

Dear Planning and Development Committee,

I am writing to object to S.B. 1024 because the legislation would remove local autonomy over zoning and is not a proven way to address economic mobility.

As a tax paying citizen of my town, I have input into the development, planning and zoning. If it is given to the State, I lose that representation. Taxpayers of a town know what is best for their communities. This legislation takes that right away. I already put up with a congested town and this legislation would contribute to it. I am also concerned that we have high income earners leaving the state, which has negatively impacted our state income tax revenues, and as a result we have continual budget deficits. This is not sustainable long-term planning. Wealthy, retired citizens are the perfect residents using less public services while giving back to their community; they have plenty of time to volunteer and donate within their community. This portion of the population is leaving and there is a dearth of resources to address local issues.

I am also against the legislation as a way to address economic mobility. I have served as a U.S. Peace Corps Volunteer and worked in development at Save the Children (Fairfield, CT) and know from experience what best practices are to improve economic mobility. Below I have included examples of what our State Legislators should consider as best practices and consider putting legislation and resources towards those that are evidence based and proven to address poverty; not recreating the wheel with legislation that is not proven. Also, having the disadvantaged move to an area with higher living expenses, is not sustainable and will not help them save for the future.

Sincerely,

*Mark and Sara Brown*

14 Salem Straits Road  
Darien, CT 06820

<https://www.brookings.edu/testimonies/how-to-reduce-poverty-and-increase-economic-mobility/>

Excerpt:

After the welfare reform law was enacted, work rates among single mothers increased dramatically, the welfare rolls fell more than ever before, and child poverty rates declined to their lowest level ever among black children and among all children in female-headed families. These effects cannot be attributed exclusively to welfare reform. There is general agreement among researchers who study welfare that the growing economy of the second half of

the 1990s and the maturing of a system of federal and state subsidies for low-income workers with children, which will be referred to here as the “work support system,” also played important roles in accounting for the dramatic increases in work and falling poverty rates.

In 2010, work declined and poverty rose, due to the Great Recession. Yet the combination of relatively high work rates in 2010 (relative to the 1987 to 1993 period) kept poverty lower than during the earlier period and the impact of government programs in percentage terms produced nearly twice as great a decline in poverty as in the earlier period (a reduction of 40.9 percent vs. 23.2 percent).

The passage of the Additional Child Tax Credit (ACTC) as part of the Bush 2001 tax reforms, along with subsequent expansions of the ACTC, were also important and now provide working families that include children with around \$30 billion each year. In addition, child care subsidies have been expanded on numerous occasions, the Supplemental Nutrition Assistance Program (SNAP) has been modified to make it easier for working families to claim the benefit, the Medicaid program has been modified and extended (in part by creating the Child Health Insurance Program in 1997) to cover almost all children under 200 percent of poverty, and a number of other improvements have been made in the work-based safety net at both the federal and state levels. This system is available to all low-income working families with children and virtually guarantees that if parents work close to full time, they and their children can escape poverty.

Over the last four decades, Congress has constructed a work support system that not only makes work pay, but also provides substantial work incentive. The food stamp program is a vital element of that system. When the incentives of the work support system are combined with effective programs that encourage work, help people acquire skills, and help them find employment, many of the adults receiving food stamps today and in the future will join the workforce, increase their self-sufficiency, set an example for their children, and improve their economic condition. Moreover, the state food stamp work demonstrations now being implemented seem likely to serve as a beacon to help states implement and sustain programs of this type.

<https://socialimpactarchitects.com/poverty-best-practices/>

Excerpt:

Instead of quitting, we need to join efforts and scale programs that work. We have learned a lot in the past 25 years that can help us in our effort to alleviate poverty. **Poverty is a consequence of inequality. To reduce poverty, we need to collectively tackle its underlying root causes and**

**not just fight the symptoms.** In 1991, Michael Wayne Sherraden's groundbreaking book, *Assets and the Poor: A New American Welfare Policy*, helped us realize that financial insecurity destabilized families and, in turn, jeopardized the long-term stability of the U.S. economy. This helped change our model from one focused on safety-net services to one focused on asset-building. National research showed that financial education classes, which many nonprofits were providing, were not enough to reverse the trend. As a result, we went beyond education and moved toward financial coaching to help develop action plans alongside our clients. **We also learned we needed to start where our clients were by helping them reduce debt, improve credit scores and create regular savings, not necessarily work toward home ownership or small business creation.**