

Hobart, Jamie

From: HAROLD HART <hart9120@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Wednesday, March 02, 2016 7:38 PM
To: pstestimony
Cc: HAROLD HART
Subject: Bill 234 and Bill 235 Written testimony from Winifred Hart

My name is Winifred Hart and I am a resident of Willington CT. My home of 24 years is located less than 1 mile from the proposed Willington site. I am providing this written testimony about the two proposed bills #234 and #235, but also to ensure that my opposition is clear to the development of such an expansive facility in a residential area under the guise of "meeting the needs" for the CT State Police Training. There are a number of concerns that I have with locating the facility within my residential area

1 – Impact of the way of life for ALL residence in Willington and surrounding towns who will be impacted based on noise pollution, drinking water contamination, decreased property values, and overall reduction in quality of life that is enjoyed in our rural area today

2 – An unnecessary increase in the tax burden on the St of CT taxpayers in an already struggling economy by the expenditure of tax dollars when other existing facilities could meet the needs vs. the desires of someone to build an expansive over the top facility that appears to be only for the purpose of a "feather in their cap". The proposed cost publicized for the development of this facility it appears is substantially understated as well.

Bill 234 – I am in support of this bill with the following clarifications and understanding

Section 1b – I am in support of this section of the act if the term of "purchased or leased property" would include the current proposal that is being considered/vetted that the CT State Police use the current CT National Guard facility in East Haven as part of the leased property option.

Section 2 - I think that it is imperative that the current known description of the needs of the firearms training facility as well as the known or discussed future expansion needs be truthfully described to the public. We have already had changes to the original use description provided at the initial scoping meeting based on concerns raised about the foreign agencies that were going to use the facility. In order to appropriately site such a facility it is imperative that the expansion plans be defined and accurate and adhered to now and in the future. This will avoid the infamous 'bait and switch" from happening to the receiving town due to hearing one proposal and actually building and using it for something entirely different. No sneaking it in later.....I also think that the evaluation of each existing firearms training facility outlined in Section 2.2 is not to be taken lightly and shouldn't allow for the immediate dismissal by DAS/DESPP Commissioners as has been their current course of action because of scheduling logistics. In today's economy they may have to "make something work" or "work with what you have" because, is such an expansive and expensive facility really necessary?

Bill 235 – I have some concerns with this bill as presently written based on its apparent intended purpose to remove East Windsor specifically from consideration based on the parcel size defined within the bill. Picking an arbitrary number for the sole purpose of eliminating one site doesn't seem like it is for the greater good of the entire state but only for one specific town presently under consideration.

I do however agree 100% with Sect 1(g) that baffling MUST be required wherever the site is located because these proposed sites are in residential areas and noise creates quality of life issue as well as reductions to property values for the surrounding residents. At our scoping meeting in May of 2015, we were informed that the EIE would outline how all of the stated concerns received within the scoping period would be addressed. We only learned at the Public Hearing on February 2nd that there were no plans for using baffling at this new facility, therefore any plans to address residents complaints/concerns with the noise created from such an expansive facility appears to have been falsely stated in the scoping meetings and the intended purpose of the EIE. Passing this portion of the bill would be a benefit that would require that the development of the facility include the baffling...

Thank you for your time and consideration of my testimony.