



## **Data Collection, Analysis, and Quality Subcommittee Minutes**

Tuesday, February 20, 2024  
1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.  
Zoom

**Attendance:** Stacey Manware, Allison Beas, Lt. Col. Mark Davison, James McGennis, Chief Riddick, Kevin Neary

**Staff:** Ken Barone, Jim Fazzalaro, Erica Escobar

### **I. Welcome & Introductions**

Stacey Manware called the meeting to order at 10:04 a.m. and members introduced themselves.

### **II. Approval of the January 23, 2024, meeting minutes**

A motion was made and seconded to approve the meeting minutes from January 20, 2024. The minutes were approved unanimously.

### **III. Old Business**

#### **a. Legislative recommendation- Mandated use of E-citation and E-Warning**

Ken Barone provided an update on the legislative recommendations, highlighting that 19 agencies currently don't utilize e-citations, although some are in the process of implementing them. He explained that e-citations integrate warnings into the same system, streamlining data entry and reducing human error. This integration also ensures that profiling system requirements are automatically met. Ken expressed interest in understanding how many agencies with e-citation capabilities are underutilizing or not fully utilizing the system.

Stacey highlighted the efficiency benefits of implementing systems like e-citations, not only for racial profiling but also for broader law enforcement processes. She mentioned an ongoing E misdemeanor project initiated by the state police. Stacy suggested exploring ways to support departments in adopting such technologies, considering factors like personnel turnover and

funding challenges. She proposed setting up meetings with interested agencies to identify and address potential barriers to implementation. Ken discussed the challenges encountered by the 19 departments yet to adopt the technology, noting that funding may not be the primary obstacle. He acknowledged the difficulties faced by smaller agencies in navigating the application process for funding. Additionally, he suggested that a lack of will among departments could pose a greater barrier, observing that some may not prioritize technology adoption. He proposed discussing mandates as a means to ensure compliance, promoting a reasonable timeframe, such as January 1, 2026, or July 1, 2027, for universal adoption. Chief Riddick suggested a reasonable implementation timeframe of two to three years and recommended exploring options linked to accreditation, such as POST, for enforcement.

Ken supported Chief Riddick's idea, suggesting devising a plan to assist the 19 agencies in adopting technology. He proposed forming a group to address funding and provide support to onboard as many agencies as possible before considering a mandate. Additionally, he emphasized the need to address the issue of low utilization rates among agencies with access to technology.

Kevin Neary suggested a nuanced approach, proposing to tie a potential mandate to targeted technical assistance for the 19 agencies facing adoption challenges. He emphasized addressing specific adoption issues, whether related to funding or integration with existing systems. Neary also raised the question of whether the mandate should address both adoption and usage rates, suggesting that these might involve different barriers and objections. He suggested considering them as separate aspects to focus on.

Chief Riddick suggested engaging the CPCA executive board in a meeting instead of drafting a letter, highlighting the importance of open dialogue. He expressed concerns about potential mandates and emphasized the financial challenges faced by municipalities when adopting new technology. Riddick underscored the complexity of implementation beyond just infrastructure costs, including human capital and consulting fees. He proposed exploring alternative pathways for success, acknowledging the need for flexibility in the process.

Ken agreed with Chief Riddick's proposal to coordinate a meeting with key stakeholders, including the CPCA executive board, the highway safety office, judicial representatives, and CJIS experts. He emphasized the importance of addressing concerns collectively and understanding the barriers faced by the 19 agencies. Ken proposed this as an initial step to underscore the significance of the initiative and facilitate further discussions on overcoming obstacles.

Stacey supported the idea of coordinating a meeting with key stakeholders and suggested addressing existing concerns and issues raised by departments.

Regarding funding, she highlighted the challenge of upfront costs associated with grants and the need for clarity on reimbursement procedures. She also emphasized the importance of maintenance for equipment provided to departments, noting instances where equipment failures were not addressed. Stacey suggested exploring opportunities for collective procurement to address varying equipment needs among departments. She emphasized the importance of resolving these issues proactively to facilitate smoother implementation.

Allison suggested discussing the limitations and protocols related to funding with the highway safety office beforehand to ensure clarity and streamline the process. She highlighted the importance of exploring opportunities for upgrades through a new grant due in May and encouraged engaging with the highway safety office to access these resources effectively.

Ken proposed several tangible next steps for the agenda item. First, he suggested reaching out to representatives from judicial, the highway safety office, and CJIS to gauge their interest in participating in discussions about the adoption of technology and structuring an agenda for an initial meeting with the CPCA executive board to express concerns and interests. Additionally, he recommended conducting internal work to categorize the 19 holdout agencies by vendors and gathering feedback on the best approach for engagement. He committed to coordinating this effort and obtaining information from the respective vendors.

#### b. CT State Police Data Audit update

Ken shared the Finn Dixon and Herling LLP with members, intending to review recommendations relevant to the subcommittee's objectives. Ken emphasized the importance of a more in-depth discussion on these recommendations at the March meeting, underscoring their significance as good general practice guidelines.

Ken proposed that if there's no objection after reviewing the recommendations, he can highlight them for CSP as they begin to develop or formalize policies. Specifically, recommendations relating to enhancing supervision and auditing of data. Regarding training, there are suggestions for developing annual roll call training and in-person research sessions to emphasize the importance of data collection. In terms of technology, recommendations include considering requiring troopers to create written records of verbal warnings and retaining copies of written warnings.

Additionally, there's interest in GPS tracking and entering paper ticket numbers into the NextGen system. Efforts to minimize written tickets are ongoing, with a focus on e-citation tickets. The only legislative recommendation discussed is whether DMV should require adding a race

code to licenses, which is complex and being considered by the policy subcommittee. Ken will send the highlighted recommendations to CSP for further consideration, shaping potential future recommendations for the state.

#### IV. New Business

##### a. IntegrAssure Team Evaluation

Ken updated the Data Subcommittee on the IntegrAssure Team Evaluation. He received a detailed draft report focusing on best practices for data integrity and is reviewing it with Jim Fazzalano for a presentation at the March meeting. The report outlines actions for police departments, identifies system vulnerabilities, and offers recommendations. IntegrAssure will present to the full Advisory Board in April. Ken aims to share a draft report with the subcommittee before the March meeting. The assessment aims to enhance data quality and suggest feasible recommendations for statewide agencies. The final report, funded by grants, will be made public upon approval.

There was no further discussion, and the meeting was adjourned at 2:00 p.m.

Next Meeting: Tuesday, March 12, 2024, at 1:00 p.m.