



Agency Legislative Proposal - 2021 Session

Document Name: 091420_CTMD_ByLaws

(If submitting electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092621_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Connecticut Military Department

Liaison: Major Erich Heinonen

Phone: (860) 524-4961

E-mail: erich.j.heinonen.mil@mail.mil

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: The Adjutant General

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Major Heinonen

Title of Proposal: AAC Military Unit Bylaws

Statutory Reference: CGS sections 27-79 and 27-53

Proposal Summary:

To eliminate obsolete requirement for military unit bylaws and to allow the state to configure and administer its military units in a manner consistent with federal military units.

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

◇ Reason for Proposal

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?*
- (2) Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? Are other states considering something similar this year?*
- (3) Have certain constituencies called for this action?*
- (4) What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?*

Proposal updates obsolete statutory language concerning the configuration and administration of military units of the armed forces of the state. This provision will eliminate an antiquated requirement for units of the armed forces of the state to create bylaws, and will require the state to configure and administer state military units in a manner consistent with federal military units.

The change will support the efficient and orderly conduct of state military operations. The notion of military unit bylaws date back to the colonial era and were replaced by military orders, regulations, and circulars of applicability to all military units under a large military command in the 19th century.

The use of individual unit bylaws, particularly among the four Governor's Guard units, has been the source of administrative burden for the Department. Eliminating the need for bylaws will further the effectiveness of state military units in times of need as evidenced by the Governor's Guards efforts in deploying Mobile Field Hospitals at the beginning of the COVID-19 pandemic.



This proposal is related to two of the Governor’s three themes for the 2021 legislative session:

(1) Continued response to the current public health emergency; and
 (2) Structural reforms to state government, including those whose need has been revealed in the last several months as we have responded to the public health emergency.

Origin of Proposal **New Proposal** **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share:

- (1) *What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration’s package?*
- (2) *Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?*
- (3) *Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?*
- (4) *What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?*

Legislative History: 2020 – raised, but did not receive a JF; 2019 – raised, but never considered in either chamber by agreement with Speaker of the House; 2018 – JF, but language replaced and amended to be “An Act Concerning Use of Military Facilities by Youth Military Organizations.”

This bill has been historically opposed by the former Speaker of the House due to his personal relationship with a long-retired member of the First Company Governor’s Foot Guard who opposed this bill for personal reasons that were not of benefit to the unit or state.

PROPOSAL IMPACT

AGENCIES AFFECTED *(please list for each affected agency)*

Agency Name: Proposal does not affect other agencies.
Agency Contact (name, title, phone):
Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal **YES** **NO** **Talks Ongoing**

Summary of Affected Agency’s Comments
 None

Will there need to be further negotiation? **YES** **NO**

FISCAL IMPACT *(please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)*

Municipal *(please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)*
 NONE



State NONE
Federal NONE
Additional notes on fiscal impact NONE

◇ **POLICY and PROGRAMMATIC IMPACTS** *(Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)*

This proposal is necessary to ensure effective configuration and administration of organized militia units of the armed forces of the state, and supports recruiting and retention.

◇ **EVIDENCE BASE**

What data will be used to track the impact of this proposal over time, and what measurable outcome do you anticipate? Is that data currently available or must it be developed? Please provide information on the measurement and evaluation plan. Where possible, those plans should include process and outcome components. Pew MacArthur Results First [evidence definitions](#) can help you to establish the evidence-base for your program and their [Clearinghouse](#) allows for easy access to information about the evidence base for a variety of programs.

Military orders, regulations, and circulars of applicability to all state military units will be published, disseminated and retained in accordance with states record retention rules.

Insert fully drafted bill here

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

Section 27-79 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective July 1, 2021*):

Sec. 27-79. Bylaws of organizations. [Each organization of the armed forces of the state] The Governor shall [make bylaws for its government, which shall be binding on its members when approved by the regimental or corresponding commander and the Adjutant General; and all fines and dues imposed by such bylaws may be collected in accordance with such procedure as the Adjutant General may, by regulation, prescribe, provided notice shall be given to any delinquent of the incurrence of any fine or dues within thirty days of the date when the same has been incurred and notice may be given collectively of such fines or dues or both. The commanding officer of the organization shall be the president of the association created in the bylaws, except that, if two or more organizations combine in one association, the senior commanding officer shall be president. The treasurer shall be elected from the enlisted personnel of the organization or, if two or more organizations combine, from among the enlisted personnel of one of the organizations. The treasurer of each such organization shall give a bond to such



organization in an amount satisfactory to the Adjutant General. The premium on such bond shall be paid by such organization] determine the organizational structure of the organized militia. Military units of the organized shall be composed in a manner consistent with National Guard or federal military units of similar composition, size and purpose. The Adjutant General may issue orders, regulations, or circulars for the administration of the armed forces of the state.



Agency Legislative Proposal - 2021 Session

Document Name: 091420_CTMD_LesoAccount

(If submitting electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092621_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Connecticut Military Department

Liaison: Major Erich J. Heinonen

Phone: (860) 524-4961

E-mail: erich.j.heinonen.mil@mail.mil

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Fiscal Division

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Major Heinonen

Title of Proposal: AAC Establishment of a Law Enforcement Support Program Account

Statutory Reference: 10 USC § 2576a; CGS section 4-32

Proposal Summary:

To establish a separate non-lapsing fund within the General Fund in order to properly execute the fiscal requirements of the federal program administered by the Military Department through which excess Department of Defense equipment is transferred to state Law Enforcement Agencies (i.e. 1033 Program).

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

◇ Reason for Proposal

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?
- (2) Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? Are other states considering something similar this year?
- (3) Have certain constituencies called for this action?
- (4) What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?

The Secretary of Defense is authorized by 10 USC § 2576a to transfer to state Law Enforcement Agencies, property that is excess to the needs of the Department of Defense (DoD) and that the Secretary determines is suitable to be used by such agencies in law enforcement activities under such terms prescribed by the Secretary (commonly referred to as the “1033 Program”).

The Governor designated the Military Department as the state agency to implement this program statewide, as well as to conduct program management and oversight. The program is funded by fees paid to the Military Department by participating law enforcement agencies (LEAs). The Military Department requires a properly designated non-lapsing fund to execute the program’s fiscal requirements.

The recently passed “Act Concerning Police Accountability” restricts, but does not prohibit, acquisition of certain DoD property by Connecticut LEAs. A large number of Connecticut LEAs will likely continue to possess or acquire excess DoD property through the program in accordance with the Act Concerning Police Accountability. This bill not only ensures proper



accountability of state funds, but also further enhances the transparency of LEAs participating in the program in keeping with the policy behind the act.

This proposal is related to one of the Governor’s three themes for the 2021 legislative session:

- (1) Racial justice and equity.

◇ Origin of Proposal □ New Proposal ☒ Resubmission

If this is a resubmission, please share:

- (1) What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration’s package?
(2) Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?
(3) Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?
(4) What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?

Legislative History: 2020 – JF (session cancelled); 2019 – JF, died in Senate.

This bill has been historically supported by Veterans Affairs Committee leadership. In 2019, the bill died in the Senate due to opposition from Senator Doug McCrory (Dist. 2 – Hartford, Bloomfield, Windsor). Despite repeated attempts to meet with the Senator to explain the nature of the bill and benefits regarding police transparency in conjunction with Senator James Maroney, Veterans Affairs Committee co-chair, a meeting never materialized.

PROPOSAL IMPACT

◇ AGENCIES AFFECTED (please list for each affected agency)

Agency Name: Proposal does not affect other agencies.

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal □ YES □ NO □ Talks Ongoing

Summary of Affected Agency’s Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? □ YES □ NO

◇ FISCAL IMPACT (please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)

Municipal (please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)

NONE

State

NONE

Federal

NONE

Additional notes on fiscal impact



NONE

◇ **POLICY and PROGRAMMATIC IMPACTS** *(Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)*

A dedicated fund is necessary and the proper mechanism for processing programmatic fees. As a policy matter, a dedicated fund supports transparency as it concerns LEAs who continue to participate in the 1033 program in accordance with the Act Concerning Police Accountability.

◇ **EVIDENCE BASE**

What data will be used to track the impact of this proposal over time, and what measurable outcome do you anticipate? Is that data currently available or must it be developed? Please provide information on the measurement and evaluation plan. Where possible, those plans should include process and outcome components. Pew MacArthur Results First [evidence definitions](#) can help you to establish the evidence-base for your program and their [Clearinghouse](#) allows for easy access to information about the evidence base for a variety of programs.

Revenue, expenditures, and property associated with the Law Enforcement Support Program are managed and accounted for in the regular course of business by the CTMD's fiscal office, Law Enforcement Support Program administrator, and the Defense Logistics Agency.

[Insert fully drafted bill here](#)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

NEW SECTION (Effective July 1, 2021):

Law Enforcement Support Office Program Account. There is established an account to be known as the "Law Enforcement Support Office Program Account" which shall be a separate, non-lapsing account within the General Fund. The account shall contain any moneys required by law to be deposited in the account, which shall include, but not be limited to, the participation fees submitted by law enforcement agencies. Moneys in the account shall be expended by the Adjutant General for the purposes of facilitating the operations of the Law Enforcement Support Program.



Agency Legislative Proposal - 2021 Session

Document Name: 091420_CTMD_EnlistmentBonus

(If submitting electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092621_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Connecticut Military Department

Liaison: Major Erich J. Heinonen

Phone: (860) 524-4961

E-mail: erich.j.heinonen.mil@mail.mil

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: Adjutant General

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Major Heinonen

Title of Proposal: AAC Additional Pay for New Members of the National Guard to Enhance Recruitment

Statutory Reference: New Section

Proposal Summary:

To provide a monetary incentive for new enlistees of the Connecticut National Guard with no prior service in the armed forces of the United States, by authorizing a one-time payment of \$500 to those who successfully complete initial entry training and advanced individual or technical training in order to enhance recruitment.

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

◇ Reason for Proposal

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) *Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?*
- (2) *Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)? Are other states considering something similar this year?*
- (3) *Have certain constituencies called for this action?*
- (4) *What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?*

To enhance recruitment in the Connecticut National Guard. Recruitment and retention is a top priority of the Adjutant General. The Connecticut Army National Guard alone must usually recruit approximately 500 new members every year in order to maintain the Army Guard's current force structure. Between competition amongst the various branches of the United States armed forces and strict enlistment criteria, recruiting qualified candidates is one of the biggest challenges facing the Connecticut National Guard today. The Connecticut National Guard is also a large employer within the state with approximately 5,000 Soldiers and Airmen and additional federal and state civilian employees and contractors. If the Connecticut National Guard is unable to recruit enough qualified candidates to fill its ranks, the organization risks losing force structure and the accompanying federal funding and equipment associated with it, as well as the lost force structures capabilities in times of domestic emergency.



Origin of Proposal **New Proposal** **Resubmission**

If this is a resubmission, please share:

- (1) *What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?*
- (2) *Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?*
- (3) *Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?*
- (4) *What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?*

PROPOSAL IMPACT

AGENCIES AFFECTED *(please list for each affected agency)*

Agency Name: Proposal does not affect other agencies.

Agency Contact (name, title, phone):

Date Contacted:

Approve of Proposal **YES** **NO** **Talks Ongoing**

Summary of Affected Agency's Comments

Will there need to be further negotiation? **YES** **NO**

FISCAL IMPACT *(please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)*

Municipal *(please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)*

NONE

State

Approximately \$300,000 per year based on an annual recruitment goal of approximately 600 new recruits each fiscal year.

Federal

NONE

Additional notes on fiscal impact

NONE

POLICY and PROGRAMMATIC IMPACTS *(Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)*



The additional \$500 bonus serves as an incentive designed to persuade potential recruits toward service to and within their own state in lieu of other reserve components of the armed forces. The bonus also serves to demonstrate the state's recognition of its interest in supporting its own National Guard.

◇ EVIDENCE BASE

What data will be used to track the impact of this proposal over time, and what measurable outcome do you anticipate? Is that data currently available or must it be developed? Please provide information on the measurement and evaluation plan. Where possible, those plans should include process and outcome components. Pew MacArthur Results First [evidence definitions](#) can help you to establish the evidence-base for your program and their [Clearinghouse](#) allows for easy access to information about the evidence base for a variety of programs.

The Connecticut National Guard's Recruiting and Retention Battalion will survey and document all new recruits regarding the importance of the \$500 recruiting bonus and its effect in their decision to enlist in the Connecticut National Guard and report their findings to the Adjutant General on a yearly basis.

[Insert fully drafted bill here](#)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

NEW SECTION (Effective July 1, 2021):

On and after July 1, 2021, subject to the availability of funds, the Adjutant General shall pay each new enlistee of the Connecticut National Guard who enlists for a period of eight total years and at least six active drilling years, with no prior service in the armed forces of the United States, five hundred dollars upon successful completion of initial entry training and advanced individual or technical training.



Agency Legislative Proposal - 2021 Session

Document Name: 100120_CTMD_AdjutantGeneral

(If submitting electronically, please label with date, agency, and title of proposal – 092621_SDE_TechRevisions)

State Agency: Connecticut Military Department

Liaison: Major Erich J. Heinonen

Phone: (860) 524-4961

E-mail: erich.j.heinonen.mil@mail.mil

Lead agency division requesting this proposal: The Adjutant General

Agency Analyst/Drafter of Proposal: Major Heinonen

Title of Proposal: AAC the Adjutant General

Statutory Reference: CGS sections 4-5, 4-8, and 27-19

Proposal Summary:

To provide that the Adjutant General of the Military Department possesses the qualifications, powers and duties of a statutory department head.

PROPOSAL BACKGROUND

◇ **Reason for Proposal**

Please consider the following, if applicable:

- (1) *Have there been changes in federal/state/local laws and regulations that make this legislation necessary?*
- (2) *Has this proposal or something similar been implemented in other states? If yes, what is the outcome(s)?*
- (3) *Have certain constituencies called for this action?*
- (4) *What would happen if this was not enacted in law this session?*

To provide that the Adjutant General of the Military Department already possesses the statutory qualifications for his or her office, and ensures he or she also possesses the powers and duties of a department head.

◇ **Origin of Proposal**

New Proposal

Resubmission

If this is a resubmission, please share:

- (1) *What was the reason this proposal did not pass, or if applicable, was not included in the Administration's package?*
- (2) *Have there been negotiations/discussions during or after the previous legislative session to improve this proposal?*
- (3) *Who were the major stakeholders/advocates/legislators involved in the previous work on this legislation?*
- (4) *What was the last action taken during the past legislative session?*



PROPOSAL IMPACT

◇ **AGENCIES AFFECTED** *(please list for each affected agency)*

Agency Name: Proposal does not affect other agencies. Agency Contact: Date Contacted:
Approve of Proposal <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input type="checkbox"/> NO <input type="checkbox"/> Talks Ongoing
Summary of Affected Agency's Comments
Will there need to be further negotiation? <input type="checkbox"/> YES <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO

◇ **FISCAL IMPACT** *(please include the proposal section that causes the fiscal impact and the anticipated impact)*

Municipal <i>(please include any municipal mandate that can be found within legislation)</i> NONE
State NONE
Federal NONE
Additional notes on fiscal impact NONE

◇ **POLICY and PROGRAMMATIC IMPACTS** *(Please specify the proposal section associated with the impact)*

Statutory clarification necessary for the efficient operation of the Military Department with respect to powers and duties of statutory department heads.



◇ **EVIDENCE BASE**

What data will be used to track the impact of this proposal over time, and what measurable outcome do you anticipate? Is that data currently available or must it be developed? Please provide information on the measurement and evaluation plan. Where possible, those plans should include process and outcome components. Pew MacArthur Results First [evidence definitions](#) can help you to establish the evidence-base for your program and their [Clearinghouse](#) allows for easy access to information about the evidence base for a variety of programs.

The Adjutant General’s actions in executing the duties of his or her office are documented and accounted for in the regular course of Military Department business, which is regularly audited by state and federal officials, and subject to public record retention and freedom of information laws. Qualitative or quantitative analysis of the agency’s varied operations and programs can be readily accomplished.

[Insert fully drafted bill here](#)

Be it enacted by the Senate and House of Representatives in General Assembly convened:

Section 4-5 of the general statutes is repealed and the following is substituted in lieu thereof (*Effective July 1, 2021*):

AN ACT CONCERNING THE ADJUTANT GENERAL

Sec. 4-5. "Department head" defined. As used in sections 4-6, 4-7 and 4-8, the term "department head" means Secretary of the Office of Policy and Management, Commissioner of Administrative Services, Commissioner of Revenue Services, Banking Commissioner, Commissioner of Children and Families, Commissioner of Consumer Protection, Commissioner of Correction, Commissioner of Economic and Community Development, State Board of Education, Commissioner of Emergency Services and Public Protection, Commissioner of Energy and Environmental Protection, Commissioner of Agriculture, Commissioner of Public Health, Insurance Commissioner, Labor Commissioner, Commissioner of Mental Health and Addiction Services, Commissioner of Social Services, Commissioner of Developmental Services, Commissioner of Motor Vehicles, Commissioner of Transportation, Commissioner of Veterans Affairs, Commissioner of Housing, Commissioner of Rehabilitation Services, the Commissioner of Early Childhood, the executive director of the Office of Military Affairs and the executive director of the Technical Education and Career System. As used in sections 4-6 and 4-7, "department head" also means the Commissioner of Education." As used in section 4-8, "department head" also means the Adjutant General of the Military Department.