



Policy Subcommittee Minutes

Monday, November 3, 2025
10:00 a.m. – 11:00 a.m.
Zoom

Members Present: Tanya Hughes, Werner Oyanadel, Chelsea-Infinity Gonzalez, Chief Drumm, Michael Gailor

Staff: Ken Barone, Erica Escobar

I. Welcome & Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 10:03 a.m.

II. Approval of the October 6, 2025, meeting minutes

A motion to approve the October 6, 2025, meeting minutes was made, seconded, and approved unanimously.

III. Old Business

a. Review and finalize updated model policy

The committee reviewed and discussed the updated draft of the Model Data Integrity Policy, including revisions made since the previous meeting. Key updates included clarifying definitions for traffic stop, exigent circumstances, data integrity review, and enhanced supervision to ensure consistency with existing training and documentation. The definition of data integrity review was narrowed to focus specifically on racial profiling data rather than broader policing standards.

Additional changes were made to reflect feedback from prior meetings. The updated draft now frames audit elements, including the use of body-worn camera footage, as recommendations rather than requirements, providing flexibility for agencies based on available resources. Guidance was added for determining sample sizes, shifting from percentage-based requirements to a tiered recommendation structure. Reporting and compliance timelines were

revised from quarterly to biannual, and departments will now have up to 60 days to respond when corrective action is required.

Members discussed workload concerns, particularly related to reviewing body-worn camera footage, and emphasized ensuring that expectations remain realistic for departments of varying sizes. The revised language was viewed as a balanced approach, offering structure while allowing operational flexibility.

Following discussion, the subcommittee expressed general agreement that the updated draft reflects prior feedback and is ready to move forward. A motion was made and seconded, and the committee voted to approve the document as a formal recommendation. The next step will be to bring the revised policy to the full board, with parallel review by the Data Subcommittee prior to submission to the POST Council.

b. Review S.B. 1436, An Act Concerning Police and Department of Correction Data Reporting Requirements

The Policy Subcommittee reviewed S.B. 1436 and discussed whether to request that the Judiciary Committee raise only the section previously endorsed by the board, specifically the language addressing intentional falsification of police records related to racial profiling data. Members noted that other portions of the bill, including Department of Correction language, fall outside the subcommittee's scope and should not be included in the request.

It was acknowledged that the bill is unlikely to be raised without a formal request, given that it has already been introduced twice and this is a short legislative session. The subcommittee agreed to move forward with a narrow request focused solely on the previously approved language.

Next steps include pulling last session's bill language and a brief endorsement statement for review at the December meeting before forwarding the recommendation to the full board.

IV. New Business

a. Racial Profiling Statement

An update was provided on the racial profiling statement. The subcommittee noted that the draft was prepared following discussions about a recent U.S. Supreme Court decision in Los Angeles related to immigration enforcement and concerns that federal agents might use race in certain actions. The statement reaffirms Connecticut's longstanding commitment to prohibiting

racial profiling, highlights the state's accountability systems under the Alvin W. Penn Act, and clarifies that the Supreme Court decision applies only to federal enforcement and does not alter state or local law obligations.

Members raised questions and comments regarding the timeline for releasing the statement, noting that the decision occurred in September and by the time the statement is published, several months may have passed. Members emphasized the importance of clear communication, ensuring the language accurately reflects the subcommittee's intent, and avoiding overly legalistic wording. It was also noted that the statement should reassure the public that Connecticut law and local enforcement practices continue to prohibit racial profiling. Additional feedback included whether to explicitly reference the Supreme Court decision or related laws, such as the Trust Act.

The draft will be circulated to members for review and written feedback, with the goal of posting the finalized statement on CTRP3's website. Next steps include collecting comments and finalizing the statement for discussion and approval at the December meeting.

V. General Discussion

There was no general discussion.

There was no further discussion, and the meeting was adjourned at 11:00a.m.