

Community Outreach Subcommittee MINUTES

Wednesday, September 27, 2023

10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.

Zoom

Community Outreach Subcommittee Present: Gail Hardy (Chair), Chief L.J. Fusaro, Rashad Glass, Rachel Timm

Staff: Ken Barone, Erica Escobar, Natalie Casanova

I. Welcome & Introductions

Gail Hardy convened the meeting at 10:05 a.m. and asked members to introduce themselves.

II. Approval of the June 7, 2023, minutes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the minutes from June 7, 2023. The minutes were unanimously approved by members via voice vote.

III. Old Business

a. Debrief- Middletown Public Forum

Ken Barone updated the Community Outreach Subcommittee on the Middletown Public Forum held on June 29th, the first forum since before COVID. Despite initial challenges, Ana Mitchell's efforts brought together community members, local officials, and notable figures like the mayor, Bill Dyson, resulting in engaging conversations. Notably, the police chief and local States Attorney, Mike Gaylor, were also present.

Based on Rachel Timm's feedback, Ken highlighted the need for a more focused panel discussion. He acknowledged that with a large panel, there's a tendency for each member to consume a significant portion of the discussion time, limiting community participation. Ken suggested refining the conversation structure to swiftly transition into community input. He proposed offering specific guidance to community members on topics of interest while agreeing that the panel size might need reduction. Instead of everyone being on the panel, Ken recommended having invited guests present in the room to listen and participate, rather than being part of the formal panel.

Ken proposed exploring different event locations and mentioned a community group in Glastonbury known for hosting regular discussions. This

group, called The Glastonbury Martin Luther King Community Initiative (GMLKCI), conducts well-attended conversations on diverse issues throughout the year at a reputable Community Center. Ken recommended scheduling the next forum in the first two weeks of November at Glastonbury's Community Center in collaboration with this group. He emphasized that this partnership would allow for program refinement before Thanksgiving and foster meaningful discussions, building on the success experienced in Middletown.

Gail Hardy and the other members of the Community Outreach subcommittee agreed to select Glastonbury as the next venue for the Public Forum. Ken mentioned that Glastonbury isn't far from Middletown, emphasizing the importance of spreading events across the state. Ken proposed Danbury as the next location after Glastonbury, acknowledging that it would require more time for preparation. He explained that Anna would need several months to establish connections and generate interest in the Danbury community, unlike Glastonbury, where they have a more established network.

Ken reported Ana's imminent return next week and her progress in networking within Glastonbury. They're considering early November dates, around the 7th, 8th, or 9th. This scheduling aims to allow ample time before Thanksgiving for potential travel plans. Ken mentioned that he and Ana aim to finalize a date for the public forum in Glastonbury within the next few days. Ken suggested February as a backup date, providing sufficient time to plan the location and make connections.

IV. General Discussion

a. New racial profiling definition notice card language

Ken Barone briefed the Community Outreach Subcommittee on updating the notice card language regarding the new racial profiling definition. He mentioned that the current notices, printed months ago, are running low, and they aim to replace them due to outdated language. The existing notice references statute 54-1M, granting motorists the right to file complaints if they believe they've been stopped, detained, or searched solely based on specific criteria outlined in the statute.

Ken raised the idea of simplifying the language on the notice card. He considered revising the statement to remove "solely," replace it with "in whole or in part by consideration of," and retain descriptors like race, ethnicity, ancestry, age, or membership in a protected class. He questioned whether to include a qualifier about identifying a specific suspect but leaned towards avoiding it to prevent confusion among motorists. He suggested a potential solution of including an additional website for those seeking more

detailed information on racial profiling, rather than adding all the complex language to the notice card.

Gail Hardy expressed her perspective on the new language, acknowledging that it might be a lot of information for some individuals. She recalled past discussions emphasizing the importance of providing more information rather than less, considering that not everyone has access to technology to visit a website. Gail mentioned her preference for accessing information online but stressed the key point: ensuring motor vehicle operators understand how to make a complaint if they feel racially profiled.

Ken proposed simplifying the language by replacing the word "solely" with "in whole or in part," reflecting the new language. He emphasized that this modification would be straightforward as this language is integrated into the electronic citation system. Ken suggested delaying the distribution of the updated language to ensure endorsement by the full Advisory Board before implementing the change. He noted that this single-word alteration would be relatively easy for all systems to adopt.

Ken proposed adding the project website to the notice card, emphasizing its significance for accessing project history, reports, and resources, alongside directing complaints to CHRO.

b. Notice to be included in past reports regarding CSP data quality.

Ken raised the issue of unreliable state police data in past reports and proposed considering how to address it. He suggested the possibility of adding an addendum to acknowledge the comprehensive audit conducted in June 2023, highlighting discrepancies in the data. Ken recommended gently cautioning readers about the historical reports' reliability and directing them to the comprehensive audit report for more information. He sought recommendations from the full board on the extent to address this issue in the reports.

Gail highlighted the State's Attorney, U.S. Attorney's Office, and the Governor's involvement. However, she indicated the need to discuss it with Pat before addressing the division's response in detail. Ken suggested striving for a stance before the upcoming Advisory Board meeting, proposing a brief follow-up meeting in two weeks. He underscored the importance of Chief Asaro's input and recommended circulating draft language among the full group, outlining different potential positions. Ken proposed reconvening briefly in a couple of weeks to align positions before the Advisory Board meeting.

Ken mentioned his intention to share the draft language with the Community Outreach Subcommittee members, aiming to do so either today or by

tomorrow at the latest. He mentioned the plan for Natalie to revise the complaint notice language and distribute it to the group. Once consensus is achieved on the finalized language, available in both English and Spanish, they aim to present it to the full Advisory Board during the October meeting. Ken proposed sending an email containing Natalie's revisions for review by the Community Outreach Subcommittee.

There was no further discussion, and the meeting was adjourned at 10:45 a.m.