The Connecticut General Assembly



Domestic Violence Criminal Justice Response and Enhancement Advisory Council

MEETING MINUTES

Wednesday, December 4, 2024

12:30 PM in Room 1D of the LOB and Zoom and YouTube Live

ATTENDANCE: Senator Mae Flexer, Senator John Kissel, Karen Foley O'Connor, Chief Alaric Fox, Charles Forcier, Meghan Scanlon, Attorney Phyllis DiCara, Joe DiTunno, Marc Pelka, Andrea O'Connor, Attorney Gail Hardy, Captain Ryan Maynard, Eulalia Garcia, Attorney Johanna Canning, Merit Lajoie, Ginger Wilk, TFC Daniel Richman

- I. CALL TO ORDER
 - a. Chairwoman Scanlon called the meeting to order at 12:33 PM.
- II. WELCOME AND INTRODUCTION OF COUNCIL MEMBERS
 - a. Chairwoman Scanlon offered welcoming remarks and Council members introduced themselves.
- III. APPROVAL OF THE SEPTEMBER 25th MEETING MINUTES
 - a. A motion was made to approve the September 25, 2024 meeting minutes by Senator Flexer and seconded by Attorney DiCara. The motion passed unanimously.
- IV. SUBCOMMITTEE REPORTS
 - a. LAW ENFORCEMENT MODEL POLICY
 - i. Chief Fox reviewed proposed changes to the model law enforcement policy on family violence (pages 15-16) regarding officer-involved domestic violence that involves a chief of police or other administrative head of a police agency, including those who may simultaneously be serving as the town's chief executive officer (e.g., mayor, town manager, town administrator, etc.) to ensure best practices and protocols related to notification, investigation, and surrender of firearms.
 - b. ARREST WARRANTS & ORDERS OF PROTECTION: COMPLIANCE, ENFORCEMENT & OUTCOMES

i. Attorney Hardy noted that at its last meeting, the subcommittee voted to approve its recommendations which are now incorporated in the council's draft annual report.

c. OFFENDER INTERVENTION STANDARDS

- i. Mr. DiTunno discussed the survey that the subcommittee used to assess the availability of offender intervention programs operating across the state, which ultimately revealed a low number of available programs. He further discussed the subcommittee's recommendation to work around this issue, which is now incorporated in the council's draft annual report.
- ii. Mr. DiTunno reviewed and discussed the state's pretrial supervised diversionary program and whether it provides appropriate programming specific to domestic violence for those domestic violence offenders referred to the program.

V. REVIEW DRAFT ANNUAL REPORT AND RECOMMENDATIONS

a. The council discussed the draft annual report and recommendations:

Offender Intervention Standards Subcommittee

- i. The council discussed the first recommendation, which is intended to allow prosecutors to confirm that offenders who are pretrial and not referred to a Judicial Branch CSSD-contracted program have received programming that meets the major tenets of the state's domestic violence offender intervention program standards. The council discussed the intersection of mental health and domestic violence, the potential need for two separate programming/treatment options to address both issues, and not creating procedures that limit the ability of the court to address all of the potential needs of the offender. Mr. DiTunno noted that the subcommittee will need to develop procedures for offenders who don't complete the form, although council members recognize that this is a common issue with many court-ordered programs and is typically dealt with on a case-by-case basis.
- ii. The council discussed the second recommendation regarding the state's pretrial supervised diversionary program. Mr. DiTunno noted that there are approximately 250 270 referrals for domestic violence offenders to this program each year but no domestic violence component to the programming. Attorney Canning suggested that language be added "for good cause shown" if the court is to add domestic violence treatment on top of the mental health treatment as the mental health treatment is extensive.

Police Response to Crimes of Family Violence Model Policy Subcommittee

- iii. There was no discussion on the first and second recommendations made by this subcommittee.
- iv. Ms. Foley O'Connor noted that the third recommendation regarding adding the Lethality Assessment Program as a best practice to the model policy will thereby make it the state's minimum standard for the police response to intimate partner violence. She noted that Connecticut already has 100% voluntary participation with the program.

- v. Ms. Foley O'Connor discussed the subcommittee's fourth recommendation and its planned coordination with the arrest warrants subcommittee to develop best practices for writing and submitting arrest warrants, including how law enforcement should prioritize those that come back from court for service. Best practices developed by the two subcommittees will be proposed for inclusion in the state's model policy.
- Arrest Warrants & Orders of Protection Compliance, Enforcement, Outcomes Subcommittee
 - vi. Attorney Hardy discussed the subcommittee's first recommendation providing examples of how firearm surrender compliance might be addressed, with the ultimate recommendation being to invite staff from NCJFCJ back to fully vet and establish best practices.
 - vii. The council discussed the third recommendation relative to victim confidentiality. Mr. DiTunno noted that the Judicial Branch is making progress on the issue and already has a form to accomplish this, but there will likely need to be a statutory change to seal the form. Attorney Canning noted that the defendant needs the address so as not to violate an order including a stay away distance. The council noted the need for further discussions about balancing victim confidentiality and safety with the defendant's right to information.
 - viii. In discussing the subcommittee's second recommendation, Attorney Hardy noted that she surveyed state's attorneys and found that most gaps appear where a prosecutor sends warrant back for a correction or more work and then the warrant falls through the cracks. State's attorneys have developed a variety of processes to address this, but the subcommittee wants to develop consistent best practices across the state. There is also a need to address gaps that come up between signing by judge and service by law enforcement, which leave the victim unprotected and gives the defense opportunities to challenge the warrant.

VI. OTHER BUSINESS

a. None.

VII. ANNOUNCEMENT OF TIME AND DATE OF NEXT MEETING

a. The next meeting of the full council will be Wednesday December 18, 2024, at which time the council will vote on approval of the annual report and recommendations. All council members were asked to send edits to the council or subcommittee co-chairs by the end of day on Monday, December 9, 2024.

VIII. ADJOURNMENT

a. Motion to adjourn was made by Mr. Pelka and seconded by Mr. Forcier. The meeting was adjourned at 1:46 PM.

Please Click the Following Link to Access the Meeting on the Judiciary Committee YouTube Channel:

Click Here