

Esteemed Chairs, Vice Chairs and Members

The Bill that is being proposed is extremely comprehensive and I as a First Selectman and Police Commissioner find need to comment on many of items. As such I will attempt to do so in a manner that is concise.

Section 3 lines 210 thru 215: If sufficient evidence is not found charges should be dismissed. Strike this phrase.

Section 12 lines 437 thru 439: (4) a study to require Police Officers to have personal insurance could only result in much opposition if it was determined that it is recommended. The imposition of said liability insurance would be an ultimate hardship on municipalities and taxpayers as they would end up ticking up the tab through additional compensation. Local Government provides insurance coverage currently at a reasonable cost.

Section 16 all: this is effectively an unfunded mandate and as such is opposed. Should local authorities determine a need to send an officer for psychiatric evaluation, the cost is appropriately the towns however required periodic evaluation is opposed.

Section 17 all: This is a function of the Police Commission

Section 18: Utilizing a Social Worker in place of a Police Officer in potentially violent or dangerous situations is not at all responsible. Additionally this would require funding and as such would constitute an unfunded mandate. When and where appropriate the court system requires offenders to obtain mental health therapy to mitigate further occurrences. By all means provide Police Officers additional training to potentially deescalate volatile situations as proposed.

Section 29: All will agree that kneeling on a person neck or administering a chokehold may not be the best approach to bringing a violent individual under control if administered excessively long. That said if these measures are eliminated, and they likely should be, then what measures may an Officer utilize to protect himself and other citizens when the need arises. Those measures and an effective protocol must be established first.

Section 41: Governmental immunity must be recognized. The financial implications could potentially be great and an unjust burden on the citizens of a community in judicial judgements, increased insurance costs or both.

Sincerely,

Edmond V. Mone  
First Selectman  
Thomaston Connecticut