

Dear Judiciary Committee:  
Here are my comments regarding this draft bill.

#### Immunity:

I do not agree with replacing government and qualified immunity by having individual officers carry professional liability. Abolishing immunity is a popular theme, but it is not necessary to rein in bad behaviors, to put it mildly, this is overkill. Perhaps reviewing discipline processes and implementing stricter rules on certain behaviors and the number of disciplinary actions would be more effective.

I also do not believe stripping officers of any immunities would change officer actions on the street. Officers are responding how they think is appropriate in urgent situations - for most of them, training and follow up can correct where they are amiss; and having ways to let officers go, who don't quickly change to recommended and required behaviors will end the practice of keeping some on the force who should not be there. Also, training for implicit bias.

So this giant endeavor to remove immunity is mostly optics, misguided and expensive optics, to make it appear that officers will be straitened to behave, and it will not work. It is also insulting and unfair to the huge percentage of officers who do a good job and deserve the same protections as all other government workers do.

I think that stripping the officers of immunity will bring on more lawsuits that will be prolonged and vicious, and many countersuits, as the sword cuts both ways, and case law may still prevail, and so the end results may not change much. Many times when the microscope to scrutinize the level of detail needed to understand what actually happened in a fast-moving situation, it isn't always as it may have appeared on the surface.

As far as not being able to be a security guard, the next employer is capable of performing background checks and enquiring as to why they are seeking a new job. Many security guards simply sit in a booth at complex entrances, checking to ensure people who are coming and going are residents or their guests.

#### Careers and Committee:

This bill is over the top. We do know that many officers are anticipating (or already) taking early retirements, and there is a harder time to fill vacancies with qualified candidates. Many officers nowadays are college graduates, why would they want to expose themselves to having their careers ruined forever by a committee of mostly uninformed lay people, and some ex-cons who may be carrying a grudge. This is an inappropriate situation to put an officer in, to be vulnerable to "justice-impacted" persons who seek revenge and may have serious psychological

problems. If you are going to change POSTS membership, you need to specifically define what are the parameters for being considered "justice-impacted," is it a conviction? A person who feels discriminated against? Be specific.

Social workers:

The concept of having social workers responding to calls may sound good to the uninitiated, but is not very practical, especially so many people now have guns and can turn violent in a nano-second. That is why we need police to respond, because it can be unpredictable, anything can happen, and police are trained to handle situations that often get out of control with no warning.

What is worth keeping in this draft:

This bill looks like it was drafted by eighth-graders, it is obviously slapped together by people who don't know much about what they are putting together. About the only things I find of value are implicit bias training, reports on recruiting minority police, badge and name-tag identification displayed prominently, body cameras and dashboard cameras, chief medical examiner investigation of deaths in police custody and prohibiting quotas on pedestrian citations. The rest is either not appropriate, redundant, or unnecessary additional layers of governing that is a waste of time.

Rose-Marie de Rensis  
West Hartford