

- Officers should perhaps be required to satisfactorily complete at least **60** hours of certified review training every 3 years, rather than 40. (pg. 3)
- The new section which relates to the option to cancel or revoke any police certificate due to “conduct which undermined public confidence in law enforcement” is excellent and should be neither lessened nor eliminated. (pgs. 7-8)
- The new section which relates to implicit bias training is excellent and should be neither lessened nor eliminated. (pgs. 12-13)
- The new section which relates to the disclosure of disciplinary records based on ethics violations is excellent and should be retained. (pgs. 13-14)
- The entirety of Section 10 of the draft is excellent and should be fully retained and supported. (pgs. 14-15)
- The entirety of Section 11 is excellent and should be fully retained and supported. (pg. 15)
- I think the entirety of Section 12 is excellent and should be fully retained and supported. However, the language which relates to the appointment of the task force’s members is a bit confusing insofar as it may reasonably be read and understood to mean that the Minority leaders will each actually be granted THREE (3) appointments as opposed to the TWO (2) which are clearly granted to the Majority leaders. (Unsurprisingly, I believe the apportionment between the parties should be equal and proportional.) (pgs. 15-18)
- Section 13: I personally do NOT at ALL believe it is wise, useful, or necessary for
  - a. A faculty member of the University of Connecticut or
  - b. The Chief State’s Attorney

... to be on the Standards and Training Council. It is a well – known and commonly held belief that the University of NEW HAVEN has the best criminal justice program in the state of CT. Thus, (if possible), I would propose that the faculty member from UCONN be REPLACED with a faculty member from the University of New Haven, instead.

Similarly, I believe the proportion of “justice – impacted” people who are appointed to the Council should be significantly INCREASED. At present, The Majority Leaders of the House and Senate are both afforded a single appointment. I believe this should be broadened to include the House Speaker, the Senate President Pro Tem, the Minority leader of the House, AND the Minority leader of the Senate. This would have the practical effect of TRIPLING the representation of these folks from a total of 2 seats to a total of 6 seats.

Another viable possibility that I believe would constitute a substantive improvement would be to simply afford the Minority Party pertinent and equivalent appointment power to the practical effect of DOUBLING rather than TRIPLING the representation of “justice – impacted” people on the Council.

Similarly, I believe the proportion of mentally disabled folks on the Council should be increased by (at the very least) affording the House Speaker the privilege to appoint a qualified individual to the Council. (This would afford equal, pertinent appointment power to the Majority and Minority parties.)

## **Police Accountability Draft Notes & Analysis**

- *Officers should perhaps be required to satisfactorily complete at least 60 hours of certified review training every 3 years, rather than 40. (pg. 3)*
- The new section which relates to the option to cancel or revoke any police certificate due to “conduct which undermines public confidence in law enforcement” is excellent and should be neither lessened nor eliminated. (pgs. 7-8)
- The new section which relates to implicit bias training is excellent and should be neither lessened nor eliminated. (pgs. 12-13)
- Section 9 (which relates to the disclosure of disciplinary records based on ethics violations) is excellent and should be retained. (pgs. 13-14)
- The entirety of Section 10 of the draft is excellent and should be fully retained and supported. (pgs. 14-15)
- The entirety of Section 11 is excellent and should be fully retained and supported. (pg. 15)
- The entirety of Section 12 is excellent and should be fully retained and supported.
- *Section 13: I personally do NOT at ALL believe it is wise, useful, or necessary for*
  - c. A faculty member of the University of Connecticut (pg. 18) or*
  - d. The Chief State’s Attorney (pgs. 18 + 20)**... to be on the Standards and Training Council. It is a well – known and commonly held belief that the University of NEW HAVEN has the best criminal justice program in the state of CT. Thus, (if possible), I would propose that the faculty member*

*from UCONN be REPLACED with a faculty member from the University of New Haven, instead.*

*Similarly, I believe the proportion of “justice – impacted” people who are appointed to the Council should be significantly INCREASED. At present, The Majority Leaders of the House and Senate are both afforded a single appointment. I believe this should be broadened to include the House Speaker, the Senate President Pro Tem, the Minority leader of the House, AND the Minority leader of the Senate. This would have the practical effect of TRIPLING the representation of these folks from a total of 2 seats to a total of 6 seats.*

*Another viable possibility that I believe would constitute a substantive improvement would be to simply afford the Minority Party equivalent appointment power to the practical effect of DOUBLING rather than TRIPLING the representation of “justice – impacted” people on the Council.*

*Similarly, I believe the proportion of mentally disabled folks on the Council should be increased by (at the very least) affording either the House Speaker or Majority leader of the House the power to appoint a qualified individual to the Council. (This would afford equal appointment power to the Majority and Minority parties.) (pgs. 18 – 21)*

- Section 14: Good. Keep.
- *Section 16 – Subsection (d): I believe this section should be amended to REQUIRE that new police officers submit to a mental health assessment within THREE (3) months of their date of hire IF they have NOT submitted to a mental health assessment within 3 years of their date of hire. (pg. 25)*
- Section 17 – Good. Keep.
- Section 18 – Excellent. Retain and support.
- *Section 19 – Subsection (f): I believe the opening excerpt which presently reads, “the subject of a disciplinary investigation”, should be ALTERED to read, “the subject of an investigation” (pg. 30)*
- Section 21 – Excellent. Keep.
- *Section 22 – Subsection (b): Needs TEETH. I think it would be wise and best to attribute a clear and explicit (and sufficiently steep / severe) PENALTY for any and all instances wherein the lawful stipulations of this subsection are NOT adhered to. (pg. 36)*
- Section 23 – Very good. Keep.
- Section 24 – Very good. Keep.
- Sections 25 – 28 Very Good. Keep.

- Section 29 – Good. Keep.
- Section 30 – EXCELLENT AND NECESSARY. Retain and Support.
- Section 31 – Very good. Keep.
- Section 32 – Good. Keep.
- *Section 33 – The Chief State’s Attorney SHOULD NOT BE the person who nominates the Inspector General. RATHER, the Governor, the judiciary committee of the legislature, or some combination thereof, should do so.*
- Sections 34 + 35 Great. Keep.
- *Section 36 – Subsection (a.) (7.): Has a glaring typo. (The word “is” must be inserted between “deceased person” and “in the custody of”. (pg. 58)*
- Section 37 – Good. Keep.
- *Sections 38 + 39 – WONDERFUL AND NECESSARY. Support and retain.*
- *Section 40 – WONDERFUL AND NECESSARY. Support and retain.*
- *Section 41 – WONDERFUL AND NECESSARY.*

*HOWEVER, I strongly believe that police officers should NOT be PERSONALLY liable for civil damages UNLESS they have truly caused significant, remarkable, and / or egregious harm to a citizen.*

*Therefore, I for one strongly support a substantive amendment which includes the implementation of a “bright line” or an explicit threshold (which MAY and perhaps SHOULD include criminal, financial, and / or substantively elevated reasonableness – based) elements AND which represents the specific point at which an officer shall become liable and / or susceptible to PERSONAL (as opposed to public) civil liability.*