunate over the past year and a half to work with Richard Maloney from the Department of Consumer Protection. As a matter of fact, we worked with him to provide input to the FAQs that you will find on their website, and that's basically to help prospective unit owners if they're looking at purchasing a condo. We've provided copies of our testimony to you, brought them here today and I had e-mailed them out this morning on the website.

Bill 457, not too much comments, you've got testimony. We're in support of it. The only thing we would say under section 2, we do think this is drafted a tad too broadly and be limited to plurality voting, otherwise we are in favor of this bill and thank you very much.

5590, mediation program, and you've heard some comments about it. I will be brief. We had looked at this, as Mr. Albis, knows last year. Some of you have letters from unit owners that copied me, so I know you got them last year. And we've looked at either doing something with the Department of Consumer Protection. We know that impacts the budget for the State of Connecticut. That was fine. We also looked at perhaps doing a procedure in small claims court. However as I said, we fully support this bill. It's the only game in town and we're going with you on it. But there is a critical need to provide a venue for condo owners to have their concerns heard.

In CCOC in 2012 we formed our investigative committee. We ended up with over 300

Keep it simple, 50 in a year and 49 refused mediations so you don't have mediation going on. That's going to show you the program isn't working and you don't need a year to do that. Okay?

REP. ALBIS: Thank you, Gail.

GAIL EGAN: I thank you all very much.

REP. G. FOX: Thank you. Any further questions? Seeing none, thank you very much.

GAIL EGAN: Thank you.

REP. G. FOX: The next speaker I think is not here, but I'll check. Bernadette Ferry. I think Bernadette left. And then Scott Sandler. Is Scott still here.

KIM McCLAIN: We switched.

REP. G. FOX: So who are you?

KIM McCLAIN: Kim McClain. I was 12, but now I'm 20, or so to speak. Thank you for your indulgence. I do appreciate the opportunity to switch. Also thank you so much for the opportunity to submit testimony. I'm Kim McClain and I'm the Executive Director of the Community Associations Institute, Connecticut Chapter.

But before I begin, I'd like to give a special thanks to Representative Albis for all of his many, many hours of time and effort to put together these bills and some of the other work that he's done with us over the past few years. We're very, very grateful for your patience. So thank you.

Our members who spoke previously did an

HB 5590  
SB 457

excellent job of articulating the issues and a few of our concerns, so I'm not going to go over that. But there are several items in my written testimony which discuss our role and perspective in supporting vibrant community associations in our state. The most important area of concerns, education and communication. We believe that when prospective buyers are well informed about their rights and responsibilities of owning in a common interest community and the association board is engaged and educated the community functions well and conflicts tend to be minimal.

HB 5590

Having said that however, CAI Connecticut acknowledges that although many community association boards and unit owners avail themselves to educational opportunities and/or seek to promote best practices in their communities, there are also many associations whereby things do not run as smoothly as they could and conflicts do arise.

The notion of providing a form of alternative dispute resolution has been supported by us for quite some time. The proposed special masters pilot program offers a well conceived process for handling a variety of conflicts emanating from within an association, but I also wish to point out that Connecticut has another opportunity to lead the way in the nation. As we were the first to adopt the revisions to UCIOA in 2009 and leadership is again on the forefront.

With your support if we succeed in passing this bill Connecticut will be looked to as a model for a more fiscally sensible method of alternative dispute resolution throughout the country. Our peers in other states are looking at this bill as a model for their own future legislation. Several states have had very

expensive and unsuccessful experiences with ombudsman programs. We believe that the special masters program will provide a much better model.

We look forward to the opportunity to study the data which will be collected when complaints are submitted for a hearing. The data will serve to inform us about the types of issues our communities face and will help to guide the education programs that we present.

And I do respectfully disagree with Gail Egan about the time period for collecting the data because as a former, or recovering researcher, I think it's important to have a substantial amount of time, but not too much time to collect adequate data in order to make an effective analysis. But we do welcome the opportunity to continue to work with the Department of Consumer Protection on this particular program as well as supporting the provisions in Raised Bill 457. We think we have a multitude of opportunities to help to promote education amongst our members and our property managers and board members.

If you have any questions I'd love the opportunity to answer them.

REP. G. FOX: Thank you very much.

Any questions from the committee?  
Representative Albis.

REP. ALBIS: Thank you, Mr. Chair.

I don't have any questions. I think I'm all questioned out on condos today, but I just wanted to thank you and Gail and everybody who came today to testify.

155  
rgd/gbr JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

March 24, 2014  
12:00 P.M.

I know working with condo associations is very thankless and you all put in a lot of work and I just wanted to thank you for that.

KIM McCLAIN: Well, thank you for the thank you. And we love the opportunity to be able to work with others who may not always agree with us, but I think we made a good effort to try to come together and reach reasonable solutions. So thank you for your time.

REP. G. FOX: Thank you.

Any further questions from the committee?  
Seeing none, thank you.

The next speaker is Marc Forschino. Is Marc here? Yes. Marc is here. Then it's Andrew Bloom and Rebecca Bombero but Marc Forschino.

ANDREW BLOOM: My name is Andrew Bloom. Marc and I are switching, if that's okay, the two of us. We go back to back because I have to be at a fire department drill.

REP. G. FOX: Sure. That's fine.

ANDREW BLOOM: These become long days. Sorry. I know they are long for you guys as well, and I don't mean that in any disrespect. My name is Andrew Bloom, bail bondsman. Bail enforcement. I've been a bail bondsman for 18 years in the bail industry. I'm here to voice my support for Raised House Bill 5588.

The bill addresses many issues that face our industry today. This bill basically in very similar form passed unanimously last year through the House and the Senate, ran into a little trouble on the Governor's desk. We're hoping that this year there was some provisions that were made to help that along so it doesn't

**JOINT  
STANDING  
COMMITTEE  
HEARINGS**

**JUDICIARY  
PART 9  
3941 – 4410**

**2014**

you, sir. Brad Wineman? Mr. Wineman is not present.

Michael McCouee? Denise Gerraro? Kevin Barry?  
Charles Crenshaw?

CHARLES CRENSHAW: Good evening. Before I start and before you start my timer, I'd just like to make one comment about the comment that was made a little earlier about a gentleman who used what I'm going to call an oxymoron. He talked about he was involved in a good divorce. Me I'm on the other side of the spectrum. I'm a victim if you will of lifetime alimony and I've been trying to get released of that for almost 12 years now. That leads into my testimony. Good evening again. My name is Charles Crenshaw and I live in Bloomfield, Connecticut and I'm a member of the Connecticut Alimony Reform also known as CTAR.

I'm here today to testify regarding House Bill 5524, specifically the language regarding the possible termination of alimony once a payer reaches the retirement age of 65. This is near and dear to me because as I said I'm paying lifetime alimony and I'm over 65 years old obviously still paying alimony.

Today I'm going to speak in terms of dollars and cents because most people can get a better understanding of an issue when it's presented in these terms. I've testified several times before on this issue and this time I'm going to talk about the dollars and cents associated with alimony. Now, I'm not going to specifically speak of a particular person, but the numbers I'm going to show are representative of a typical alimony ruling. So let's take an average middle to upper class husband who was 50 years old for example and he's making between 80 and \$100,000 per year.

After 25 years of marriage, his wife decides to file for a so called no fault divorce. Skip all the details, she's awarded a lifetime alimony of \$25,000 per year. Being 50 years old he has 15 years until he reaches retirement age of 65. Let's do the math. That's \$375,000 in alimony payments alone. But hang on there's more. The legal fees were about \$25,000 so now this husband is out \$400,000.

The gentleman saved about \$100,000 in a 401K, his wife is awarded half, that's \$50,000, now he's up to \$450,000; but, there's more. His wife is awarded half the \$100,000 equity in the house, another \$50,000. So now he's out \$500,000. Now the gentleman can't afford to retire because of his responsibility to support his ex-wife continues even after he retires. But, for the sake of argument, let's say that he does retire at the age of 65. And, let's say this gentleman has pretty good health and excellent genes and he's going to live to the age of 85. That's 20 more years of alimony or another \$500,000. Now he's out \$1,000,000.

Hold on, there's more. His ex was also awarded half of his pension; that's \$22,000 a year, so in actuality, his ex-wife is now double dipping. She's collecting \$25,000 a year in alimony and collecting \$22,000 a year from her ex-husband's pension. From half of his pension he has to pay her his alimony. The gentleman is also losing \$22,000 a year in his lost pension. So over that 20 year period, that's another \$440,000. That money goes to his ex-wife. I'm almost done. The total cost to this gentleman for his divorce has now reached over \$1,440,000.

Said another way, that money all goes to his ex-wife. This is better than winning the lottery. Some of you heard me say this before, but all the ex have to do to collect this money is two things

-- one, breathe air and two maintain a 98.6 degree body temperature. How many people in this room think this situation makes any sense? This is why I support House Bill 5524 and urge you to move this bill forward and ultimately have it passed and signed into law. It's a beginning; there's still more to be done, but as I say, a journey of 1,000 miles starts with this first step so this certainly a step in the right direction. Thank you.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Thank you.

Any questions for Mr. Crenshaw?

Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Thank you for your testimony. Just quickly, in that scenario you just gave and assuming that it's a real story, was the alimony modifiable?

CHARLES CRENSHAW: The alimony was not modifiable as to term.

REP. REBIMBAS: Modifiable as to amount?

CHARLES CRENSHAW: Modifiable as to amount.

REP. REBIMBAS: And was that as a result of a trial or an agreement?

CHARLES CRENSHAW: That was a trial.

REP. REBIMBAS: Thank you. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Do other members have questions?  
Thank you, Mr. Crenshaw.

Colleen Kerwick.

COLLEEN KERWICK: Senator Coleman, members of the

SB 494

Judiciary Committee, thank you for validating the parental concerns for guardian ad litem and for accepting my testimony today. I'm an attorney at law from Ireland and I've practiced as a litigation attorney in New York for 14 years.

I was divorced (inaudible) jurisdiction in 2007 with one court appearance. We remained friends, we had been married for seven years. We had no professionals involved other than a mediator. I believe that the divorce cost \$350. I was remarried in 2008 and I asked for divorce in 2010. My ex responded that he would let me go even though it was painful to the core, that was my gift to you if it made me happy as much as it hurts to do so. What went wrong? There was a financial affidavit of \$13.5 million. Vendors got involved. They threw a grenade into the family for the benefit of their on-going revenue stream. I've been in court nearly every week and I've many other parents involved just through being in court nearly every week for the past three years.

I have been at interval heights 150 times; I've been with Dr. Wendy Haviland 25 times even though I've no mental illness; I've been psychologically evaluated four times; I believe 400 pleadings have been in my divorce case and it completely escalated out of control. The guardian ad litem on the case, I objected to her. I moved to reargue her appointment. I moved to recuse her for bias a number of times. When I conducted an audit of guardian ad litem, I asked -- I submitted it to certain members of the task force before Thanksgiving, prior to presenting it at the task force public hearing.

I had asked for answers as to why certain guardian ad litem had 35 motions on one morning or eight appearances on another morning and the billing that I had gotten from other parents had

indicated that they were double and triple billing. I was not receiving any answers. However, I did receive an answer on December 20 when my son was taken from me on a false AMBER alert scam. Even though I do not have my son's passport because I'm from Ireland, it was alleged that I was going to abscond with my child. I was with my ex-husband at the pediatrician's office that day.

Since then I -- the billing on my case which was taken from the file in my court with one of the motions to recuse the guardian ad litem for bias, was published in the Washington Times and indicated that the guardian ad litem in my case had spent precious little time with the minor child and had spent no time with me and a huge amount of time with my ex-husband who is very wealthy. As a result of that she asked for a status conference and mentioned that negative references had been made to her in the Washington Times.

Without speaking to me she changed her recommendation under a (inaudible) motion she recommended that I be put on supervised visitation. I've not seen my four year old son as a result of retaliations. So as I stand here before you speaking out against guardian ad litem, I know that there is at least 10 people behind me who are afraid to speak out because of the retaliations that are being levied against people who do speak out. As for my opinion on the bill more importantly, I believe that parents should have the fundamental right to parent their children. I believe that's enshrined in the Constitution in the absence of abuse or neglect.

I think that there's a place for them in probate court, there's a place juvenile court but there's not an automatic place for them in family court. While therapist and social workers and therapists

have their place in helping families heal and reorganize from break ups, Attorney GALs are incentivized to throw grenades into families for the benefit of their billing. I don't understand how an attorney is an expert in family relations matters more than a therapist.

And while I understand that there's 1.5 million attorneys' in the United States of America, I don't understand why they've hijacked the guardian ad litem program and are making recommendations in areas which are outside their expertise. Another question that I have is why are guardian ad litem who have 36 hours of training or so, six classes, less than a nanny's training, charging \$300 an hour? In a free competitive market a price would be more in line with what Representative O'Dea had recommended or suggested earlier in some cases. At least make it more affordable for parents.

I also think it's in the best interest of children that they have shelter, that they have educational accounts as opposed to their funds and their finances being given to guardian ad litem who purport to be acting in their best interest or from my experience, generating conflicts for the benefit of their revenue streams. I also note that Bill 494 mentions that a judge could suggest five guardian ad litem and the parents could pick from one.

I believe that there is an incestuous group of guardian ad litem in the family court system, many of them were here today and there using anti-competitive practices to keep the price up. There's a lot of guardian ad litem out there who are not getting the work and if there was more free market conditions, we would be getting back at the hourly rate of more in the line of 25, 50, \$75 an hour as opposed to \$300 an hour.

We'd also be able to guardian ad litem if they were needed, to go out and actually see the children, go to the playgrounds, go to the school, be the eyes and ears of the court as they're supposed to be outside of the courtroom, not hanging around for the court, for the court already had eyes and ears, it's called the judge. If the judges need help in the courtroom they should have more clerks. They should not have more guardian ad litem. Again, thank you for allowing me to testify and I welcome any questions.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Are there questions?

Representative O'Dea.

REP. O'DEA: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Just to clarify, I actually didn't recommend that amount. I do find it outrageous the numbers that I've been hearing. What I was simply asking is what is a reasonable amount and so I just wanted to clarify that. That's not something I said was an amount. But certainly what I've heard is outrageous so I was trying to figure out if a cap or a reduced hourly rate would be more appropriate. So that's kind of where my question was.

COLLEEN KERWICK: I think -- I did a little bit of comparative competition law when I was in law school years ago, and I remember there was a comparison between EU law and the Sherman Act. I thought at least in the European Union there was laws against price fixing and monopoly's and anti-competitive practices to keep fees artificially high and that seems to be going on in the guardian ad litem system and I think that if there was more a free market and every single guardian ad litem who takes those six hour classes -- they can be teachers, nurses, moms, dads, they don't necessarily have to be

attorney's, working as guardian ad litem I think that the market might level itself out and with free competition I'm sure there's plenty of people who would love to work as a guardian ad litem for \$25 an hour or \$50 depending on their demand based upon their qualifications. But I think that needs to be opened up. Three hundred dollars an hour is outrageous.

REP. O'DEA: Thank you very much. Thank you, Mr. Chairman.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Do other members have questions? If not, thank you very much for your testimony.

COLLEEN KERWICK: Thank you very much, Senator Coleman.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Monica Peters.

MONICA PETERS: Good evening, Senator Coleman and members of the committee. My name is Monica Peters. I currently have no written testimony. It will be forthcoming later this evening.

My case is a little bit unique. I had a very good GAL assigned to my case in 2013. This was after three years of very litigious behavior between me and my ex. I had been fighting for equal custody of my seven year old special needs son since January of 2010. My son has autism and my relationship with him is languishing due to parental alienation. The GAL recognized this and recommended shared equal custody. My GAL, his name is Charles Wilson, he's out of East Hartford, he did a great job.

Because I was fortunate enough to be indigent at the time, I qualified for state pay for Charles Wilson. I have very little to comment about Raised Bill 494 because I don't have any personal experience with GALs acting inappropriately. My

issue is why did my judge go against the GAL's recommendation for shared parenting in favor the adversarial nature of my relationship with my ex? That I don't understand.

If there was a hearing about judge reform, I would be here to testify about my experiences with Holly Avery Whetstone out of Rockville and Jose Suarez out of Rockville. The situation in Rockville, Connecticut is completely unacceptable and my son is aging and our relationship is changing because of this behavior by the judges in Rockville court.

I'm going to close early because I want to allow the parents who really are being brutalized by GALs to be able to speak. I will say again, Charles Wilson out of East Hartford was a very good GAL and it's unfortunate that he was ignored and that his recommendations for shared custody and the system that he set to help my ex and I deal with our issues, were completely ignored by Holly Avery Whetstone and that's all I have to say.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Thank you for your testimony and especially your consideration for the others who are waiting to testify. Representative Rebimbas.

REP. REBIMBAS: Thank you, Mr. Chairman. Not so much a question as just a comment and a compliment. I just want to thank you for your testimony and I just want to also just reiterate the importance it is that we're giving weight to every single person that comes before us. So, you had a positive experience and I want to thank you for sharing. Now we have heard one or two or several previously to you, but we also to truly look at the system and how it's working or how it might be broken and needs to be fixed, we need to know about all the experiences. So thank you for taking the time waiting this long to share your

story with us.

MONICA PETERS: I want to add that Charles Wilson took four weeks to complete a 20 plus page report and when I hear about GALs dragging cases for months and years; it really doesn't make any sense to me. Why does a GAL who makes \$50 an hour completing the entire task within four weeks, why is he checking references and speaking to the schools, speaking to the school psychologist about my son's regression for not seeing his mom enough? Charles Wilson spoke to my mom, my ex's mom -- he covered all his bases and did a phenomenal job. Why is his report being ignored?

REP. REBIMBAS: Sounds like he did everything he was supposed to do. Thank you for your testimony.

MONICA PETERS: It makes no difference. It made no difference in my case.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Are there other questions? Thank you, Monica.

MONICA PETERS: Thank you very much.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Cheryl Martone.

SB494

CHERYL MARTONE: I'm just going to tape myself because someday I want to show this to my son, how hard I worked on this thing. I'm Cheryl Martone. I started U.S. Concerned Parents support group in February of 2009. Most of you know me here. I was from Westbrook and now I live in West Haven and I'm a parent lobbyist and working on parents and children's rights, networking with other parents, grandparents locally and I belong to a national group called We The People Family Preservation which is a 501(c)(4) and I recently became a 501(c)(3).

I'm not going to be so nice about GALs because of

what has happened to my son and the AMCs. I sent you this testimony too. We should not have to fight with these poorly trained, ill minded, money grabbing, not caring about children that work as GALs and AMCs in our court. The do work? What kind of work are they doing? It is making a family go into poverty, become homeless, lose assets and then being threatened with losing your child if you don't suck up to their RICCO lies and Sue Cousineau was my child's GAL.

Never did any good work for my child. He is 18 and very emotionally torn because of this bad system. Why do they continue to play with a fit parent? Parents who provided wholesome activities in a good home for their child and try to continue to make parents look unfit. My message to GALs and AMCs is stop your nonsense and my suggestion is to the judges, stop appointing GALs and AMCs where they're not needed.

Yes, we are in a good fight in a holy war and we have our ammo with constitutional and family law practice befools in the plan we want to make for our children. We have to put our hard hats on and watch out for the immoral grenades being thrown at us by the GALs and AMCs. As a good, loving, nurturing parent, God has his spear of protection around us now because we go all your attention and there's many of us here that are speaking up. We need to put our moral boundaries of which they cannot penetrate.

You know the family court and juvenile courts have put our lives through hell, or tried to with the GALs misconstruing all things up in your case. You know these so-called professionals right now are squirming in their devilish seats because we are bringing forward the atrocities that have caused and need to keep doing this. We need to ask this Judiciary Committee to abolish

the GAL and AMC system or make oversight on them to show all their earnings is why their appointments are out of control when they lie about innocent, caring, nurturing parents.

I'll just wrap this up, last part. They cause intentional infliction and emotional distress when they brainwash, brow beat, ridicule, humiliate your child saying things about the caring, protective parent, that is not true. There's more but I sent the Judiciary Committee this testimony.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Thank you. Are there questions?

CHERYL MARTONE: This was my child before he was illegally taken and put into DCF custody because a GAL wanted to write false reports and aid and abet DCF to make false reports and then perjure herself in the courtroom.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Cheryl, my eyesight's not that good. Would you give that copy to the staff at the desk over here so I can see it, please?

CHERYL MARTONE: Yes, because this was a happy, loving, well-nourished, wholesome child before. Now he's pretty much doing nothing with his life at 18 and I have to fix the pieces. Thank you. Is there any questions?

SENATOR COLEMAN: Hand that to Al Orpuga to my left, over here to my left, at the desk to my left and I'll give it right back after I take a look at it.

CHERYL MARTONE: I appreciate you listening to my testimony.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Anytime. I know you do.

CHERYL MARTONE: I hope they can either abolish the

system or fix what's going on because I court watch all the time and I have (inaudible) appearance and I see the atrocities and the blemishes that causes parents lives. Thank you.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Thank you. I have Monica Peters. Is this a different Monica Peters? Okay. Sarah Littlefield. Susan Skip?

SARAH LITTLEFIELD: Thank you and good evening.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Good evening.

SARAH LITTLEFIELD: I submitted two forms of testimony. One was in the form of a federal complaint that I have against the State of Connecticut in the Judicial Branch that survived a domestic relations exception. If you get a chance to read it, it will give you an outline of some of the real issues that are going on and not just these smaller issues of GALs billing too much money, but a broader picture of judges also taking place in this.

SB 494

I have a few questions, we have no statutory provision for a GAL to be in superior court, however, Legislation happened to have Linda Monroe's family commission have GAL training. I don't understand how something is Legislated if there isn't a statute providing it. I think the GALs in family court and in my experience and people I have spoken with, have destroyed families. The Children's Law Center for example testified that she has somebody making time sheets but they don't account for time. They bill by the child yet in September, the office of the public defender said they paid \$300 an hour for the Children's Law Center attorneys. So I think a lot of accountability is missing both in private contracting GALs as well as the Children's Law Center GALs.

The way I'm reading -- maybe I'm reading 494 wrong, but it looks like more forced contracts. GALs pretty much are a forced contract. I've never had a retainer signed. My GAL stayed on the case without an appointment or stipulation in our agreement and billed over \$90,000 more in the case. Then this is supposed to be child support, but this woman wrote 30 motions against me which counted as not following the court orders. Two of them were modifications of custody. GALs are not allowed to file motions. She billed for these motions, she billed for the days in court, she cross examined. So it's not just a GAL issue, it's a system failure and to say it's a GAL issue, it's really kind of being a euphemism for a larger system failure.

I don't understand how 36 hours of training gives anybody more knowledge about someone's child than the parent. A McDonald's cashier gets about 36 hours of training to push the picture of the French fry button on the cash register. So if we were to follow free market and training, the value of a GAL would be significantly reduced and nowhere near \$250 to \$850 an hour depending on where your GAL's judges price fix.

I don't agree with the GAL fees being child support. A GAL is supposed to function as a discretionary tool to make a finding. How is that a parent's responsibility? It has nothing to do with raising a child; it has nothing to do with litigating for a child. I filed bankruptcy and the GAL filed an adversarial complaint and I asked for discovery and then she withdrew her complaint and I objected to her withdrawing her complaint because I want discovery as any other contract should have. I've not ever had a contract, it's all been forced. My time's up, so I hope you have questions. I don't know if I have any answers.

333  
vkd/cd

JUDICIARY COMMITTEE

March 31, 2014  
10:00 A.M.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Are there questions?

REP. G. FOX: I just want to say thanks for being here today. And I know you, just like everybody else that's still here have waited a long time so thank you for your testimony.

SARAH LITTLEFIELD: Thank you. I hope you do -- my federal complaint is 70 pages so I don't expect you to slog through the whole thing, but just go to the middle where all the legalese is out of it and it will show you a pretty good run down of you know, I can't say all -- everybody's corrupt, but there certainly is a pocket of corrupt individuals and they're the same names that come over again and again. Thank you for listening.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Thank you. Veronica King. Maureen Khan.

MAUREEN KHAN: Sorry to be repetitive. We're all saying the same thing. The GAL system is broken. The court system is broken. The family court system I've been involved with since -- my case is FA and starts with zero zero, so since 2000. When I heard Joette Katz speaking -- my name is Maureen Kahn, by the way, I forgot to say -- but when I heard Joette Katz speaking about the DCF, our case started off with a DCF report and when they go after the parents that report, they cause the parents to not want to report because they attack the parent.

SB494

The GAL in our case said you're not going to get a forensic -- this was back in 2001. We we're appointed; she said I'm not going to spend a lot of time on this. She never had a child. The case went on for years; nobody did anything. My son had been to counselors, qualified counselors, MCSWs, he spoke about his father in an inappropriate way; it was reported to DCF -- it was a case that was open seven times.

We ended up with another GAL who was appointed, Fred Gillman, who is now a judge. He quit our case in 2010 after having me arrested and thrown in jail. My son did not want to be with his father and he wasn't with him for two years previous to this. It was just a -- something they did to throw a monkey wrench into the whole case. They ignored my child repeatedly.

My son ended up actually refusing to be with his father for three and half months and they forced him to go with his father by taking our dog, cat, guinea pig, mine and my sons, and forcing my son to go and see his father and live with his father. We had Sue Conley get involved with our case. She had already recused herself from our case. Our judge had already recused himself from our case because I filed an appeal against him and it went to the supreme court and Judge Bolden still made decisions on our case. That's a conflict of interest.

Sue Conley who had recused herself in the beginning of 2010, took the case back and went ahead and made a lot of inappropriate remarks about forgetting what happened to my child as if I could ever. I had a lot of punitive things happen to me due to the fact that there was ex parte communication. That was one of the reasons I filed an appeal in the appellate court and that's where it ended up getting up into the Supreme Court level and it's Kahn versus Hillier. I heard that the GALs cannot file motions, but when they give ex parte communication to the judge, there's -- it's inappropriate. They're not supposed to that.

Anyways, each court is different. I've heard so many different names around here that everybody sends -- each of these GALs sends you to a psychologist of their choice that they are hoping

that they can convince the judge of something. My son went to a psychologist and had a forensic evaluation and the recommendation was that he should not be with his father.

There's so much corruption I don't even know where to begin with our case. But there needs to be transparency; there needs to be enforcement as far as the judge's orders; there needs to be an oversight committee on the judges also because I filed a judicial review against the judge, Judge Bolden who was on our case and who recused himself. Nobody does anything. There's no recourse. There's nothing -- it's useless, it's around and around. There's nothing that a parent can do to get anybody to listen or to understand.

Anyways, people have mentioned the word racketeering or cabal, everybody's entrenched. There are a lot of very good attorney's out there that do want to be GALs. There's a lot of psychologists out there that want to help with the GAL system and they're barred, they're actually -- they can't get involved with it because there's so many people that are entrenched, people that have been there for a long time. So I don't know what the answer is, but I don't know. I think that there needs to be a lot more enforcement as far as the ethics of these GALs, the AMCs -- when you're forced to take an AMC, the judge appointed an AMC who was Sue Conley and then when Fred Gillman who was the GAL quit the case, they ended up allowing her to be the GAL.

Well, she's charging me and taking disability away from me. She actually has a lawyer and she took me to court in September to sue me for her GAL fees. I know its state rate, I know its \$40 a month, but I can't afford \$40 a month. I have also been depleted another \$134 in February on my disability. My disability of \$380 goes to the

father and he has a business, he owns a business. I make \$626 a month. I can't live on it. I can't keep insurance, I can't stay above water. It's crazy. It's insane. I have to make payments of \$25 a month or they'll come after me.

That's how I feel being brought to court by this other attorney and she was wonderful, she was actually pretty nice and she didn't really know what to expect. I talked to her beforehand. She just couldn't believe it either. It's awful. It's just a crazy system, there are people that are indigent, it doesn't matter, it doesn't matter. You still have to pay even if the court appointed the attorney and even if they change it over to a GAL.

I never signed a contract, never signed a retainer for this woman. She has recused herself because I had asked her to be my attorney at one point five, six years ago and recused herself from the case, she should be on it. There's a lot of punitive actions going on in this case and I don't know what to do. And I hope you guys look at this and make changes. That's it, I guess.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Are there questions, any further questions? If not, thank you so much.

MAUREEN KHAN: Thank you.

SENATOR COLEMAN: Tom Moran is next. I think Mr. Moran's not here. Linda Palermo.

LINDA PALERMO: Good evening, Co-chairs of the Judiciary Committee and honorable members as well. I'm here today -- this evening to testify in opposition to the bill raised 494, AN ACT CONCERNING GUARDIAN AD LITEM AND ATTORNEYS FOR MINOR CHILDREN IN FAMILY RELATED MATTERS.

First, I ask that those that I have spoken to before in the past, that they judge me for me and who I am and what I speak with regard to. Don't judge me by those that might have made up stories and spread to you things that are not true. I have been attacked and targeted by various people in the political circles and those attacks have extended to my family as well as myself because they wanted to destroy the fact that I am a very outspoken person and I speak what I feel which we are supposed to do according to our constitutional rights.

Those issues that I raised with regard to the bill I have -- I bring them to you because I have watched my son in a divorce in 2003. A guardian ad litem comes between him and his older daughter who he has not seen for four and a half years. Every time I see her I constantly remind her, you only have one father, you only have one set of parents. They love you and you should respect them and love them equally with regard to that.

I also bring several things to this open forum because I have witnessed friends of mine going through probate court matters and I feel all of these issues should be resolved. Several years ago I spoke with regard to the guardian ad litem in divorce issues and the fact that they should be ordered to submit a monthly written report accounting to not only the parties of divorce but in common law as well regarding how much time and/or how many times they interacted with the child or children who may have contacted the guardian or who the guardian may have visited and if the problems were resolved or if (inaudible) situation. I just do not see where this Legislation has been enacted upon.

With regard to paying for the guardian ad litem services, I believe that Legislation should be enacted to take control over this so that we do

ORDER

The foregoing motion having been heard, it is hereby ORDERED:  
GRANTED/DENIED.

And it is FURTHER ORDERED that:

---

Judge/Clerk