

Police
INDIVIDUAL TECHNICAL ASSISTANCE REPORT

In Response to a Request for Technical Assistance by the

**Law and Justice Planning Office
Seattle, Washington**

**for the
Bellevue, Washington, Police Department** *Planning*

for Pistol Range -

October 20, 1972

Prepared by:

**Public Administration Service
1313 East 60th Street
Chicago, Illinois 60637**

(Per Contract J-LEAA-015-72)

34221

I. PRELIMINARY INFORMATION

A. Consultant Assigned:

John Sturch
Sergeant and Rangemaster
Chicago Police Department

B. Date Assignment Received:

September 15, 1972

C. Date of Contact with LEAA Regional Coordinator:

October 3, 1972 (via LEAA/W)

D. Dates of On-Site Consultation:

October 9, 10, 11, 12, 1972

E. Individuals Interviewed:

L. J. Miller, City Manager
Bellevue, Washington

Cabot Dow, Assistant City Manager
Bellevue, Washington

Nicholas Guardina, Chief of Police
Bellevue, Washington, Police Department

Van Blairingen, Major
Bellevue, Washington, Police Department

Lieutenant Ian Wallace, Training Officer
Bellevue, Washington, Police Department

A. Waldt, Sheriff
Department of Public Safety
King County, Washington

Joseph Bernstin, Administrative Aid
Department of Public Safety
King County, Washington

Sergeant Carl Crain, Training Officer
Department of Public Safety
King County, Washington

Chief Robert Solitto
Redmond, Washington, Police Department

Chief Albert Englin
Medina, Washington, Police Department

Chief Lawrence Hamilton
Clyde Hill, Washington,
Police Department

Chief Harold Doss
Kirkland, Washington,
Police Department

Chief James Scaggs
Mercer Island, Washington,
Police Department

II. STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM**A. Problem as per Request for Technical Assistance:**

Provide technical assistance in planning for the construction of an indoor pistol range for the use of the Bellevue, Washington, Police Department and nearby law enforcement agencies.

B. Problem Actually Observed:

As stated in II-A. above.

III. FACTS BEARING ON THE PROBLEM

(See attached consultant's report.)

IV. POSSIBLE AND RECOMMENDED COURSES OF ACTION

(See attached consultant's report.)

TO: G. M. Morris, Associate Director
Public Administration Service

FROM: John Sturch, Special Consultant
Chicago Police Department

SUBJECT: Technical Assistance in Planning for the Construction of an Indoor
Pistol Range for the Bellevue, Washington, Police Department

Relative to my assignment as a special consultant to the Bellevue, Washington, Police Department, concerning the construction of an indoor pistol range, please be advised of the following findings:

1. On 9 October 1972, at 0900 hours, the undersigned met with Mr. L. J. Miller, City Manager of Bellevue, Washington; Mr. Cabot Dow, Assistant City Manager of Bellevue, Washington; and Lieutenant Ian Wallace, Training Officer, Bellevue, Washington, Police Department at City Hall, where I was apprised of the scope of the proposed project.
2. I was informed that the construction of the proposed pistol range was not only to benefit the City of Bellevue, but was to benefit five and possibly six other police departments in the area. The departments involved are: Bellevue, Redmond, Medina, Clyde Hill, Kirkland, Mercer Island, and possibly the King County Sheriff's Department of Public Safety.
3. A site for the range had been selected and an agreement entered into between the Bellevue Police Department and the Veterans of Foreign Wars, Lake Washington Post No. 2995, to lease the site to the City of Bellevue for a period of 15 years at the rate of \$1 per year, with a first option for an additional 15-year lease. The site is agreeable to the other cities participating in the project, and the undersigned made an on-site inspection of the location at 1100 hours on the ninth of October and found it suitable.

4. Upon returning from the site the undersigned interviewed Chief Nicholas Guardina, Bellevue Police Department, and was informed that the Department's personnel had not been qualified on a formal firing course in over two years because the Department had only a makeshift outdoor range with two firing positions in a strip of woods on the outskirts of town and which is shared with other communities.
5. The undersigned, in the company of Lieutenant Ian Wallace, Training Officer, Bellevue Police Department, then proceeded to Redmond, Washington, where I interviewed Chief Robert Solitto. His information coincided with that of Chief Guardina of Bellevue. There is no formal firing facility anywhere in the area, with the exception of the Seattle Police Range, owned by a private organization (the Seattle Police Athletic Association) and so heavily used by the Seattle Police Department, members, and federal law enforcement agencies that it is virtually impossible for the smaller communities to utilize this facility to train personnel in the use of firearms.
6. Following the interview with Chief Solitto, Lieutenant Wallace and I drove to Medina, Washington, where I interviewed Chief Albert Englin, evoking the same replies as I had from the two previous chiefs.
7. On 10 October 1972 the undersigned, again in the company of Lieutenant Wallace, drove to Clyde Hill, Washington, where I interviewed Chief Lawrence Hamilton, receiving the same replies to my questions as I had the previous day. We then proceeded to Kirkland, Washington, where I interviewed Chief Harold Doss with the same results: no formal training area, makeshift ranges, and insufficient funds available from their respective city councils to erect a formal range on an individual city basis. This was followed by an interview with Chief James Scaggs of Mercer Island, Washington, where the same replies were forthcoming. All of the officials interviewed expressed not only a concern for the safety of the men of their departments, due to lack of formal firearms training on a continuing basis, but a concern for the citizens of their community. There was also concern about possible lawsuits involving the communities if an innocent person were injured as a result of ineffectual firearms training.

8. On 11 October 1972, the undersigned, in the company of Cabot Dow, Assistant City Manager, Bellevue, Washington, and Lieutenant Ian Wallace, Bellevue Police Department, drove to Seattle, Washington, for an interview with Sheriff A. Waldt of King County, Washington, and Mr. Joseph Bernstin, Administrative Aid, King County, and Sergeant Carl Crain, Training Officer, King County Department of Public Safety. This interview was to serve a two-fold purpose, since it was the first formal overture by the officials of Bellevue and the other communities to involve the Sheriff's Department in the proposed project.
9. Prior to my interview of Sheriff Waldt, the Assistant City Manager of Bellevue, Mr. Cabot Dow, briefed Sheriff Waldt on the proposed project, and Sheriff Waldt acknowledged that he had a prior, but unofficial, knowledge of the project and had indicated an interest in it. He was inquisitive as to how it would suit the needs of his Department of Public Safety personnel, and an explanation was given to him. At this time Sergeant Carl Crain, Training Officer for the King County Department of Public Safety, acknowledged that a dire need existed in the area for a formal firearms training facility and agreed that the proposed facility might serve some of their needs. His preference, however, was for a 30-position, outdoor range, with skeet field and sniping course range. The Sheriff agreed that this type of facility would be more suitable to their needs, but was vague as to where a suitable location could be found and from where the funds necessary to purchase such a site would be forthcoming. The conclusion of the interview was conducted in the office of Joseph Bernstin, Administrative Aid, King County, where it was agreed that further discussions on the matter would be held between Mr. Bernstin and Mr. Cabot Dow. Mr. Bernstin indicated that there was more interest in the proposed project than was evident in the interview with the Sheriff and Sergeant Crain.
10. In analyzing all of the above interviews, it was evident that there existed some reservations on the parts of both parties as to the extent of cooperation that would be forthcoming from either side if the project became a reality. All readily agreed that there is an urgent, even desperate need for a formal firearms training facility

in the area. This is also the sincere opinion of the undersigned who outlined three possible courses of action that could be taken to rectify the situation. The following is an outline of these three courses:

- a. The six communities have all pledged an amount of money on a departmental per capita basis—\$150 per man. Total present complement of sworn members is 172, which would provide working capital of \$25,800. Based on this, and the site already acquired by the City of Bellevue, the first possible course of action would be the construction of a five-position, indoor firing range to be utilized by the six cooperating communities.
 - b. The second course of action would be the construction of a six-position, indoor firing range utilizing the same site, but, of necessity, construction of a larger building to be used by the six communities and partially by the King County Department of Public Safety. This course would have to be on mutually agreed financial participation, based upon the number of King County Department of Public Safety officers utilizing the facility and a mutually agreeable method of funding by the communities.
 - c. The third and most practical and desirable of the three courses is as follows: Full participation by all six communities and the entire King County Department of Public Safety in the construction of an eight-position, double gantry-type, indoor firing facility. This would, of course, mean mutual funding and maintenance of this facility, which could be constructed on the site obtained by the City of Bellevue. Again, of necessity, the type of construction would have to be wider in order to accommodate eight firing positions.
11. As stated above, the undersigned feels that Course "c" is the most practical and desirable of the three proposals. It would enable both the communities and the King County Department of Public Safety to construct, at minimal cost, an indoor firing facility far superior to anything existing in the area. Only makeshift setups

now exist, none of which is suitable; nor in the opinion of the undersigned, safe for any type of comprehensive and safe firearms safety or firing program. The total present complement of men to be trained on this facility would be, in round figures, 700 members. Description of the type of firing facility recommended for this course of action is as follows:

- Concrete block structure, approximately 115 feet by 40 feet.
- Concrete slab on grade flooring.
- Eight 4-foot armor, partitioned, acoustically treated firing lanes (a safety factor).
- Steel plate, louvered, eight-position bullet trap.
- Two 4-position target gantrys (carriers), electronically operated from rangemaster's control booth through control console and two remote control cables, enabling operation from the firing line itself. (This is another safety factor.)
- Indirect, protected lighting.
- Adequate ventilation (a definite health factor).
- Acoustical treatment for walls and ceiling of the actual firing area, 75 feet.
- Rangemaster's booth.
- Restroom.
- Classroom.
- Work and storage area.

12. The exact cost of a structure of this type and size is not known to the undersigned at the present time, but probably would round out somewhere in the vicinity of \$25,000 to \$28,000. In addition to the cost of the structure with restroom, classroom, work and storage areas, rangemaster's booth, lighting, and the ventilating

system, there would be the cost of the firing range equipment itself. This would be an additional \$20,000 and would cover the following equipment: armor plate steel, louvered or venetian blind type of bullet trap (of sufficient width to encompass eight firing positions), a double bridge track or gantry (each of four-target carrying capacity) electronically controlled, armor plate steel partitions, with acoustical treating, six feet high, four feet long, to separate the eight shooting positions, one control console and two remote control cables.

13. The above described facility, in the considered opinion of the undersigned, would adequately serve the needs of the six communities and the King County Department of Public Safety at the present time, and is large enough to encompass even a sizable increase of manpower in any or all of the departments involved. It also would afford local federal law enforcement agencies a facility when pressed for space in their own. This was the purpose of suggesting the double track gantry (target carrier)—it would enable two different agencies to utilize the facility at the same time, regardless of what type of training one or the other was attempting and without interference.
14. Courses "a" and "b" were submitted to the participating communities, as an alternate course, in the event the King County Sheriff declines participation in this proposal. This, of course, would mean revision of building size, a reduction of width from 40 feet to 25 or 30 feet, depending upon whether a five- or a six-firing position range was decided upon. Costs would also be revised downward—building costs as well as range equipment costs. All of the above described equipment with the exception of one 5-position bridge track carrier would be used. Cost of this equipment would be \$13,000. The same equipment in a six-position, single bridge track carrier would be \$14,000—with two 3-position carriers the cost would be \$18,000.
15. The undersigned, as consultant, worked more closely with the requesting agency, the Bellevue City Manager's Office, and the Bellevue Police Department than with the other agencies involved.

So it was to this agency the undersigned directed the courses or alternatives as described above with the understanding that they would be submitted to all other agencies. Suggestions as to firms to contact regarding the special equipment involved in the construction of firing ranges were submitted as follows:

Shooters Equipment, Inc
2001 N. Parkside Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60639

Detroit Bullet Trap Company
2233 West Palmer Drive
Schaumburg, Illinois 60172

Caswell Equipment Company, Inc.
1215 Second Avenue, North
Minneapolis, Minnesota 55405

Any of the above listed firms manufacture the type of range equipment described above, and will bid competitively on an invitation and notice to bid. All materials used by these firms are of comparable quality, and all are willing to submit plans on a request basis and estimate costs of construction of any type of range, indoor or outdoor.

16. The undersigned is quite convinced that there is a dire need for a modern, safe, adequate firing facility in this area and urges that due and just consideration be given this matter. I have also urged the communities involved to pursue closer relationship and cooperation with the King County Department of Public Safety on this issue, as I am certain it would be to their mutual advantage to follow Course "c." The type of range equipment suggested has, in the past experience of the consultant, proven its worth many times in the operation of a *safe*, as well as extremely efficient, firing facility.
17. Any further information regarding this matter will be provided on request.

Respectfully,

(Signed)
John W. Sturch
6939 N. Hiawatha Avenue
Chicago, Illinois 60646

END

7 dlt. Cas / rns m