



## **Connecticut Racial Profiling Prohibition Project**

Tuesday, March 31, 2015

10:00am – 12:00pm

CCSU Downtown Campus, Room 319

### **Minutes**

Present: William Dyson, Mike Lawlor, Chief Doug Fuchs, Commissioner Dora Schriro, Orlando Rodriguez, Tanya Hughes, Cheryl Sharp, Michael Gailor, Deborah Del Prete Sullivan, Tamara Lanier, Mui Mui Hin McCormick, Aaron Swanson, Sandra Staub, Jeff Matchett, Captain George Battle, Captain Nick Boulter, Dr. Cato Laurencin, Jim Fazzalano, Ken Barone, Andrew Clark, Matt Ross, Alissa DeJonge, David McGuire, Glenn Cassis.

The meeting was called to order at 10:05am

#### **I. Welcome**

Bill Dyson welcomed the advisory board thanked them for attending.

#### **II. Approval of Dr. Cato Laurencin to the Advisory Board**

Dr. Cato Laurencin from UCONN Health Center was invited to participate as a community member of the advisory board. Dr. Laurencin, M.D., Ph.D. is the Albert and Wilda Van Dusen Distinguished Endowed Professor of Orthopaedic Surgery and Professor of Chemical, and Biomolecular, and Materials Engineering at the University of Connecticut. He is also an elected member of the Institute of Medicine of the National Academy of Sciences and an elected member of the National Academy of Engineering. Dr. Laurencin is the Founder and Director of both the Institute for Regenerative Engineering and the Sackler Center for Biomedical, Biological, Physical and Engineering Sciences at the UCONN Health Center.

A motion was made by Glenn Cassis and seconded by Andrew Clark to approve Dr. Laurencin as a member of the Connecticut Racial Profiling Prohibition Project Advisory Board. Dr. Laurencin was approved by a unanimous voice vote.

#### **III. Presentation of the 2013-2014 Traffic Stop Data Analysis and Findings Report**

Ken Barone, Jim Fazzalano and Matt Ross presented the final draft of the 2013-2014 Traffic Stop Data Analysis and Findings. The information presented in this report includes traffic stop data collected from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2014 for 168 of 169 municipalities in Connecticut. Across these municipalities, there are 92 municipal police departments. An additional 81 fall under State Police jurisdiction: 56 of those have resident state troopers and the other 25 are served by the State Police troops responsible for the town. Additionally, a total of 13 special agencies have the authority to conduct traffic stops.

The Stamford Police Department has been excluded from this data analysis. The Stamford Police Department reported conducting approximately 25,000 traffic stops during the 12-month period covered in this report. Unfortunately, the software program used to capture racial profiling data was not connected to the state data collection portal for all traffic stops. After discovering the problem, the project staff worked with the police department to manually secure the missing files. Review of the traffic stop data indicated that a large number of traffic stops were missing some component of the required information. Because of the high number of stops that were missing data, it is not appropriate to proceed with any analysis. The project staff has been working with the Stamford Police Department to re-train officers on proper data collection procedures and to connect their software to the state portal. We anticipate a full inclusion of Stamford data in next year's report. Please note that safeguards have been put in place for all departments that are connected to the state portal that prevent this error from occurring in other departments. Since Stamford is currently the only department not connected to the state portal, this is not a concern for the other agencies.

The report relied on a series of methodological approaches to assess disparities in traffic stops. In total, four descriptive measures and three statistical methods were used. As a result of the analysis, the findings reported are summarized below.

A total of 13.5 % of motorists stopped during the analysis period were observed to be Black. A comparable 11.7 % of stops were of motorists from a Hispanic descent. The results from the *Veil of Darkness* analysis indicated that minority stops were more likely to have occurred during daylight hours than at night. The statistical disparity provides evidence in support of the claim that certain officers in the state are engaged in racial profiling during daylight hours when motorist race and ethnicity is visible. These results were robust to the addition of a variety of controls including time of day, day of the week, state traffic volume, department level fixed effects, and department volume controls. The results from the post-stop analysis confirm that the disparity carries through to post-stop behavior for Hispanics.

Although we find results at the state level, it is important to note that it is specific officers and departments that are driving these statewide trends. In an effort to better identify the source of these racial and ethnic disparities, each analysis was repeated at the department level. The departments that were identified as having a statistically significant disparity are presumed to be driving the statewide results. Although it is possible that specific officers within departments that were not identified may be

engaged in racial profiling, these behaviors were not substantial enough to influence the department level results. It is also possible that a small number of individual officers within the identified departments are driving the department level trends. The five departments identified to exhibit a statistically significant racial or ethnic disparity that may indicate the presence of racial and ethnic bias include:

#### *Groton Town*

The Groton municipal police department was observed to have made 23.7% minority stops of which 8.3% were Hispanic and 13.6% were Black motorists.<sup>1</sup> The results from the *Veil of Darkness* indicated that minority motorists, across all racial and ethnic categories, were more likely to have been stopped during daylight as opposed to darkness hours. The results were robust to the inclusion of a variety of controls and sample restriction that excluded equipment violations. Although the post-stop analysis could not be conducted due to an insufficient sample of vehicular searches, the analysis using the *Veil of Darkness* produced sufficiently strong results to make a determination that these results indicate the presence of a significant racial and ethnic disparity that is occurring in Groton. The results of these analyses indicate that further investigation into the source of the observed statistical disparity is warranted.

#### *Granby*

The Granby municipal police department was observed to have made 9% minority stops of which 2.8% were Hispanic and 5.7% were Black motorists. The results from the *Veil of Darkness* indicated that minority motorists, across all racial and ethnic categories, were more likely to have been stopped during daylight as opposed to darkness hours. The results were strongest in the sample that was restricted to motor vehicle violations and were potentially being masked by the inclusion of equipment violations in the combined sample. Although the post-stop analysis could not be conducted due to an insufficient sample of vehicular searches, the analysis using the *Veil of Darkness* produced sufficiently strong results to make a determination that these results indicate the presence of a significant racial and ethnic disparity that is occurring in Granby. The results of these analyses indicate that further investigation into the source of the observed statistical disparity is warranted.

#### *Waterbury*

The Waterbury municipal police department was observed to have made 64.8%<sup>2</sup> minority stops of which 33.2% were Hispanic and 32.3% were observed as Black motorists. The *Veil of Darkness* for the subsample of motor vehicle violations showed a marginally significant racial disparity across all racial definitions except for Hispanics alone. Minority motorists, for these demographic groups, were more likely to have been stopped during daylight as opposed to darkness hours. The results were strongest in the sample that was restricted to motor vehicle violations and were potentially being

---

<sup>1</sup> These results do not include stops for the police departments with jurisdiction over Groton Long Point or Groton City.

<sup>2</sup> The minority stop percentage is derived from all non-Caucasian drivers stopped, which does not include drivers identified as White and Hispanic.

masked by the inclusion of equipment violations in the combined sample. The results of the post-stop analysis also indicated that minority motorists, as compared to their Caucasian counterparts, were being searched more frequently relative to the rate at which they were found with contraband. The results of the pre- and post-stop analyses both indicate the presence of a significant racial and ethnic disparity that is occurring in Waterbury. The results of these analyses indicate that further investigation into the source of the observed statistical disparity is warranted.

#### *State Police Troop C*

State Police Troop C was observed to have made 15.2% minority stops of which 5.6% were Hispanic and 7.2% were observed to be Black motorists. The *Veil of Darkness* for the subsample of motor vehicle violations showed a significant racial disparity across all racial definitions. Minority motorists, for these demographic groups, were more likely to have been stopped during daylight as opposed to darkness hours. The results were stronger in the sample that was restricted to motor vehicle violations. The results of the post-stop analysis also indicated that minority motorists, as compared to their Caucasian counterparts, were being searched more frequently relative to the rate at which they were found with contraband. The results of the pre and post-stop analysis both indicate the presence of a significant racial and ethnic disparity that is occurring in State Police Troop C. The results of these analyses indicate that further investigation into the source of the observed statistical disparity is warranted.

Troop C covers 10 towns, five of which are resident trooper towns, including Mansfield. The 26 resident troopers assigned to these five towns represent the largest component of the Resident Trooper Program in the state. In addition, four of the five resident trooper towns employ a total of 24 full- or part-time constables to augment the law enforcement coverage provided by the resident troopers. Shift assignments are determined by the towns, not the State Police with the majority of the resident troopers assigned to the day shift. The interrelationship of these staffing patterns with overall Troop C operations is one of the factors that will be considered when further investigating the Troop C data for the source of the statistical disparity.

#### *State Police Troop H*

State Police Troop H was observed to have made 37.5% minority stops of which 13.5% were Hispanic and 22.5% were observed to be Black motorists. The *Veil of Darkness* for the subsample of motor vehicle violations showed a significant racial disparity across all racial definitions. Minority motorists, for these demographic groups, were more likely to have been stopped during daylight as opposed to darkness hours. The results were stronger in the sample that was restricted to motor vehicle violations. Although the post-stop analysis could not be conducted due to an insufficient sample of vehicular searches, the analysis using the *Veil of Darkness* produced sufficiently strong results to make a determination that these results indicate the presence of a significant racial and ethnic disparity that is occurring in State Police H. The results of these analyses indicate that further investigation into the source of the observed statistical disparity is warranted.

### *Departments Identified from Descriptive Analysis*

In addition to the five departments identified to exhibit statistically significant racial or ethnic disparities that may indicate the presence of racial and ethnic bias, 12 departments were identified using the descriptive tests. The descriptive tests are designed as a screening tool to identify the jurisdictions where consistent disparities that exceed certain thresholds have appeared in the data. They compare stop data to four different benchmarks: (1) statewide average, (2) the estimated driving population, (3) resident-only stops, and (4) peer groups. Although it is understood that certain assumptions have been made in the design of each of the four measures, it is reasonable to believe that departments with consistent data disparities that separate them from the majority of other departments should be subject to further review and analysis with respect to the factors that may be causing these differences.

The other important factor is the relative size of the disparities. For this portion of the study, a threshold of 10 percentage points is the point at which a department's data is considered sufficient for identification. In a number of instances, the disparities were significantly above the threshold.

In seven departments the screening process shows stop data that exceeded the disparity threshold levels in at least three of the four benchmark areas as well as in a majority of the 12 possible measures. Those departments are (1) Wethersfield, (2) Hamden, (3) Manchester, (4) New Britain, (5) Stratford, (6) Waterbury, and (7) East Hartford. The project staff will continue to study the data and attempt to identify the factors that may be causing these differences. In addition, these departments should evaluate their own data to better understand any relevant patterns.

The screening process also detected an additional five departments whose stop data exceeded the disparity threshold levels in at least three of the four benchmarks, and six of the 12 possible measures. Those departments are (1) Meriden, (2) New Haven, (3) Newington, (4) Norwich and (5) Windsor. Going forward, the data for these five departments will continue to be monitored to determine whether any changes relative to the descriptive benchmarks indicate the need for further analysis.

The full report and presentation can be found on our website at [www.ctrp3.org](http://www.ctrp3.org).

#### IV. General Discussion

Following the presentation, advisory board members asked specific questions regarding the methodology and presentation of the report to the public. The advisory board was given one week to fully read the report before its official release on April 7, 2015.

There was no further discussion and the meeting was adjourned at 12:15pm.