



STATE OF CONNECTICUT
EXECUTIVE CHAMBERS

DANNEL P. MALLOY
GOVERNOR

GOVERNOR'S OFFICE

June 6, 2012

BILL NOTIFICATION
RELEASE No. 9

For Immediate Release

Governor Dannel P. Malloy signed the following legislation of the 2012 Session on June 4th:

PA 12-103 AN ACT CONCERNING THE INSURANCE HOLDING
SB 411 COMPANY SYSTEM REGULATORY ACT
This bill shall take effect October 1, 2012.

PA 12-139 AN ACT CONCERNING CREDIT ALLOWED A DOMESTIC
HB 5484 CEDING INSURER FOR REINSURANCE
This bill shall take effect October 1, 2012.

Governor Dannel P. Malloy signed the following legislation of the 2012 Session on June 6th:

PA 12-70 AN ACT CONCERNING DEPARTMENT OF
SB 33 TRANSPORTATION PROJECT DELIVERY AND PROJECT LABOR
AGREEMENTS FOR CERTAIN PUBLIC WORKS PROJECTS
This bill became effective upon receiving the Governor's signature.

PA 12-71 AN ACT CONCERNING SIBLING VISITATION FOR
SB 156 CHILDREN IN THE CARE AND CUSTODY OF THE
COMMISSIONER OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
This bill has various effective dates. [Refer to text of bill.](#)

PA 12-72 AN ACT CONCERNING THE STORAGE OF STOLEN
SB 195 PROPERTY BY LAW ENFORCEMENT AGENCIES AND THE
PAYMENT FOR PROPERTY RECEIVED BY PRECIOUS METALS
OR STONES DEALERS
This bill shall take effect October 1, 2012.

PA 12-74 AN ACT CONCERNING TRAFFIC STOP INFORMATION
SB 364 This bill has various effective dates. [Refer to text of bill.](#)

PA 12-75
SB 78 AN ACT CONCERNING THE LEARN HERE, LIVE HERE PROGRAM
This bill became effective upon receiving the Governor's signature.

PA 12-76
SB 207 AN ACT CONCERNING RESIDENTIAL HEATING OIL AND PROPANE CONTRACTS
This bill shall take effect July 1, 2013.

PA 12-77
SB 353 AN ACT CONCERNING THE STATE'S SECOND INJURY FUND
This bill shall take effect October 1, 2012.

PA 12-78
HB 5031 AN ACT CONCERNING SEXUAL VIOLENCE ON COLLEGE CAMPUSES
This bill shall take effect July 1, 2012.

PA 12-79
HB 5089 AN ACT PROHIBITING TELEMARKETERS FROM TRANSMITTING INACCURATE OR MISLEADING CALLER IDENTIFICATION INFORMATION
This bill shall take effect October 1, 2012.

PA 12-80
HB 5145 AN ACT CONCERNING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE SENTENCING COMMISSION REGARDING THE CLASSIFICATION OF UNCLASSIFIED MISDEMEANORS
This bill has various effective dates. [Refer to text of bill.](#)

PA 12-81
HB 5164 AN ACT CONCERNING REVISIONS TO THE MOTOR VEHICLE LAWS
This bill has various effective dates. [Refer to text of bill.](#)

PA 12-82
HB 5217 AN ACT CONCERNING REVISIONS TO STATUTES CONCERNING THE DEPARTMENT OF CHILDREN AND FAMILIES
This bill has various effective dates. [Refer to text of bill.](#)

PA 12-83
HB 5237 AN ACT CONCERNING PAYMENT OF WAGES FOR EMPLOYEES OF AN ENTITY CALLED A STATE-AIDED INSTITUTION
This bill became effective upon receiving the Governor's signature.

PA 12-84
HB 5263 AN ACT INCREASING THE PENALTY FOR POACHING
This bill shall take effect October 1, 2012.

PA 12-85
HB 5285 AN ACT ADJUSTING COMMUNITY HEALTH CENTER RATES
FOR CAPITAL INVESTMENTS
This bill shall take effect October 1, 2012.

PA 12-86
HB 5289 AN ACT INCREASING THE PENALTY FOR SUBSEQUENT
OFFENSES OF CRUELTY TO ANIMALS
This bill shall take effect October 1, 2012.

PA 12-87
HB 5299 AN ACT CONCERNING THE DISPOSITION OF REMAINS OF
MILITARY PERSONNEL
This bill became effective upon receiving the Governor's signature.

PA 12-88
HB 5347 AN ACT CONCERNING THE REPORTING OF CHILDREN
PLACED IN SECLUSION
This bill shall take effect July 1, 2012

PA 12-89
HB 5388 AN ACT CONCERNING COURT FEES AND THE DELIVERY
OF LEGAL SERVICES TO THE POOR
This bill has various effective dates. [Refer to text of bill.](#)

PA 12-90
HB 5395 AN ACT CONCERNING CUSTODY ORDERS FOR DEPLOYED
MEMBERS OF THE ARMED FORCES AND CONFIDENTIAL
COMMUNICATIONS MADE TO MEMBERS OF THE ARMED
FORCES WHO ARE VICTIM ADVOCATES OR SEXUAL ASSAULT
PREVENTION COORDINATORS
This bill has various effective dates. [Refer to text of bill.](#)

PA 12-91
HB 5476 AN ACT EXPANDING CONSUMER CHOICE FOR LIFE
SUPPORT CARE AT HOME
This bill shall take effect October 1, 2012.

Governor Dannel P. Malloy vetoed the following legislation of the 2012 Session on June 6th:

SA 12-2
HB 5424 AN ACT CONCERNING DELAYS IN REVALUATION FOR
CERTAIN TOWNS
This bill would have become effective upon receiving the
Governor's signature. The Governor vetoed the bill. Scroll down to
read the veto message.

PA 12-73
SB 218 AN ACT CONCERNING POLLING PLACES FOR PRIMARIES
This bill would have had various effective dates. The
Governor vetoed the bill. Scroll down to read the veto
message.

As of this date, the Governor has signed ninety-three (93) bills, and vetoed three (3) bills, of the 2012 Legislative Session.



DANNEL P. MALLOY
GOVERNOR
STATE OF CONNECTICUT

June 6, 2012

The Honorable Denise Merrill
Secretary of the State
30 Trinity Street
Hartford, CT 06106

Dear Madam Secretary:

I hereby return, without my signature, substitute House Bill 5424, *An Act Concerning Delays in Revaluation for Certain Towns*. This bill would allow the municipalities of Norwich, Farmington, Windham, Stamford and New Britain to postpone until 2013 the property revaluations due to be performed in those communities this year. The apparent rationale underlying the bill is the unsupported perception that property values have decreased in these communities disproportionately from other communities since the last round of revaluations. Proponents fear this will lead to a disproportionate shift in the property tax burden among these five municipalities' taxpayers. In juxtaposition, I believe that delaying a regularly scheduled revaluation for just these communities, and not for other communities that are similarly situated, is unfair and that, regardless, delaying a revaluation at this time might exacerbate, rather than mitigate, the problems that Connecticut communities face in these uncertain economic times.

The purpose of revaluation is to ensure that the tax burden is distributed equally, according to the fair market value of property, whether that property is residential, commercial, or industrial. Delaying revaluations on regularly scheduled intervals may distort this system by continuing to use outdated and inaccurate property values in the calculation of a property taxpayer's tax bill.

The proposed postponement of the revaluation for the town of Windham is particularly disconcerting. Windham's last revaluation occurred in 2005. Pursuant to Public Act 09-60, the Windham Town Council chose to postpone their 2010 revaluation until 2011. In 2011, pursuant to Public Act 11-239, the Town Council voted again to delay revaluation until 2012. Now, this Special Act would allow Windham – for a third time – to again postpone their revaluation until 2013, thus ensuring that at least eight years will elapse between Windham's revaluations. The longer the time period between revaluations, the less accurate the assessments become and the larger the disruption that is caused when the revaluation is actually completed. Many will remember that, in 2001, the General Assembly voted to take over the finances of the city of Waterbury, at least in part because it had not conducted a revaluation in over 20 years. Waterbury's experience demonstrates that prolonging the revaluation period only exacerbates

fiscal problems and delays that which is inevitable. While I can conceive of exigent circumstances which might justify a single delay for a particular town, I cannot support delaying a revaluation three times in a particular community. The downside to that community, and the state, is too great, as the Waterbury experience taught us.

Finally, the decline in the real estate market did not only effect the five municipalities contemplated in this bill. For the past five years, our state and our country have been slowly emerging from the biggest economic downturn since the Great Depression. In large measure, this downturn resulted from the collapse of the housing market. While Connecticut fared better than many states, home values have nevertheless declined throughout the state since their peak in 2007-08. Had this bill simply given all municipalities the option of a one year delay in revaluations – like Public Act 09-60 did – I might be more predisposed to sign it. However, 38 municipalities are mandated to perform revaluations this year, but this bill extends the time period to do so for only five. I find that there is no compelling reason to make a special exception for these five municipalities, as opposed to the others which are facing the same challenges including, ironically, the city of Waterbury.

For these reasons, I disapprove of substitute House Bill 5424, *An Act Concerning Delays in Revaluation for Certain Towns*. Pursuant to Section 15 of Article Fourth of the Constitution of the State of Connecticut, I am returning substitute House Bill 5424 without my signature.

Sincerely,



Dannel P. Malloy
Governor



DANNEL P. MALLOY
GOVERNOR
STATE OF CONNECTICUT

June 6, 2012

The Honorable Denise Merrill
Secretary of the State
30 Trinity Street
Hartford, CT 06106

Dear Madam Secretary:

I hereby return, without my signature, substitute Senate Bill 218, *An Act Concerning Polling Places for Primaries*. This bill allows for changes to the location and number of polling places for primaries at the discretion of Town Registrars. Although I understand that this bill may result in potential cost savings to municipalities, the potential for undermining the right to vote contained in the bill is unacceptable. Indeed, voters may be easily confused and reluctant to vote if their polling place is suddenly closed during a primary process. There is no provision in this bill for input from citizens prior to the registrars' closing of a polling place to express their concerns or to suggest alternative locations for such polling locations. We strive as a democracy to give voters every opportunity to vote – and they should be afforded the opportunity to vote at their normal polling place – even in an uncontested election. Given the importance of ready access to the polls and my commitment to ensuring every eligible citizen their ability to vote, I cannot support this bill.

The timeframe for choosing the polling stations provided for in the bill does not provide adequate notice to candidates and voters, particularly when an objection is filed. Candidates would no longer be able to include the location of the polling stations in their campaign literature because of the potential for change, leaving voters less informed as to the location of the polling places. There is also a high potential for confusion on the part of the voters if polling locations are changed. Voters who go to the wrong polling place may not have the ability to reach an alternate location due to transportation or time constraints. Additionally, the potential for having two different polling locations for a primary election and a general election in the same election cycle could cause significant confusion for members of the voting public.

Separate from my concerns regarding the relocation of polling locations, I do not have confidence that the procedure set out in Section 2 of the bill for removal of registrars of voters

from office is advisable. In particular, the procedure set forth does not establish any standards by which a judge could determine whether to remove a registrar from office, and effectively overturn the results of an election. Rather, the bill simply indicates that a judge could remove such a registrar if the judge "is of the opinion that the evidence presented warrants the removal of such registrar of voters." Additionally, the bill does not make it clear that such a removal order is a judgment of the court, or that a registrar so removed could appeal such an order to either the Appellate or Supreme Court. A procedure to remove an elected official from office, regardless of what office that is, must be rigorous, effective and in accordance with traditional notions of due process. The procedures set forth in this bill do not meet that test.

For these reasons, I disapprove of substitute Senate Bill 218, *An Act Concerning Polling Places for Primaries*. Pursuant to Section 15 of Article Fourth of the Constitution of the State of Connecticut, I am returning substitute Senate Bill 218 without my signature.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "D. P. Malloy". The signature is stylized and written in a cursive-like font.

Dannel P. Malloy
Governor