



Connecticut Racial Profiling Prohibition Project

Thursday, November 9, 2017

10:00am – 12:00pm

Legislative Office Building, Room 1C

Draft Minutes

Present: William Dyson, Mike Lawlor, Chief Dryfe, Commissioner Dora Schriro, Tanya Hughes, Cheryl Sharp, Michael Gailor, Rashad Glass, Tamara Lanier, Aaron Swanson, David McGuire, Lt. Col. George Battle, Chief Fusaro, Dr. Cato Laurencin, Jim Fazzalano, Ken Barone, Andrew Clark, Jesse Kalinowski, Lt. Marc Petruzzi, Michelle Riordan-Nold, Stacey Manware, Subira Gordan.

The meeting was called to order at 10:05am

I. Welcome

Bill Dyson welcomed the advisory board thanked them for attending.

II. Approval of the September 7, 2017 minutes

Andrew Clark made a motion to approve the minutes from September 7, 2017. The motion was seconded by David McGuire. There was no discussion and the minutes were passed unanimously.

III. Traffic Stop Data Findings and Analysis, 2015-16 Report Presentation Part I

Ken Barone and Jim Fazzalano presented the findings from the 2015-16 Traffic Stop Data Analysis and Findings report. The information presented in this report included traffic stop data collected from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016. The report relied on a series of methodological approaches to assess disparities in traffic stops. In total, three descriptive measures and three statistical methods were used. As a result of the analysis, the findings reported are summarized below.

A total of 14.7% of motorists stopped during the analysis period were observed to be Black. A comparable 13.1% of stops were of motorists of Hispanic descent. The results presented in the state-level Veil of Darkness analysis provide strong evidence that a

disparity exists in the rate of minority traffic stops by both municipal and State Police departments in the 2015 to 2016 sample. The level of significance remains relatively consistent for both groups when the sample is reduced to only moving violations. This, we conclude that these results are relatively robust and that the State Police disparity is likely driving much of the overall statewide disparity. The results from the post-stop analysis confirm that the disparity carries through to post-stop behavior across all racial and ethnic groups. In aggregate, Connecticut police departments exhibit a strong tendency to be less successful in motorist searches across all minority groups. Again, it is impossible to clearly link these observed disparities to racial profiling as these differences may be driven by any combination of policing policy, heterogeneous enforcement patterns, or individual officer behavior.

Although there is evidence of a disparity at the state level, it is important to note that it is likely that specific departments 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 likely to be having the largest effect on the statewide results. Although it is possible that specific officers within departments that were not identified may be engaged in racial profiling, if these behaviors existed, they 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 results.

The six municipal departments and one state police troop identified to exhibit a statistically significant racial or ethnic disparity include:

1. Berlin
2. Meriden
3. Monroe
4. Newtown
5. Norwich
6. Ridgefield
7. Troop B

In addition to the six municipal police departments and one state police troop identified to exhibit statistically significant racial or ethnic disparities in the VOD analysis, five 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. Although it is understood that certain assumptions have been made in the design of each of the three 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 five municipal departments identified to exhibit a significant racial or ethnic disparity using the descriptive measures include:

1. Wethersfield
2. East Hartford
3. Stratford
4. Darien
5. Trumbull

The entirety of the initial 2015-2016 statewide traffic stop data analysis as presented in the report is utilized as a screening tool by which the Advisory Board and project staff can focus resources on those departments displaying the greatest level of disparities in their respective stop data. By conducting in-depth follow-up analyses on the departments identified through the screening process, the public has a better understanding as to why and how disparities exist. Therefore, an in-depth follow-up analysis should be conducted for the following departments based on our analytical results for traffic stops performed from October 1, 2015 through September 30, 2016: **(1) Berlin, (2) Monroe, (3) Newtown, (4) Norwich, (5) Ridgefield, (6) Darien, and (7) Troop B.** None of these seven departments have been identified in previous reports. As in previous years, police administrators from these departments will be invited to be an integral part of the follow-up analysis.

IV. Traffic Stop Data Findings and Analysis, 2015-16 Report Presentation Part II

Ken Barone and Jim Fazzalano also presented the findings from a three-year analysis of traffic stop information. The information presented in this report included traffic stop data collected from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2016.

A total of 14.1% of motorists stopped during the analysis period were observed to be Black. A comparable 12.5% of stops were of motorists of Hispanic descent. The results presented in the state-level Veil of Darkness analysis provide strong evidence that a disparity exists in the rate of minority traffic stops by both municipal and State Police departments in the combined 2013 to 2016 sample. Throughout, the disparity persists through the inclusion of both municipal departments as well as officer fixed-effects. Further, the level of significance grows across all specifications when the sample is restricted to moving violations.

One overarching observation is that the largest and most persistent disparities driving the VOD results statewide are likely coming from the State Police. Not only are these results strong across all specifications and robustness checks with a high degree of confidence, but the large overall sample size means that they exert more influence on the overall average effect for the mixed sample. The results from the post-stop analysis confirm that the disparity carries through to post-stop behavior across all racial and ethnic groups. In aggregate, Connecticut police departments exhibit a strong tendency to be less successful in motorist searches across all minority groups. Again, it is impossible to clearly link these observed disparities to racial profiling as these differences may be driven by any combination of policing policy, heterogeneous enforcement patterns, or individual officer behavior.

Although there is evidence of a disparity at the state level, it is important to note that it is likely that specific departments 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 likely to be having the largest effect on the statewide results. Although it is possible that specific officers within departments that were not identified may be engaged in racial profiling, if these behaviors existed, they 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 results.

The six municipal departments and four state police troop identified to exhibit a statistically significant racial or ethnic disparity include:

1. Ansonia
2. Groton Town
3. Madison
4. Monroe
5. New Milford
6. Norwich
7. Troop C
8. Troop G
9. Troop H
10. Troop K

In addition to the six municipal police departments and four state police troops identified to exhibit statistically significant racial or ethnic disparities in the VOD analysis, seven 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.

The seven municipal departments identified to exhibit a significant racial or ethnic disparity using the descriptive measures include:

1. Wethersfield
2. Stratford
3. East Hartford
4. New Britain
5. Hamden
6. Manchester
7. Trumbull

The entirety of the statewide traffic stop data analysis as presented in the report is utilized as a screening tool by which the Advisory Board and project staff can focus resources on those departments displaying the greatest level of disparities in their respective stop data. By conducting in-depth follow-up analyses on the departments identified through the screening process, the public has a better understanding as to why and how disparities

exist. This transparency is intended to assist in achieving the goal of increasing trust between the public and law enforcement.

Based on our analytical results for traffic stops conducted from October 1, 2013 through September 30, 2016 there were 13 municipal police departments and two state police troops identified with significant racial and ethnic disparities. A full in-depth follow-up analysis should be conducted only for those departments that have not been identified in any of the previous annual studies. Those departments are: **(1) Ansonia, (2) Madison, (3) Troop G, and (4) Troop K.**

V. General Discussion

The full report and presentation can be found on our website at www.ctrp3.org.

Following the presentation, advisory board members asked specific questions regarding the methodology and findings. However, there was limited time for follow-up questions from advisory board members.

There was no further discussion and the meeting was adjourned at 12:05pm.