

- In 1975, the General Assembly adopted Public Act 75-425, Section 1, effective on July 1 of that year. The Act, now codified as Connecticut General Statutes Section 4b-3, created the State Properties Review Board, which would consist of six members, three selected by the Speaker of the House and the President Pro Tempore of the Senate (so the majority party in the General Assembly) and three selected by the minority leaders of the House and Senate (so the minority party in the General Assembly), with no party to have more than three seats on the Board.
- The Board membership had to include one member with expertise in architecture, one in building construction, one in engineering, one the purchase, sale and lease of real estate, one in business matters in general, and one in the operation and management of state institutions. In most matters, the Commissioner of Administrative Services was designated to represent the State in its dealing with the Board.
- Thus, from its inception, the Board was intended to be a bipartisan, nonpolitical agency, the members of which possessed expertise and experience in the purchase, sale, leasing, management, and operation of land, buildings, and facilities.
- The Board's powers include the authority to "review real estate acquisitions, sales, leases and subleases proposed by the Commissioner of Administrative Services," not including certain transportation and other miscellaneous projects, and to "review, for approval or disapproval, any contract for a project described in subsection (h) of section 4b-91," which describes "every contract for the construction, reconstruction, alteration, remodeling, repair or demolition of any public building or any other public work by the state except a public highway or bridge project" or other projects administered by the DOT. The Board also has the power to review and approve the State Facility Plan, which is drafted every two years. The Board has to recommend the plan before it can be sent to the General Assembly as part of the budget process. The State Facility Plan is compiled from individual agency "wish lists" for the upcoming five years, which are updated (like the Plan itself) every two years.
- The whole purpose of the Board and the Plan is to ensure that both the executive and legislative branches of the State government have a unified, cohesive plan for major capital projects for the upcoming five years, so that duplication and waste can be avoided.
- A review of the Plans indicates that in the 1995-2000 Plan (prepared in 1994), the Department of Public Safety requested \$5,982,000 (on top of a previously approved \$250,000) for a combination weapons training facility and emergency services facility, which would include canine training,

central vehicle impound, and a training academy. The Board only approved \$2,410,000. Since that 1994 Plan, there has been no mention of any weapons training facility, though the vehicle impound and the canine training facility was mentioned in the 1999-2004 Plan *to be located in Cheshire*, and the Board approved \$6.2 million for that facility. That same year's plan called for \$943,000 for a weapons training facility *in Meriden*. From what we can determine the money was spent on those facilities in those towns.

- Since 2007, none of the minutes of Board meetings have any mention of a gun range facility. During that same period, neither the Department of Public Safety nor the Department of Administrative Services requested a gun range in their submissions to the Board. This shouldn't be surprising, since the inventory of State property maintained by the Office of Policy and Management has for the past several years listed the existing run range in Simsbury as being in "good condition."
- It is difficult to understand how a new, multi-million dollar gun range is being pressed as being such an urgent need if the OPM is listing the Simsbury facility as being in "good condition;" and the State Police long-range facility plan doesn't call for a new gun range; and the DAS hasn't requested a gun range in their submission to the Board; and the Board hasn't included such a facility in any State Facility Plan since 1994 nor even discussed it since 2007; and the General Assembly has never included such a facility in its budget plans.
- At this time, there is *no* provision in the current State Facility Plan for *any* weapons training facility at all—not in Glastonbury, nor in East Windsor, nor in Willington, nor in Griswold. It appears that untold hundreds of thousands of dollars has been spent in site investigations, feasibility studies, and other engineering studies for a facility that isn't in the State Facility Plan; that hasn't been requested by the Department of Public Safety in its Plan submission to the Department of Administrative Services; that has no recommendation from the State Properties Review Board, a prerequisite to inclusion in the budget; and that cannot be funded unless and until the proper procedures are followed. There is an exception in the law for "emergency" facilities, but it appears that the State already spent millions of dollars back in 1990s for similar facilities elsewhere.
- The whole purpose of the State Facility Plan and review by the State Properties Review Board is to make sure that the State doesn't waste tax dollars on land, buildings, or other improvements that they don't need, or other duplicated elsewhere, or that aren't planned for in the budget

process. The proposed gun range has, from its inception, violated the State's own procedures that were put in place more than 40 years ago to avoid exactly the kind of unplanned, unanticipated, and unnecessary expenditures that have already been made for site studies in four different towns, with millions more required for actual construction.