

Connecticut General Assembly

Logistics Subcommittee of the Police Transparency & Accountability Task Force

Rep. Joshua Hall, Chairperson



c/o Judiciary Committee, Room 2500
Legislative Office Building
300 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Ct 06106

Logistics Subcommittee

DRAFT MINUTES

Tuesday, August 4, 2020

1:00 p.m., via Zoom

Attendees: Joshua Hall (Chair), Daryl McGraw, Chief William Wright, Ken Green, Cheryl Sharp, Tanya Hughes, Bishop John Selders, John Szewczyk, Mel Medina, Shafiq Abdussabur, Stephen Saloom

Others: Ken Barone (CCSU), Deb Blanchard (Judiciary Committee), Andrew Clark (CCSU), Renee LaMark Muir (CCSU)

I. Welcome

Chair Hall convened the meeting at 1:00 p.m. Members introduced themselves.

II. Review subcommittee charge

Chair Hall provided some general background about the formation of the state task force, and the development of subcommittees. The main objectives of the Logistics Subcommittee include: 1) reviewing and developing a course of action for the remaining preliminary priorities and recommendations; 2) engaging with the Governor and Connecticut General Assembly to ensure coordination of efforts with respect to legislative and administrative actions relative to the Task Force's purview; and 3) determining structure and scope of final report.

III. Review of Task Force priorities document

Chair Hall and Ken Barone provided a summary of the 22 priorities for police accountability and transparency that the state task force adopted in June 2020. The list of priorities was developed with the intent that additional items may be added throughout the year. Renee LaMark Muir developed a

Connecticut General Assembly

Logistics Subcommittee of the Police Transparency & Accountability Task Force

Rep. Joshua Hall, Chairperson



c/o Judiciary Committee, Room 2500
Legislative Office Building
300 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Ct 06106

document for members to review which compares the list of priorities developed by the task force and the legislation recently passed by the Connecticut General Assembly.

Members requested that the comparison document include implementation dates for the different aspects of Public Act 20-1. Additionally, members requested that staff identify what other organizations, such as the Connecticut Bar Association, may be working on so that the committee can determine how to best organize their work.

IV. Review of HB 6004 of the July Special Session & associated changes to the task force charge

Ken Barone summarized the changes to the charge of the task force that were made in Public Act 20-1. In particular, the task force is required to report to the legislature on the following items: (1) Police officer interactions with individuals who are individuals with mental, intellectual or physical disability; (2) the merits and feasibility of police officers who conduct traffic stops issuing a receipt to each individual being stopped that includes the reason for the stop and records the demographic information of the person being stopped; (3) strategies that can be utilized by communities to increase the recruitment, retention and promotion of minority police officers, as required by section 7-291a of the general statutes; (4) strategies that can be utilized by communities to increase the recruitment, retention and promotion of female police officers; (5) the merits and feasibility of requiring police officers to procure and maintain professional liability insurance as a condition of employment; (6) the merits and feasibility of requiring a municipality to maintain professional liability insurance on behalf of its police officers; (7) the establishment of primary and secondary traffic violations in the general statutes; (8) the establishment of a requirement in the general statutes that any police traffic stop be based on the enforcement of a primary traffic violation; (8) the establishment of a requirement in the general statutes that any police traffic stop be based on the enforcement of a primary traffic violation; (9) how a police officer executes a warrant to enter a residence without giving audible notice of the police officer's presence, authority and purpose before entering in this state and under the laws of other states, including verification procedures of the address where the warrant is to be executed and any documentation that a police officer should leave for the residents where the warrant was executed; (10) how a professional bondsman under chapter 533 of the general statutes, a surety bail bond agent under chapter 700f of the general statutes or a bail enforcement agent under sections 29-152f to 29-152i, inclusive, of the general statutes take into custody the principal on a bond who has failed to appear in court and for whom a rearrest warrant or a capias has been issued pursuant to section 54-65a of the general statutes, in this state and other states, including what process of address verification is used and whether any documentation is left with a resident where the warrant was executed; (11) whether any of the grounds for revocation or cancellation of a police officer certification under

Connecticut General Assembly

Logistics Subcommittee of the Police Transparency & Accountability Task Force

Rep. Joshua Hall, Chairperson



c/o Judiciary Committee, Room 2500
Legislative Office Building
300 Capitol Avenue
Hartford, Ct 06106

section 7-294d of the general statutes should result in mandatory revocation by the Police Officer Standards and Training Council, as opposed to discretionary revocation; and (12) any recommendations related to the implementation of section 41 of P.A. 20-1 and the anticipated impact that the implementation of section 41 will have on the ability of a police officer or municipality to obtain liability insurance.

Ken Green recommended that the subcommittee consider a review period regarding the implementation of Public Act 20-1 and include in a report the impact of the legislation. Other members agreed that reviewing the impact of the law that passed would be appropriate.

V. Discussion regarding other priorities for consideration

Members identified several other priorities for consideration. Those priorities included how to change the culture of policing, reviewing police departments currently under consent decree to evaluate the effectiveness of those reforms, the use of an ombudsman or oversight entity to monitor police departments, review existing citizen complaint data and internal affairs investigation outcomes, explore how the changes to law may impact persons of color from joining the profession, privacy and civil rights protections, regulations around the use of technology to record police interactions, qualifications for certification and training for chiefs of police, early intervention for “bad officers, centralized repository for training and recertification records, and challenges faced with removing “bad” officers.

Renee and Ken indicated that they would update the task for priorities document to include the other priorities identified by the subcommittee for consideration.

VI. Next Meeting

The subcommittee agreed to meet again in two weeks on Tuesday, August 18, 2020 at 1:00 p.m.

VII. Adjournment

There was no further discussion and Chair Hall adjourned the meeting at 3:05 p.m.