Data Collection, Analysis, and Quality Subcommittee
Minutes

Tuesday, February 10, 2026
1:00 p.m. – 2:00 p.m.
Zoom

Attendance: James McGennis, Dr. Michael Mascari, Chief Vern Riddick, Kevin Neary, Jill Walsh

Staff: Ken Barone, Erica Escobar, Jim Fazzalaro

Guest: Matthew Ross

I. Welcome & Introductions

The meeting was called to order at 1:04 p.m.

II. Approval of the January 13, 2026, minutes

A motion was made and seconded to approve the meeting minutes of January 13, 2026. The minutes were approved unanimously.

III. Old Business

a. Data Schema Changes Roll Out

An update was shared on the Data Schema Changes Rollout. The new data fields are being successfully submitted by vendors, and no major issues have been identified. Validation rules for these fields are not yet being enforced and will be revisited after further assessment. Monitoring is primarily focused on NexGen due to its large user base.

Enforcement is temporarily delayed due to the limited remaining use of the COLLECT portal, which a small number of agencies still rely on to submit data. Rather than updating the system, remaining agencies are being transitioned to other platforms.

The group also clarified that the ZIP code field should be limited to U.S. ZIP codes when a valid ID is available and may be left blank if not. This guidance will be added to training documentation.

Next steps include continuing to monitor data submissions, completing the transition of remaining COLLECT users, updating and circulating training documentation for review, and reassessing the timing for enforcing validation rules once all agencies have transitioned.

b. 2025 End of Year Data Review

An update was shared on the 2025 end-of-year data review. Data cleaning for 2025 has largely been completed, with a more detailed report to be provided. Statewide traffic stops increased by approximately 8%, rising from about 413,000 in 2024 to 448,000 in 2025.

While overall enforcement increased, activity declined in the final quarter of 2025. After strong gains in the first half of the year, enforcement began to decrease around August, with notable declines in October through December, including a 12% statewide drop in October alone. This late-year decline was largely driven by state police, who experienced monthly decreases ranging from 20–35% in the second half of the year and ended 2025 approximately 10% below 2024 levels, with around 90,000 total stops.

In contrast, municipal police departments saw an overall increase of approximately 12%, rising from about 313,000 to over 350,000 stops, accounting for most of the statewide growth. However, municipal enforcement also slowed in the final quarter, leveling off compared to 2024.

Traffic stops have steadily increased each year since 2020, when enforcement dropped significantly during COVID-19 (approximately 250,000 stops annually), but remain below pre-pandemic levels (approximately 510,000 annually). While the upward trend continues, it remains unclear what the “new normal” will be for overall enforcement levels.

Seasonal trends and external factors, such as weather and federally funded enforcement initiatives, may influence fluctuations. For example, March and April typically see higher enforcement activity due to federal grant-funded campaigns, while colder winter months may contribute to temporary declines.

The team will continue monitoring trends into early 2026 to determine whether the late-year decline represents a temporary fluctuation or a broader shift in enforcement patterns.

IV. New Business

a. Mobility Data Analysis Presentation

A presentation was given by Matthew Ross on Mobility Data Analysis. The purpose was to share progress on applying mobility data to better estimate the racial composition of drivers, which could serve as a benchmark for evaluating traffic stop disparities. Matthew explained that the method uses anonymized GPS data from cell phones, provided by a telemetric data company. This data is fully anonymized and legally compliant and includes location pings that allow researchers to infer the share of drivers of different racial or ethnic backgrounds based on where they live, work, and shop. The data is calibrated using crash data where race is known to improve accuracy.

Initial applications of the method used Massachusetts State Police data because Massachusetts collects race information in crash records, whereas Connecticut does not. The analysis compared the telemetric method to census-based benchmarks, crash-based benchmarks, and the Veil of Darkness test. Census data often overstates disparities because it underestimates the share of minority drivers on specific roadways. Crash data produces results similar to telemetric data when calibrated, validating the approach. Veil of Darkness captures disparate treatment, but underestimates disparities compared to the telemetric method, which measures disparate impact, including race-neutral decisions that disproportionately affect certain groups.

It was highlighted that this method captures approximately 60 percent of the geographic and temporal variation in driver racial composition and tracks well with observed traffic stop data. He clarified that the measure reflects disparate impact rather than pure disparate treatment. While this provides a broader view of potential disparities, some of the disparity may reflect facially race-neutral enforcement decisions rather than explicit discrimination. He also noted that the current statute language in Connecticut asks for a comparison of the racial composition of stopped drivers to the population at the time and location of the stop, which is effectively a disparate impact measure and not a pure test of disparate treatment.

Concerns discussed included Connecticut's lack of race data in crash reports, which limits direct calibration. Alternatives being explored include using crash data from tickets where race is recorded, applying predictions from Massachusetts data to Connecticut, or refining proxies based on cell phone data. Matthew explained that the proxies rely on averages and inferred demographics, which could introduce measurement errors if not recalibrated with known race data. Additional discussion addressed the potential to refine the method to separate the measured

disparity into components reflecting disparate treatment versus race-neutral enforcement that has disproportionate impacts. There was also discussion about how these results should be presented publicly, given that the telemetric method may show larger disparities than Veil of Darkness.

Next steps include exploring ways to apply this method in Connecticut despite limitations in crash race data, developing a white paper to share initial findings and methodology with the advisory board, and continuing research to distinguish disparate impact from disparate treatment. The group agreed to share a working paper with the team to allow deeper examination of the method and data. Periodic check-ins are planned as research progresses, with the possibility of integrating these findings into future annual traffic stop analysis reports once the method is further validated.

b. DESPP State Police Data Portal

The topic was tabled for the next meeting.

c. Sigma Squared Data Tool

The topic was tabled for the next meeting.

V. General Discussion

The next meeting will be held in April, as no subcommittee meetings will take place in March due to public hearing month.

No further discussion occurred, and the meeting concluded at 2:00 p.m.