

**Testimony by Representative Tom Reynolds**  
**HB 6632, AN ACT CONCERNING THE SITING OF RESIDENTIAL SEXUAL OFFENDER**  
**TREATMENT FACILITIES**  
**Judiciary Committee**  
**April 4, 2011**

Representative Fox, Senator Coleman and distinguished members of the Judiciary Committee, I am pleased to submit testimony in support of HB 6632, An Act Concerning the Siting of Residential Sexual Offender Treatment Facilities.

In 2008 the legislature and Governor adopted comprehensive criminal justice reform, which identified the need to provide treatment services to sex offenders and to ensure their supervision after they complete their prison terms. The Department of Corrections (DOC) and Court Support Services Division (CSSD) of the Judicial Department were charged with developing an exhaustive process for the siting the program. However, they failed.

As a result, the legislature—by unanimous votes in both chambers—adopted new law in May 2010 mandating that DOC and CSSD, before considering proposals from treatment providers:

- (1) Require at least five proposed sites in various geographical locations around the state for consideration;
- (2) Establish criteria by which such proposed sites are evaluated, including, but not limited to, the proximity of a proposed site to parks and recreational facilities, youth services facilities and senior centers, public and private schools, commercial or residential property, bars, places of worship, child care centers, casinos, and local and state roads.
- (3) Require each agency submitting a proposal to provide a description of the physical location of the proposed site and the surrounding area, including local and state roads, the function and number of properties within one mile of the proposed site including those serving commercial, recreational, religious or residential uses, the number of schools, child care facilities, bars, senior centers, and casinos.

Governor Rell purposely signed the legislation immediately AFTER she authorized that the contract be awarded to Connections, Inc. and the facility sited in Montville, thus relieving the state from applying the agreed upon standards to the Montville proposal. This action is reprehensible and a slap in the face to Montville residents.

This new law, still in effect today, is balanced and reasonable. It does not prohibit the placement of a sex offender facility in any one town. It requires fair and thoughtful standards and criteria to provide basic protections for all communities, while acknowledging the need for treatment and supervision to protect the public.

The bill before you today requires the state to repeat the selection process using the standards in statute. When the state proposes something as controversial as the siting of a residential sex offender treatment facility, the process must be above reproach and must be able endure the greatest scrutiny. Failure to repeat the process established in law means the state's site selection will continue to lack integrity and will forever be challenged by the host municipality and its residents.