



## **Connecticut Racial Profiling Prohibition Project**

Thursday, December 6, 2018

10:00am – 12:00pm

Legislative Office Building, Room 1E

### **Minutes**

Present: William Dyson, Jim Fazzalano, Ken Barone, Andrew Clark, Neil Dryfe, Michael Gailor, Marc Petruzzi, Aaron Swanson, Rashad Glass, Cheryl Sharp, Werner Oyanadel, Dr. Cato Laurencin, Mike Lawlor

The meeting was called to order at 10:05 a.m.

#### I. Welcome

Bill Dyson welcomed the advisory board and thanked them for attending.

#### II. Approval of the October 18, 2018 meeting minutes

Michael Gailor made a motion to approve the October 18, 2018 meeting minutes. The motion was seconded by Werner Oyanadel and the minutes were approved.

#### III. CTRP3 Mission Statement Proposal

Dr. Cato Laurencin presented the draft mission statement developed by an advisory board working group. The following components of the mission statement were adopted by a consensus of members present:

1. The Alvin W. Penn Racial Profiling Traffic Stop Law enacted by the Connecticut General Assembly in 1999 required state and local police to collect traffic stop data and report the data to the state.
2. The 2011 federal investigation into the East Haven Police Department brought this issue to the forefront in Connecticut again and led to the Connecticut General Assembly updating the Profiling Legislation in 2012.

3. Disparities across racial and ethnic groups occur in traffic stops in Connecticut.
4. Enforcing the law's data reporting requirement and collecting and analyzing racial disparities in traffic stop records is the primary charge of the advisory board.
  - a. A broader analysis, utilizing multiple methodologies is the preferred method for measuring for the presence of racial disparities in traffic enforcement;
  - b. Although no measure is 100% accurate in measuring disparities, the analysis utilized in Connecticut is sufficient in determining the presence of disparities;
  - c. We will continue to modify and refine our methodologies based on the best available research and accepted practices in the field.
5. We will take a proactive approach in understanding, explaining and addressing disparities found in the analysis by:
  - a. Utilizing input from all stakeholders to understand the underlying causes for such disparities;
  - b. Clearly explaining to the public and stakeholders if there are justifiable reasons for such disparities;
  - c. Reporting to the Office of Policy and Management instances where the Connecticut Racial Profiling Prohibition Project Advisory Board believes that a police department is in violation of the Alvin W. Penn law.

The advisory board did not have agreement on part 5, subsection D listed below and the chair asked that members review the language and come back with suggestions at the next meeting.

- d. Diligently assuring counteractive measures are taken to eliminate unjustifiable disparities

IV. Presentation by representatives from the Bridgeport Police Department regarding data issues

The Bridgeport Police Chief and members of his staff made a presentation before the advisory board in response to the June 2018 letter sent by the board regarding Bridgeport's non-compliance with the Alvin W. Penn Act. The department highlighted a number of steps that have been taken to rectify the data issues. Department officials conducted a full audit of the current data collection system and identified several areas of concern. A compliance officer was assigned to oversee the system moving forward and backlogged data was entered into the system. The project staff will continue to monitor the data reporting from the department and provide support when needed.

V. Presentation on preliminary findings for the 2017 Traffic Stop Data Analysis report

Ken Barone and Jim Fazzalano presented the preliminary findings from the 2017 Traffic Stop Data Analysis and Findings report. The information presented in this report included traffic stop data collected from January 1, 2017 through December 31, 2017. The report relied on a series of methodological approaches to assess disparities in traffic stops. In total, three descriptive measures and four statistical methods were used. As a result of the analysis, the findings reported are summarized below.

Across Connecticut's municipal departments and State Police troops, a total of 16 percent of motorists stopped during the analysis period were observed to be Black while 14 percent of stops were Hispanic motorists. Taken as a whole and relative to prior year's studies, the findings from the 2017 analysis of Connecticut's traffic stop data indicate that some progress has been made in terms of the decision to stop a minority motorist. Across the state, as well as in the analysis based on the aggregate municipal and State Police samples, the Veil of Darkness did not indicate that stopped motorists were any more likely to be from minority groups in daylight relative to darkness. Although we have identified one municipal police department and two state police troops where the Veil of Darkness indicated a statistically significant disparity, the lack of a disparity statewide and the lower number of identified departments is a promising sign.

However, the data show that large and statistically significant disparities remain in terms of how minorities are treated following a traffic stop. The new post-stop test for differential outcomes provides compelling evidence that minority motorists receive different dispositions (tickets, warnings, searches) after a stop is made, even after we condition on the basis for the stop and other potentially confounding factors. Similar evidence of adverse treatment was found statewide in terms of searches where the data suggests that the bar for searching a minority motorist is substantially lower than their white non-Hispanic counterparts. Finally, the statewide hit-rate analysis also found statistically significant evidence that the police were far less likely to be successful when searching a minority relative to a white non-Hispanic motorists.

Based on the criteria outlined in the report, it was recommended that an in-depth follow-up analysis be conducted for the following departments: **(1) Derby, (2) Fairfield, and (3) Troop K**. None of these municipal departments or one state police troop have been identified in previous reports.

**Meriden, Wethersfield, and Troop C** were also identified with racial and ethnic disparities in this study as well as in previous annual reports. Meriden was identified in the Year 2 (Traffic Stop Data Analysis and Findings, 2014-15) and Year 3 (Traffic Stop Data Analysis and Findings, 2015-16) studies. Wethersfield has been identified in all four statewide studies conducted since the start of this project. Troop C was identified in the Year 1 (Traffic Stop Data Analysis and Findings, 2013-14) study. An in-depth follow-up analysis, with recommendations, was previously completed for all both municipal agencies and Troop C. The racial and ethnic disparities have remained fairly consistent in each of the annual studies for Wethersfield and Troop C. However, Meriden was identified with

fewer racial and ethnic disparities in this report. Based on the results of the previous follow-up analysis and our further understanding of traffic stop enforcement in Meriden, Wethersfield, and Troop C, we do not believe a full follow-up analysis is necessary. The departments should continue to review and monitor traffic enforcement policies to evaluate the disproportionate effect they could be having on minority drivers. They should also continue to take steps to assure that their minority community is fully engaged in the process of understanding why the allocation of enforcement resources are made and what outcomes are being achieved.

Once the in-depth follow-up reports are completed, the full report will be available online.

## VI. General Discussion

The advisory board created a Policy Work Group to focus on exploring larger policy trends within the data. Tanya Hughes and Tamara Lanier were unanimously elected to co-chair the work group. The first meeting will be scheduled in early 2019.

There was no further discussion and the meeting was adjourned at 12:05pm.