1	
2	SANDY HOOK ADVISORY COMMISSION
3	MARCH 1, 2013
4	9:30 AM
5	Legislative Office Building
6	Hartford, CT
7	
8	
9	
10	SCOTT JACKSON, Committee Chair ADDRIENNE BENTMAN
11	RON CHIVINSKI ROBERT DUCIBELLA
12	TERRY EDELSTEIN KATHLEEN FLAHERTY
13	ALICE FORRESTER EZRA GRIFFITH
14	CHRIS LYDDY PATRICIA KEANEY-MARUCA
15	DENIS MCCARTHY BARBARA O'CONNOR
16	WAYNE SANDFORD HAROLD SCHWARTZ
17	TAROLD SCHWARIZ
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	CONNECTICUT COURT REPORTERS ASSOCIATION P.O. Box 914
23	Canton, CT 06019
24	
25	

1		AGENDA
2		
3	I.	Call to Order
4	II.	Connecticut State Police Presentation
5		Process of purchasing, transferring, or possessing a firearm
6 7		Regulations on storage and safeguarding weapons
8		Training and Qualifications for Certain Permits and Licenses
9 10	III.	Emergency Protocol by State and Local Police
11		Department of Emergency Services and Public Protection
12		Connecticut Police Chiefs Association
13	IV.	Use of Firearms in Today's Society: Concerns and Suggestions
14 15		Presentation by Dr. Brendan Campbell, Connecticut Children's Medical Center
16		Panel Discussion with Dr. Brendan Campbell, State Police, and Local Police
17	٧.	Other Business
18	VI.	Discussion
19	VII.	Adjournment
20		
21		
22		
23		
24		
25		

ROBERT DUCIBELLA: I don't know how to start to thank you for being here and for what you did. I honestly don't know -- I don't have words for that as a commissioner, but thank you.

I heard you mention "precious seconds" and I know we've heard from previous testimony how important tabletop exercises are, and training, and what I call interagency interoperability, that fancy word for all of you who wear a uniform to work together.

Question: Newtown is a small town, it was a big school. It would seem to make sense that wherever one could, train specific to the locale. I mean there's many different incident command systems, but they are set up so that you use, arrange, communicate resources, and it's a tool chest. But then applying them to a specific location is where you pick up the necessary time.

So the question I have for all three of you: Would it make sense for there to be on a mandatory basis -- and I can't identify the schedule, whether it's once every six months or once every year -- a tabletop exercise where an active shooter scenario is -- I hate the term -- played out in a

school? Does that buy time? Does that -- are precious seconds saved by staging an event that simulates? We heard this from Colorado. You folks were in the thick of this. You actually were there. Does it make sense for that to be something that is legislated, i.e., every school? CHIEF MICHAEL KEHOE: Well, here's what we had done before this for training. I should have maybe elaborated a little bit more on that. ROBERT DUCIBELLA: Please, I did not

mean to impugn anything that you did that day. I'm looking for, as a commissioner, a process where we learn from that terrible experience and we then inform others that there is a requirement for schools and the responding communities to not only be aware of the incident command system and how you marshal resources, but to actually in the school environment conduct that exercise because the seconds are so important. And I'm sorry to repeat myself.

CHIEF MICHAEL KEHOE: No, no, I understand your question, and I can give you just a little bit of a foundation for that.

My answer would be that we had trained similar -- you call it a tabletop exercise; I would say it's more realistic than that. We had what you call

Simunitions training. And that's really where we think 1 2 about actually using our weapons, but it's Simunitions, 3 so you're not really actually firing bullets, you're firing paintballs. And it gives you the real life, as 4 much as real life as you can as a police officer to 5 determine the stress levels that you're going to feel 6 when this type of call comes in. This is an active 7 shooter call. This could be an officer involved call. 8 Okay? One of the highest stress level calls a police 9 10 officer can have -- okay? -- when dealing with an 11 incident. But we want to be able to create that for 12 the officer so that the mistakes they make in training 13 is not repeated when these incidents have to be dealt 14 with. So we had practiced with our Simunitions and had 15 actually gone to abandoned buildings in Newtown to do 16 the training. And, again, that's where we all trained, everybody from the chief on down. 17 18 So the only thing I would say that we didn't do was train in those facilities where we may 19 20 have to go. 21 ROBERT DUCIBELLA: Yeah, you're sort of 22 referencing a fact situation, a firearms training 23 simulation. 24 CHIEF MICHAEL KEHOE: Right.

25 ROBERT DUCIBELLA: And my real question

to you is: Since I hear about seconds, and there's some terrible statistics that one of you mentioned about a life every 15 seconds. That's just unacceptable.

As architects we can do things to design so that it takes time for people to get into buildings, and that might help, but there's no perfect security. So does it make sense for a recommendation to come out of this commission in your opinion for the simulation plan to be conducted less generically -- not that that doesn't have extraordinary value, as you mentioned -- but perhaps in the actual environment in our schools? That's my question.

CHIEF MARC MONTMINY: I would like to suggest to you perhaps that you gear it more towards school personnel. Every year, multiple times a year, most school systems do fire drills. And they have gotten so good at fire drills that no student has died in a school-based fire I believe in 50 years.

How often do they drill for an active shooter? And in some jurisdictions, that's never.

Those of you who may be old enough to remember, at one point in time we were taught to shelter under our desks for the fear of nuclear attack. Some of you may be old enough to remember that. And then we started doing

fire drills on a routine basis. And so that today the 1 2 kids can do the fire drills in their sleep with their eyes closed. And that's good, it saves lives. 3 But now I think we need to start 4 5 mandating that school systems drill for this kind of safety as well. I call it a good and a bad plan. 6 good plan is get out of Dodge, and the bad plan is 7 bunker and defend. And there has to be ways to make 8 sure that doors can be secured, kids can be sheltered. 9 10 And they have to practice that I think in order to make 11 it reality when something really does happen. 12 ROBERT DUCIBELLA: Would you advocate --13 because I want to turn this over to Commissioner 14 Chivinski -- would you advocate that those exercises take place in the presence of and with the support of 15 law enforcement? 16 17 CHIEF MARC MONTMINY: Yes, and --ROBERT DUCIBELLA: Thank you very much. 18 19 CHIEF MARC MONTMINY: That's what happens in Manchester. 20 21 ROBERT DUCIBELLA: Thank you. CHIEF MATTHEW REED: If I could just add 22 briefly that the statute within the last two years that 23

deals with school fire drills was modified or amended

to include as one of their fire drills a "crisis

24

drill." Obviously, the schools have to prepare for all hazards, not just shooters, but they have to prepare for all sorts of other weather-related hazards and other instances that could occur.

- So there has been, I think the legislature has certainly been cognizant of that need and has set forth the replacement of at least one fire drill with one of these crisis drills, and that they are to work in cooperation with the local public safety organizations.
 - So I think you'll see there is some framework for that. That's not say it can't be made better, but there is some framework for that that's been contemplated.
 - thank you. And if there are recommendations which may come back -- and I like what you said -- things can always be improved. And if there are things that we learn from Newtown that can inform that legislation, I'd like to make a request of you gentlemen, if you wouldn't mind, to codify that and perhaps pass it on to the chair.
- It's great to hear that it's out there.

 We just had a terrible event. We always need to learn

 from that. And if you have a sense that there's some

additions to that, and I realize you're in the public 1 2 service domain, but so are we. CHIEF MATTHEW REED: Right. 3 ROBERT DUCIBELLA: If there were 4 5 recommendations that we could hear from you through the chair on what you might see as making that better, I'd 6 like to ask you to do that, please. 7 8 CHIEF MATTHEW REED: Absolutely. ROBERT DUCIBELLA: Thank you very much. 9 10 RON CHIVINSKI: I actually conduct that 11 nuclear training with my students every year, getting 12 under the desk. 13 Seriously, concerning these Simunitions 14 training and going into the facilities, just to reiterate: Do you think there would be benefit? We 15 16 heard from John Barry, the Aurora superintendent in Colorado, that they conduct full-blown drills every 17 18 year not necessarily with the students, but with all 19 the players; the schools, law enforcement, emergency responders, leaving so much with the buses, sending 20 them if they're in a certain vicinity one way, another 21 22 vicinity another way. Do you believe that would help, and is 23

24 anyone currently doing that type of integration in the state currently?

1 CHIEF MATTHEW REED: To answer very 2 generally, it does occur from place to place. In South 3 Windsor we did a large-scale drill two years ago that included one of our elementary schools. We did the 4 Simunitions training utilizing not only our local 5 response officers, but also a Capitol Region Emergency 6 Services Team, the CRES Team, which is an amalgam of 7 emergency responders from around the capital region. 8 And we used one of our schools. It was during the 9 10 summer. We had some volunteer students that came in 11 and acted as victims and helped us out. We integrated our fire department and our emergency medical service 12 13 in that. I can't recall if we had school buses involved or not. 14 But I say that only to say that that's 15 16 perhaps a fair representation of things that are happening in different locations around the state. Not 17 18 everybody is able to do it. Simunitions are expensive. 19 Not everybody is able to have that technology available to do it. 20

But I certainly think it is a viable way of training. It's a great way of getting your officers to know your facilities and getting them to work cooperatively with other officers from around the region. So we certainly support that concept.

21

22

23

24

We as chiefs, at least I know up in the capital region and also the other regions around the state, look to train not just as their own in-agency, but with the surrounding agencies as often as possible. Because we all see the benefits of magnifying the size of our force and getting everybody to know and train together. So it is very beneficial and it is occurring from place to place throughout the state. MR. CHAIRMAN: If I can follow up on

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I can follow up on that just a moment. There are circumstances where local resources will be overwhelmed. Can you talk a little bit about deployment versus self-deployment and communications interoperability from your experience?

CHIEF MARC MONTMINY: Yeah, I guess I'll start that off.

Everybody's experience was slightly different, but as times goes by, I'm hoping it's getting better and better. And what happened in Manchester is initially the call went out for help from surrounding towns, and eventually the call went out for help from anybody. And what happened is we were inundated with personnel before we had an opportunity to set up logistics.

And when I say that, I mean think about, for example, what happened in 9/11. We were prepared

to get 30 or 40 cops together and send them to New York City. And at some point New York said: Stop. Please don't. We have no place to put these guys, we have no place to feed them, we have no place to bed them down. Don't send them right now. We know that the support is available, we'll get a hold of you.

Manchester went through, we put the call out for help and we got such a tremendous response, at some point we needed to stage certain resources and just have them stand by. At some point we might need dogs. At some point we might need a fire marshal. If you recall, the building was set on fire in addition to the act of shooting. There was going to be bomb squads needed. But we couldn't simply have everybody come right to the scene.

So one of my concerns after HDI is I went to the Capitol Region Chiefs of Police and said:

Look, we kind of need a system so that everybody knows what is expected of them; they know where to go, they know on what channel to communicate, and so on and so forth.

And what we did is we learned our lesson from our brothers in fire. They have a fire ground channel, and they have a support channel, and they use

the incident command process on a much more frequent basis than we do. And we have to kind of develop these procedures. And that's what we did.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So now the Capitol Region has a plan in place called the Blue Plan. And the Blue Plan says if you're called to Bloomfield, here's what surrounding towns are going to be requested at Stage 1. turns into a Stage 2 event, these other towns are going to be expected to send this many, this many, this many. And a Stage 3 event, it even gets further and further. You're told what frequency to respond on and where you should stage, and things of that nature. Because we've had two situations, the hostage situation in South Windsor and the beer distributorship in Manchester were only separated by, what, 4 or 5 miles perhaps. And in both of those scenarios, there was tons and tons of responders that had to be managed. And so the result of that is we have this Blue Plan now that we're trying to make sure that everybody understands and follows.

And I would hope that as these scenarios happen, we're more logical in our response.

Everybody's gut reaction is: If I can get there quick,
I may be able to save lives. And that's something that all first responders I think share. And so the need to get there right away becomes paramount.

end in ten or 15 minutes. They're over with almost as soon as they start. And that's why we talk about the immediate confrontation. The plan is to confront as quickly as humanly possible. So we do have a need for the immediate response, but by the same token, as the situation expands, we need to provide logistics to make sure that we have people, no one is unaccounted for, and everybody knows what resources they have.

And perhaps Chief Kehoe can comment.

CHIEF MICHAEL KEHOE: In the initial first few seconds of the 911 call to our center, the Newtown center, both of our communications officers were now detached to the job of answering to two calls that did come from inside the school. That meant they had to multitask, and that meant they couldn't take other calls. Okay? They are, you know, those calls that they could not answer would be rolled over to another 911 center.

We also know that landline calls come into the police department, cell phones go into the state police, which in this particular case helped us immensely because when you have to make that call to the state police, they knew what was going on, all right, so they could automatically dispatch from that

location.

Now you talk about what happened with the local law enforcement where we didn't have enough time to call them because, again, we were getting information directly from those callers inside the building to help us tactically with the call. They --some of those 911 calls will roll over to other local law enforcement, therefore, they're going to know what's going on or they have the radio frequencies in their cars.

So when it came to deployment, we hardly made any calls for deployment, for help. We didn't have the staffing to do that. That's what's going to happen in a small agency. That's what's going to happen when you only have two or possibly three communications officers on duty at one time and you know everyone is going to be calling in. Everyone calls in. And some of them are going to be critical callers, and others are going to be questioning callers: What's going on? Okay? Yet you still have to deal with those.

So the deployment part initially worked because of the interoperability that we have, the unique way law enforcement is set up in Connecticut, that we all know each other very well, we all work

together, and, you know, being on the scene, you know 1 2 your partners a lot. You may not know who they are, 3 but you recognize their patches; you recognize where they're from and that they've been trained similarly, 4 certified very similarly, so we're all going to respond 5 in an appropriate manner, in a professional manner. 6 ALICE FORRESTER: Thank you for 7 everything that you've done. 8 You mentioned a couple of things. One 9 10 is the Blue Plans. Is that across the state? You 11 mentioned up in your area, but does each region have a 12 Blue Plan in terms of connecting in these incident 13 responses? 14 CHIEF MARC MONTMINY: Yeah. The Blue 15 Plan that I spoke of is a Capitol Region Chiefs 16 Initiative and I believe it only is with departments of the Capitol Region. I'm unaware if other regions 17 18 within Connecticut have implemented it. 19 CHIEF MATTHEW REED: I can't speak for other regions beyond the Capitol Region. I know that 20 the president of the Connecticut Police Chiefs 21 22 Association and many of the key players are part of the Capitol Region. And this may be a pilot project to see 23

literally going to adopt it officially within the next

how this works out with all the agencies. We're

24

1 few weeks now that we've gotten all the responses down.

2 And I think if we see that effective, it will then move

on to other regions in the state to see if it's

4 applicable to the way they do business.

ALICE FORRESTER: Thank you. I have a second part of the question: You mentioned, I mean time, I'm hearing time is of the utmost essence. And in your recommendations you talk about panic alarms with caution. I wonder, you mentioned the barriers. Every single barrier, you know, takes seconds away, those precious seconds. I wonder if you could name some of the barriers that you wish were there or that you feel really were tremendously important or are important in any of these experiences.

CHIEF MICHAEL KEHOE: One of the things that Sandy Hook School had, okay, and I know from firsthand experience because I was a youth officer in our community for many, many years and entered that school to teach D.A.R.E. classes, this is 20 years ago. And I will tell you that of all the schools that are in the community of Newtown, Sandy Hook was probably one of the safest based upon their principal's willingness to take that extra effort to make their kids as safe as possible, make their faculty as safe as possible. So even 20 years ago when I would enter into the school,

although I wasn't buzzed in at the time, I would enter school, I would go first and foremost, because of all the signs there were in place, to the front office. I would sign in, what I was doing, and actually even if I was in uniform, I would get a little name tag and I would put that on. I felt that was so important for them to administer that safety program at that time and that they felt that way.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

Over the years, they increased their security by having a buzzer system that automatically locked doors, every door in the building, okay? That buzzer system took time to breach. Because it did, it saved lives. We talk about other, you know, the confronting, the principal confronting. Well, we all know, even back 20 years ago, the principal in that school at that time wanted all of his teachers to confront anybody in that school who did not belong, to say, "Can I help you?" You're confronting somebody. Even if they're walking around, okay, looking for their If they didn't have a name tag on, we know that they had no reason to be there. Of course, if they've got a name tag on and they were going to a classroom, they would be notifying that teacher, giving them directions, or maybe even giving them an escort.

So there's a lot of security measures

```
that are personnel based, and there's obviously
 1
 2
     security measures that can be let's say structurally
     based. And every one is important.
 3
                    I'm not an expert in that to tell you
 4
     that this is what I would like to see. But I know that
 5
     each barrier, each thing that has to happen before you
 6
     enter a school becomes time.
 7
                    RON CHIVINSKI: This is to the
 8
     Connecticut Police Chiefs Association:
 9
10
                    Testimony, I was very happy to see
     testimony laid before me today to the subcommittee
11
     dated January 25th. And it's about barriers and,
12
13
     specifically, locks. And in here I just want to get on
14
     record, it says, "Interior locks are important in that
15
     they control access throughout the inside of the
     facility. Lock hardware on classroom doors should
16
     allow the classroom and other rooms to be locked from
17
18
     the inside. This allows the user to quickly lock the
19
     door during a crisis without exposing himself and
20
     students to hallway hazards."
21
                    As my fellow commissioners know, I feel
    very strongly about that. Could you speak any more to
22
23
     that, what led you to that recommendation?
```

recommendation that's existed for some time. It

CHIEF MATTHEW REED:

It's a

certainly wasn't novel when I wrote it into this document. Just some background on this document: This was to -- it wasn't actually to Sandy Hook Advisory Panel, it was the other school safety subcommittee. But we wanted to be uniform in our message that we've supported throughout the legislative process, and that's why both of these documents you'll see are to different committees and have different names on them. But I wanted you to be aware that the message is very much the same.

And I offered this particular document on the school security and it reflects very much what we've done with our Safe Schools Initiative in South Windsor since 2006.

The interior locking of doors I know I think from an educator's standpoint can be somewhat controversial. Certainly from a fire marshal's standpoint, it can be somewhat controversial. But it has been shown and I think when the report of what happened at the elementary school in Sandy Hook is revealed we perhaps will see that that was very instrumental in creating delays. That was the inability of the shooter to get into other rooms throughout the building.

So we feel very strongly that there

should be the capability of securing the room from the 1 2 inside without exposing students or the teacher to any 3 hallway hazard. But we are also very cognizant of the fact that should there suddenly be a fire hazard, 4 people need to be able to get out of that room. 5 certainly any hardware needs to meet the recommendation 6 of the fire marshal in that with a single action, 7 you're able to release that lock and get people out of 8 the room should they need to suddenly find themselves 9 10 in a position where they can actually escape. 11 fleeing is certainly one of the options when faced with 12 some sort of a hazard inside the school. 13 RON CHIVINSKI: Agreed. But you would 14 make that recommendation as the Connecticut Police Chiefs Association not just in Newtown, but to all 15 16 schools in Connecticut; correct? 17 CHIEF MATTHEW REED: Yes. 18 RON CHIVINSKI: Thank you. 19 One last question, and this goes to all of you: Again, it's been mentioned that there's been 20 21 discussion of greater integration between various 22 agencies, including the school districts, the municipalities, law enforcement, emergency responders 23 24 for conducting these full-blown drills. Would it in

your opinion benefit us, as we've heard prior

testimony, for, for example, law enforcement to have access in advance to school emergency procedures, as confidential as they need to be kept, and school floor plans, et cetera?

CHIEF MATTHEW REED: I think it's beneficial. I can speak specifically for our community, and we do have access to that. We work very much in partnership with our superintendent and board of education. We've always had a very good working relationship. Like Chief Kehoe, I also was a D.A.R.E. instructor 23 years ago. He and I were trained together at the same time, as a matter of fact, and was in and out of our schools on a daily basis and had a very good working relationship.

And when you talk about barriers, I think that some of the barriers that exist, although they are beginning to come down, are people. And we can't legislate relationships. And the academic world and police world are two very different worlds that have to collide from time to time. And sometimes it is a collision that can be somewhat noisy. And I don't know how you change that. I think it is changing now with events that have occurred over the past decade in schools and schools are understanding that police want to be helpers and they want to get into the schools and

they want to help them with their planning. I know I learned a tremendous amount. I was surprised at how much they already knew and how many programs had already existed through the school community, not just in our community, but I mean schools, education in general, steps that are taken and how teachers and administrators are trained to protect their students, and I was comforted by that.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

But I think one of the things that we all need to see going forward is more of an ongoing relationship; not just a once a year because we're going do our mandated crisis drill, but an ongoing relationship. And I think part of that is having a key person from the police department who can work collaboratively with the leaders and decision-makers of the local board of education and school system in giving advice to their emergency plans. I'm not saying that the police have all of the absolute answers, but certainly should be consulted. Because it's important for the officers who are arriving at the school to know what kind of action is that school doing. When you arrive at a school that's in lockdown, quess what? You can't get in. So now your first responders, your medical crew, your fire crew, and your police officers have to go back to their car and get some kind of a

tool in order to break into the school.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So how do you overcome that? You overcome that by working collaboratively and saying: Listen, we'll have key fobs that electronically can get us into the doors of the school. But you have to come up with solutions like that. But I think that's where the collaboration really is effective. Understanding what kind of security systems are in place and what is the expectation of the officer that shows up. And, conversely, what's the expectation of the school staff? I think the education of the staff is important, too. What can they expect when an officer shows up? school staff should understand what our active shooter response is. That when the officer shows up, their first priority is not to render aid to those that are injured, but in fact to go towards the shooting or the sound wherever that crisis is occurring to make the crisis stop. The teachers and the staff need to know that so they're not later saying: Oh, the police officer was stepping over injured children and I just can't believe how heartless they were. But they need to understand that that's the way they're trained and that there's a reason for it.

So I certainly think there's room for a lot more collaboration between police leaders and

educational leaders.

BARBARA O'CONNOR: Thank you, gentlemen.

Chief Reed, I have a question for you, and I think you're particularly well suited to answer this in that you're also an attorney, and I think the commission should know that. And I know you spent a lot of time studying the permitting issues, and we

heard a lot of testimony earlier.

One of your recommendations is to eliminate the Board of Firearms Permit Examiners. So can you explain that a little bit, and directly talk about your experience? And I know you've actually analyzed the law and are well aware of, you know, why this is happening. So I'm wondering if you could share that with us.

CHIEF MATTHEW REED: Right. I know there were some questions asked of Detective Mattson from the state police earlier on this issue. And one of the concepts we as the Chiefs of Police have supported is some sort of reorganization of the Firearm Board of Permit Examiners.

We as local police chiefs are the issuing authorities for pistol permits. And, again, as we saw in the earlier presentation from the state police, you need permits for pistols and revolvers.

You do not under the existing law need permits for long guns, for shotguns, but only for pistols and revolvers. And those permits are channeled through a local issuing authority, which in communities where there's a police chief, it is the chief of police.

So we have been frustrated through the years of the results that we've seen from the Board of Firearm Permit Examiners. We don't know whether, from the discussions we've had, whether elimination is completely the appropriate step, because certainly people have the right to appeal of any governmental decision and there should be some tribunal they go to to explain why they think the issuing authority is wrong. But perhaps that could be reconstituted, and maybe there should be some folks a little more suited to help evaluate the suitability of an applicant.

You know, as the issuing authority, one of the standards in the law is, is the applicant a suitable person? And then there's no real definition of what "suitability" is. You saw from the slide the state police put up there are a number of things that you can consider. So one of our, one of the concepts that we have supported is expanding that suitability standard so that it's articulated in the statute. We all know that statutes are there to put people on

notice of what the expectations are, and it provides help for us as issuing authorities. What can we consider when we are considering if somebody is suitable to have a permit? We'd like to be able to consider things beyond what currently exist in the four corners of the statute. The statute, as you heard before, talks about are you convicted of a felony, convicted of any disqualifying misdemeanors, are you the subject of a protective order or a restraining order, have you been involved in a domestic -- crime of domestic violence.

We'd like to expand that a bit more so that we can consider anything that we think is reasonably necessary to consider when determining somebody's suitability. Who else lives in the home? Do you live in the home with somebody who would be disqualified from having a weapon? Can we disqualify you even though you may otherwise be qualified, but perhaps you live with somebody who is a convicted felon. Should we be able to disqualify you as a result of that relationship that you have? Maybe we should. We should at least be able to consider it. Should we be able to consider any other contacts that you've had with the police, even if they haven't resulted in arrest or a conviction? We want to broaden that idea

of suitability.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

The other thing that I want to point out is that the only place in the statute where suitability is considered is the initial issue of a temporary permit to carry a pistol or revolver, that 60-day permit. After that, suitability is not included in the Here's what I mean: Five years later when you law. renew that pistol permit, suitability is not considered. They do what's called a background check, which is a computerized database search. They don't even positively identify you through fingerprints. They don't do a fingerprint search for criminal history. They just type in your name and your date of birth -- and I'm not saying that this is, they're wrong; they're just complying with the law. They put in your name and your date of birth and see if you have any criminal convictions, if you've been committed by order of the probate court within the past 12 months, and they look at some very specific database items to decide whether you qualify. The issue of suitability is not mentioned in the statute for renewal of your pistol permit. The suitability standard is not mentioned for an eligibility certificate. You can get

an eligibility certificate so that you can possess a

weapon in your house or possess a weapon in your place
of work. But the suitability standard doesn't exist
there either. Again, it's just a computerized check of
the databases to see if you've been convicted of a
felony, or any of the disqualifying misdemeanors, or
any of those few other articulated things that are in
the statute.

So we as the Chiefs of Police have asked for some more uniformity when it comes to the permitting process. One, shouldn't there be permits for all firearms, not just pistols and revolvers? Shouldn't you have to engage in the same process to get a shotgun or to get any of these sporting rifles? And shouldn't that process include some check of your "suitability"? When it's time to renew, should there be some level of suitability check that's done beyond just the computerized database check?

So we've supported a number of these concepts because the permitting process is really something that we as local chiefs own. It's the one thing that we can really have an impact on when it comes to who lawfully possesses a firearm.

BARBARA O'CONNOR: So, Chief, do you have those in writing anywhere, and would you be able to supply those to us for specific recommendations

beyond what we have here?

CHIEF MATTHEW REED: We do. And that may be what is in the -- you see one handout I have to the Bipartisan Task Force on Gun Violence Prevention and Safety. That should show all the concepts that we supported when it came to the gun safety. I asked the clerk to distribute that to the members of the commission so you could reference that.

BARBARA O'CONNOR: Okay. Thanks.

CHIEF MATTHEW REED: Chief, if you find there's something more that's beyond that that I spoke of, I can certainly put that in writing and get that to you and members of the commission.

BARBARA O'CONNOR: Okay. I was thinking specifically about your suitability. I scanned this real quick, I didn't see that in there. But if it's in there, great.

CHIEF MATTHEW REED: Okay.

BARBARA O'CONNOR: I have two other questions, if the folks don't mind. This is for all three of the chiefs:

I'm wondering if you can talk about from your perspectives things that you feel we could pass in legislation that will, you know, be sort of force multipliers in terms of jurisdictional issues or any

concerns you have there.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHIEF MATTHEW REED: One of the issues that's come before the legislature for many years is the idea of statewide authority for police officers. There's always a question of where does the authority of a police officer end. Well, there's really not a question. Really, the law says you're a police officer in your community and that's it. Except for Connecticut General Statute 54-1f, which says if you are a police officer in the state of Connecticut and you are anywhere in the state of Connecticut and somebody commits a felony in your presence or you have probable cause to believe somebody has committed a felony, you can make an arrest. But that's for a felony crime, which is our most serious crimes. That's been in existence from 1949, probably even before that. And that's been applied without any issues through the years.

What's come up in recent years when we deal with service sharing, sharing police resources across town borders, is the ability for police to act as police officers beyond felonies; misdemeanors, violations, infractions, or whatever other instances where there are for the police to take enforcement action. There's no statute that authorizes a police

officer to enforce those types of laws beyond their jurisdiction, which can be challenging.

Now I don't know whether this created any challenges in the Newtown situation or the Hartford Distributors situation. But certainly there are chiefs who question sending out an officer to another community to render aid, especially after the emergency passes. Where does the officer stand as far as their authority?

You know, I think as a resident, driving around the state, when you see a police officer, whether it says Monroe or Norwalk or Norwich or South Windsor or Manchester on the side, you probably figure that that police officer can do whatever they need to do as a police officer to uphold the law.

Unfortunately, our statutory structure doesn't allow that. They only allow the police officer to take action outside of their geographical jurisdiction if they see a felony being committed. So if you witness some sort of a larceny or a crime of domestic violence, you can't take action if you are outside of your jurisdiction, which is frustrating and kind of ties the hand of law enforcement.

Connecticut, I don't want to say we're unique, but because we don't have any kind of a county

1 system, really the only ones who have broad power 2 across town borders are the state police, state capitol 3 police actually have statewide powers for all police powers throughout the state, and really that's it. The 4 Department of Environmental Protection has some. 5 They're even battling now to have our motor vehicle 6 inspectors have statewide arrest powers because 7 although they are police officers, they're only allowed 8 to enforce motor vehicle statutes. They pull over 9 10 somebody for speeding and they have marijuana in the 11 car, guess what? The motor vehicle inspector can 12 arrest them; they've got to call a trooper, which is 13 fine, the trooper is great, does a great job, but now 14 we have two people who really have equal training and one can make the arrest and the other can't. 15 16 So, from a law enforcement standpoint, it becomes kind of frustrating for a local law 17 18 enforcement, that if I need to go to the Newtown or I 19 need to go to Manchester, or I need to go to Vernon, it 20 would be nice to know that because I wear this badge 21 that says you're a police officer in the state of 22 Connecticut, shouldn't I have all of the authority that you would expect a police officer to have throughout 23

the state? So that certainly has been a challenge

through the years for Connecticut municipal police

24

officers.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHIEF MICHAEL KEHOE: And if I could just follow up on that, because that became an issue here in Newtown. Because after the critical event was over, we needed to have a lot of law enforcement in our town because we were dealing with so many different things; daily threats to our community, we had multiple funerals, wakes and internments to handle. wanted to make sure that each one of those was given the dignity and the respect that they deserved. also had memorials being set up all over town. Traffic was a nightmare that, you know, we could not handle. Yet we were still dealing with an investigation, and we still had to secure two crime scenes. We had three commands posts. You can imagine the amount of law enforcement that was, you know, situated in the town of Newtown from those two weeks thereafter. And one of the command posts was just operational, just to get through the things that we needed to do. And that meant we needed to have or deploy 60 to 120 officers on a given day for a given shift to handle all the things that we were going to handle that day. We deploy in Newtown anywhere from four to ten officers a day. you can see that we were taxed. And we were bringing in officers from as far away as Stonington, Greenwich,

```
UConn -- thank you -- and other communities that were
 1
 2
     just, they were coming. And I know at one point the
 3
     question came to me, one of the hundreds of questions
     that came to me during that week was: Are they covered
 4
     from a liability standpoint? Our mutual aid compact
 5
     was Fairfield County. But we knew we needed more than
 6
     Fairfield County to handle this incident. And that
 7
    became an issue.
 8
                    I think we just did it and we knew we
 9
10
    had to do it because that's what law enforcement does.
11
     And we were going to worry about it later on and pick
12
     up the pieces later.
13
                    MR. CHAIRMAN:
                                   Thank you. I want to
14
     take a quick time check. We have a few more minutes.
15
                    BARBARA O'CONNOR: Chief Reed, do you
16
     have specific recommendations for legislation and can
17
    you get that to us?
                    CHIEF MATTHEW REED: I can get it to you
18
19
     in writing, the legislation that we've supported in the
    past that would provide statewide arrest powers for not
20
     just felonies, but also misdemeanors and other
21
22
     violations throughout the state that would assist in
     extending the authority of municipal police officers.
23
24
                    BARBARA O'CONNOR: Thank you. Police
```

officers in general. I just want to make sure you

1 don't leave us out.

CHIEF MATTHEW REED: We always include the universities. Yes, absolutely important.

DENIS McCARTHY: Thank you very much for coming. I want to just take a second to recognize and honor the police officers who responded to your incidents. The scars that they bear they bear for the rest of their lives. And speaking for the fire service, I can say that we appreciate the opportunity to work with you collaboratively under unified command, to support and maybe multiply your effectiveness from a rear position during events like these. I think that we as public safety have come a long way to support each other very effectively.

I'm concerned about the long-term impact on first responders and am curious if you have any insight on what we need to consider so that first responders who bear the brunt of some of these incidents in the response community, how we care for them long term so they can be effective first responders for a long career post-incident.

CHIEF MICHAEL KEHOE: I can handle that.

I mean I'm living it right now with my staff. And

certainly I would think that the other responding

people from the agencies, whether it be law

enforcement, EMS, or fire service, because we all were there, we all have different roles, but we all kind of understood what was going on and knew that it was a catastrophic event. So there's going to be an impact on multiple levels. That's not even talking about the impact on the teachers and students in that school.

So you can see that clearly we need to start thinking along those lines, that if this type of event should ever happen -- and I wish it doesn't -- however, history will show us and experience will show us and if you do the numbers, active shooter situations in the United States of America are increasing every year. We're going to have these over and over and over again. And make no mistake about it; unless we do something about it, we're going to continue to have them. And they may get worse before they get better. And that scares me as a law enforcement officer, it scares me as a first responder because now we're going to be thinking about this.

So, you know, our action is so important now that not only to prevent it, but if it does happen, we're situated to handle that mental health aspect.

And, again, I don't have an answer for you, other than maybe we should set up a fund that just talks to that mental health. And we know that, and I'm

sure you've gotten a lot of information from previous days that you've had these hearings, the mental health physicians that you've heard from, the experts in those fields, it's something you can't put your hand around, but you know it's there, you know you need to do work on it, and you know you need to some have something, some systems in place to deal with that. And I don't have all those answers for you, but I know that we have to do something for that specifically too, in addition to some of the other things, important things that we talked about today.

CHIEF MATTHEW REED: I think I would simply say that from a statutory perspective, as far as recommendations, and we've seen a number of recommendations already proposed, when it comes to workers' compensation and being able to cover those who are somewhat disabled as a result of witnessing these types of traumatic events, we support that. We support some sort of legislation that would provide some safety net, some ongoing compensation so that those who are devastated by this type of an event can continue to be compensated in some form, perhaps rehabilitated, and hopefully returned to their job at some point, if that's appropriate.

KATHLEEN FLAHERTY: And, Chief Montminy,

I'm wondering -- and thank you all for the information you've given us so far today. And I'd just like to echo what the Chief said, knowing the impact of these kind of events on our first responders. But also I know we've been talking a lot today, focusing on the active shooter events. But also the interaction that police departments have with folks who are experiencing mental health crises, which sometimes are a different kind of active event.

What kind of training have you instituted in your department in Manchester for dealing with those kind of events? If I can just indulge a moment of the commission's time, because we often deal -- we've been asked to focus on that, too, and the impact on people who are dealing with the mental health system because -- would you recommend that other departments institute that kind of training, too?

CHIEF MARC MONTMINY: Yes. We call these EDP calls, emotional disturbed person calls. And we have done a statistical trend and noticed that over the last several years, our number of calls for EDPs has continued to climb and climb and climb. 2012 Manchester police responded to 1,025 EDP calls. Just in the one year, over a thousand EDP calls.

And several years ago I came to the

realization that this is a growing trend and that this is a situation that law enforcement is typically untrained or unprepared for. So what I did is I brought in the CIT model training that originated in New London, I believe, and we have I believe 38 officers now who are trained CIT officers. And what they do is they receive specific training in how to deal with people in emotional crisis. And I suggest that that training should be given to every police officer. It's a self-preservation thing. The better trained you are in how to determine who is emotionally disturbed and how to best deal with them, it's really, not only is it beneficial to the individual, but it's an officer safety issue.

How many times have we heard about people either forcing police officers to shoot them or getting involved in some kind of a suicide-by-cop ordeal where had the proper tactics been used, they could have been defused.

And so we did, in Manchester, we did it out of necessity. Our numbers were simply so high that we felt that we had to get our officers trained in how to better deal with the emotionally disturbed population. And so we did it out of necessity. But it has been tremendous. And now we've got many of our

street patrol officers are trained and we get kudos
from other agencies on how we dealt with emotional
disturbed people and now we're getting to the point now
we're getting phone calls from other agencies wanting
to know how to implement the same system under their
municipality. So it's been very productive.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We've got one

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you. We've got one final question.

RON CHIVINSKI: We as a commission kind of went round and round with the last presenter. It could have been all the weapons up on the counter that got us excited. But we were trying to pin down, you know, did they feel -- I was trying to pin down -- did they feel the definition for assault weapons was adequate. And I see here in -- again, you had referenced Connecticut Police Chiefs Association
Bipartisan Task Force Testimony on Gun Violence and Prevention and Children's Safety. There's a lot of I guess you'd call them recommendations. And it says, "Review state statutes to either expand or ban the sale of assault-type weapons."

Again, we had many different weapons here up on the counter, many -- I was raised around guns in Pennsylvania, many I have handled when I was young, when I was a teenager. But there seems to be a

fine line between does it have this feature or two of those features and how do you get around that. There was also a Glock on the counter. And it could have a ten-magazine clip, 15, all the way up to 40.

So my question to all of you is: Where do you see the line and how would you in your professional opinion expand that definition? Thank you.

CHIEF MARC MONTMINY: This is what I was talking to you about before. You know, I don't want to speak for the Connecticut Police Chiefs, but I sense that some common sense needs to be added to this equation. Right now we're in a situation where if you add this or subtract that from seemingly identical weapons, it makes it legal or illegal. We're quickly approaching the point where as long as it's painted green, we're good and if it's not, then it's not an assault weapon.

We need a better working definition of what an assault rifle is. But also I think that there are certain common-sense things that need to be put in place. I'm speaking just for myself, not for Connecticut Chiefs of Police. But I don't believe that any purchase of firearm should be had without the benefit of a background check. And I think we should

move to ban certain things that nobody would ever need under normal circumstances. Why are incendiary bullets legal? Why are armor-piercing bullets legal? Why are bullets designed to pierce police officers' bullet-proof vests legal? Why are they commonly

available?

Do you realize -- maybe you don't realize. You can order 1,000 rounds of ammunition for an assault rifle and have it drop-shipped to your front door via Internet. You don't need to sign, you don't need to prove that you're 21, you don't need to prove that you have a permit. You can go onto the Internet and have 1,000 rounds delivered by UPS two days later at your front door. So I think there's certain common-sense things that could be done.

I personally agree with the Connecticut Chiefs of Police that the Board of Firearms Permit Examiners I think puts, reverses chiefs of polices' decisions that they have to make on a day-to-day basis of who is suitable to possess a firearm. And I don't understand what additional qualifications that somebody who sits on that committee possesses to overrule a chief of police. But that's what happens. So we've got representatives on that commission from the Ye Old Gun Guild and other entities and they determine that

- 1 the chief of police was wrong when he denied a person
- 2 based on suitability and they order the chief to
- 3 instate the person's pistol permit. To me that is
- 4 shocking to the sense and I think these are the kind of
- 5 things that could be instituted without terrible public
- 6 outcry. I mean I don't believe that the public would
- 7 | object to the fact of having to go through a background
- 8 | check to buy a weapon. I don't think they would.
- 9 These are the kind of things that I think are
- 10 common-sense approaches. But Chief Reed I'm sure will
- 11 have more comment.
- 12 CHIEF MICHAEL KEHOE: If I may make one
- 13 | comment on that, I'll make it brief.
- I guess I would look at it if you talk
- 15 | about an assault weapon and military assault weapon, it
- 16 | would be similar to what I guess the Supreme Court
- 17 Justice says, "I know what pornography is when I see
- 18 | it." I'll know what an assault weapon is when I see
- 19 | it. And if you just add some common sense to that, you
- 20 | would know that it's a killing machine and it has no
- 21 | purpose in my mind in our society other than to kill,
- 22 okay? And I don't see the sportsman having access to
- 23 that. That's just my feeling. But certainly that's
- 24 kind of how I would look at it.
- 25 CHIEF MATTHEW REED: I think that really

sums it up because I was going to go along with the pornography definition; you know it when you see it.

So it's very -- it's hard to articulate and say this is the way it should be written. Because I think for years they've been chasing this idea of an assault weapon as being a bad thing and how do we outlaw it. I mean just like certain pharmaceuticals. You know, you change one chemical mixture and suddenly that pharmaceutical which does the same thing as the one that's already banned is no longer banned because the chemical composition changes. So I don't know how you chase this idea of what an assault weapon is and write a statute that is going to outlaw everything that looks like, smells like, tastes like, sounds like an assault weapon. I think that's very challenging to do.

But as Detective Mattson pointed out from the state police, you can own a fully automatic machine gun in the state of Connecticut. And until you're going to make that stop, what difference does it make? I mean really. You can own a fully automatic machine gun. As long as you have an FFL and you pay the fee, you can own a fully automatic machine gun in the state of Connecticut.

So we chase around the idea of what is an assault weapon, what isn't an assault weapon. You

know, I'm not saying that it should be okay to have all of these things. But my point is I don't know the answer to that without looking to the manufacturer and trying to figure out exactly what, you know, how can you write a law that says: Okay, you can limit the magazine capacity, how many rounds you can shoot; you can say you can't shoot it fully automatic or with a three-round burst, you can only shoot one round with every pull of the trigger. But now you get it to the point where you don't want -- are you going to start to outlaw the semiautomatic pistols that the police carry? Because that's the same thing; one round with one pull of the trigger, a magazine greater than ten. So I think that's why they came up with these standards and talked about the detachable magazine and talked about the lug for the bayonet and talked about the way the grips are. Because they tried to put together something where you could add these things up and say: Okay, that's what we're going to call an assault weapon.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So the shorter answer is: I'm not sure how you specify it so that you're going to eliminate all of these weapons. But, you know, the most popular weapon used in crime in the state of Connecticut is a .38 caliber pistol. And I don't think anyone has an

appetite to ban .38 caliber pistols.

We just saw another terrible tragedy unfold the other day that dealt with mental health and a .38 caliber pistol. It's a bad mix regardless of what kind of gun it is.

So, to Chief Montminy's point, I think the permitting process -- and I don't know what the status of that most recent incident over by the Lake of the Isles Golf Course, if there were any permits involved in that situation, or I don't know if all that information is out yet. But I think we can control the things we can control. And we can control the permitting process and the examination of applicants and people who want to have permits. And I think that's where perhaps our strongest defense is going to be.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you very much,
Chiefs. In fact, Chief, you just highlighted something
that I was going to say to close, and it's actually a
request.

We have spent a lot of time talking about assault weapons or assault-style weapons. But the charge of the commission is broad. And addressing issues of gun violence at all levels was one of the items issued to us by the Governor. So if there are

1 additional, from an association standpoint, if there 2 are additional handqun-specific recommendations, if you 3 could forward those to the commission via the Governor's Office, that would certainly be helpful. 4 Thank you again for your time. 5 you for sharing your experience with us. And thank 6 you, commission members, for your questions. 7 We will take a break for lunch now, 8 reconvene at 1:30. Thank you. 9 10 (Lunch Recess) MR. CHAIRMAN: All right. Let's 11 12 reconvene here. Our afternoon session will start with 13 Dr. Brandon Campbell from the Connecticut Children's Medical Center with a presentation on qun violence. 14 The floor is yours. 15 16 DR. BRANDON CAMPBELL: I'd like to thank the Commission for the invitation and the opportunity 17 18 to talk to you on qun violence. Hopefully what I cover 19 will not be too redundant with what I know you've already heard, but hopefully I'll be able to provide 20 some unique perspective on the topic. 21 22 If you only take away two things from what I say to you, the first is that you have to 23 recognize that guns are more dangerous than they are 24 protective in American society. We know that full 25

well. But the good news is firearm injuries and deaths can be prevented. And hopefully I'll give you a little bit of insight as to why I think that's the case.

violence from a fairly unique perspective. As a pediatric general and thoracic surgeon, I take care of the victims of gun violence and other types of injuries, as well as other childhood conditions requiring surgery. I am a gun owner, I'm an avid sportsman, and I'm also the parent of a four and 8-year-old girls, elementary school-aged girls.

So the overview of what I'd like to talk to you about today is just a little bit about the basics of the epidemiology of how gun injuries occur, with a special emphasis on childhood injuries, talk a little bit about lessons that we've learned looking at motor vehicle crashes and how those lessons can be applied to gun injuries, and, finally, I want to tell you from my perspective why I think that sensible regulation of firearms makes good sense. And then I will leave you with some evidence-based recommendations which came out of a firearm policy forum that the Children's Hospital sponsored at the end of January and also with the recommendations which have been endorsed by many medical societies, including the American

Academy of Pediatrics and the American College of Surgeons.

So what I'm not going to cover today is the real details of the science of gun violence research. It can be pretty boring and uninteresting on a Friday afternoon, and I don't think it's really that germane to our discussion. And I'm not going to talk specifically about the gun buy-back program that we've held here in Hartford for the last four years, but I'd be happy to answer questions about that later in the discussion portion.

So people have been doing foolish things with guns in the United States for a long time. This is Annie Oakley with her intrepid dog, I forget the name, with an apple on the head that she used to shoot the apple off as a sort of a circus-type event. And when the bullet goes through the apple, it is not that big a deal. But it is a very big deal when a bullet goes through human tissue. This is not a human specimen, but what it illustrates is what the bullet from a high-velocity gun, like a handgun or an assault rifle, will do to human tissue when it goes through it.

Once an injury like this has occurred, there is nothing as a surgeon that I can do to rectify what has happened. And I think that is a very, very

important thing. And in my discussions with my friend Susan Williams, who is one of the associate medical examiners here, these are exactly the types of injuries that were observed in the children at Sandy Hook Elementary School.

So these are my patients.

Unfortunately, they make the headlines of the Hartford Courant. This is a toddler who found his dad's loaded handgun in the nightstand and inadvertently shot himself in the head. This is a boy who was at the West Indian Day parade here in Hartford not that long ago that caught a stray bullet when some gang members got in an altercation.

I'm not the first surgeon who's, by any stretch of the imagination, who's been concerned about gun injuries. C. Everett Koop, pediatric surgeon, was talking about this a long time ago in his role as the U.S. Surgeon General.

When I was a surgical resident at the University of North Carolina, we were looking at the source of guns that were killing kids in that state, and what we concluded is that many gun-owning parents substantially underestimate the risk of injury firearms pose to their children and do not realize that a gun in the home is more dangerous than protective. And I'm

going to spend a little bit of time talking about guns in the home during my presentation.

So, interestingly enough, before the whole thing happened in Newtown at Sandy Hook
Elementary School, the American Academy of Pediatrics
this past fall put forth recommendations on what can be
done to prevent firearm injuries. And it fell largely
on deaf ears. I sit on the Injury Prevention Committee
of the American College of Surgeons Committee on
Trauma. When we talked about it last March, they
didn't even want to talk about the issue. They said
it's not going to go anywhere, it's not worth devoting
any time or resources to. But things have changed.

So I'm sure someone probably has put a slide like this up and the only important thing that you take away from this is that from a child's first birthday right up through their mid-40s, the leading cause of injury and death is injury -- the leading cause of death is injury. It's not a cancer, it's not infections, it's not cardiovascular disease; it's injury.

And this slide illustrates how in persons from their first birthday to their 24th, that injuries are the leading cause of death, and a third of those injuries are due to guns.

1 When you look at my patients

specifically, and this is a little bit different than
adults, the injuries are mostly homicides, with a
significant portion of suicides, and a much smaller

5 portion of accidental-type shootings.

England Journal of Medicine for the first time when they really started looking at the presence of guns in the home and its association with both accidental injuries from an accidental discharge of a weapon as well as suicides and homicides, and they found that if you have more guns in the home, you're more likely to have these types of injuries. And I'll spend a little bit more time covering that.

If you look at a map of the United

States, and this came out of the New England Journal of

Medicine in 2008, you can see that those states that

have more lax gun laws and higher rates of ownership

are more likely to have a higher rate of both suicide,

homicide, and accidental shootings.

This is a paper that came out of the New England Journal of Medicine when I was I think a freshman in college, and it was intriguing to me as a gun owner and a then member of the National Rifle Association, for the first time I really started to

look at guns differently and I said: You know what? 1 2 Maybe these guns, which were part of my life growing up, may not be as great as I thought they are and there 3 may be dangers associated with them that you have to 4 pay attention to. And what Art Kellerman did is he 5 looked at in the state of Washington all of the 6 homicides that were occurring in homes, and he was 7 looking at all of the injuries sustained by intruders 8 in homes, and was able to recognize that having a qun 9 10 in your home was much more likely to be used in a 11 homicide or suicide of a family member than it was to 12 shoot someone who was breaking into your home to harm 13 you. And this is important because this has been borne 14 out in the medical literature over and over and over 15 again. 16 Just a little bit more firearm facts. apologize if these are things that you've seen before. 17 18 More than 30,000 people in the United 19 States die every year as a result of gun injuries. 20 There are about 70,000 nonfatal injuries which significantly impact the quality of life of people in 21 22 this country. The case fatality rate from qun injury -- so if you get, you're shot by a gun, you've 23 24 got about a 30 percent chance of dying, which is not insignificant. And I think the other important point 25

is that half of gun deaths in the United States are due to suicide. You're certainly more likely to make the newspaper if you're killed in a homicide or an accidental shooting, but suicide is an important issue as well. And I know others have covered that.

So a little bit -- my practice is almost exclusively in children. So I want to spend a little bit of time talking about the types of injuries that we see in children and, more importantly, why those types of injuries occur.

shown that about a third of American, a third of homes where there are children in the United States have guns. And the alarming thing is that about 13 percent of those homes have guns that are stored in a way that they're loaded and accessible to children. And that's why we see accidental shootings, that's why we see teenagers who kill themselves with a gun. And this isn't a unique problem. We see suicide attempts at the Children's Hospital on a monthly basis and we see suicide by gun that don't make it to the Children's Hospital because they're found dead on the scene, unfortunately, all too often.

So this is too many words on this slide, but I think there were some research surgeons at Johns

Hopkins who interviewed parents, qun-owning parents who were coming into their pediatric practice to try and get a sense for what the understanding of these parents were as far as their developmental capabilities of their children and the real risk that having a gun in the home posed to their children. And the interesting take-home message was twofold: One, that parents have a very unrealistic perception of their children's capabilities and tendencies with respect to guns. example, there are a lot of parents, and we see this in practice, who have a 6-year-old at home and will say, "You know what? I've talked to my 6-year-old about the loaded gun that we keep in case someone breaks into our house and they know not to touch it." We know as physicians who take care of children that a 6-year-old does not have the developmental and cognitive abilities to be able to discern a toy qun from a real qun and a real qun that's loaded and a real qun that's not loaded. So that's something that's important to consider.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

And the second point is that a lot of people feel that the best way to prevent gun injuries is just through education. And what we know as public health scientists is that that is the worst way to prevent injuries. You know, you can talk and you can

educate, but it's not as effective as legislation and laws that regulate gun ownership and practices around firearms.

So I just want to digress briefly for about four slides and talk a little bit about my experience on the Governor's Task Force on Teen Driving Safety and how that may be relevant to some of the things that you guys are doing.

So the good news with motor vehicle crashes and teenage motor vehicle crashes as is illustrated in this graph is that for the last 30 years, the number of teenagers dying in motor vehicle crashes has been declining. And that just hasn't happened by magic; it's happened through sensible legislation.

So we've identified that teenagers from the time they turn 16 and start driving a car, they're at dramatically increased risk of being involved in a motor vehicle crash for that 18 months until they gain the experience to operate a motor vehicle more safely. We also learned that the more passengers they had in a car, the more likely they were to be involved in a motor vehicle crash. And that all -- that happens with boys, that happens with girls, that happens in Connecticut, California, Alaska. It's a universal

phenomenon.

So graduated driver licensing is one way that we found that you can combat that. GDL systems allow novice drivers to gain experience under conditions of minimal risk. And lo and behold, research in both the United States, Canada, Europe, New Zealand has found that when you implement these GDL laws, the number of crashes and fatalities decreases substantially. And the stronger you make GDL systems, the greater the observed reduction in the number of crashes and deaths that you see.

There's nothing that tells us as public health scientists and physicians that these types of sensible regulation would not work with guns the same way it's worked for motor vehicle crashes.

So involvement of people like you, much as we got involved with Governor Rell and the Commissioner of the Department of Motor Vehicles, Bob Ward at the time, and Ray LaHood at the federal level were able to make recommendations to the legislature in these same buildings to implement sensible changes which have strengthened the GDL systems in Connecticut and prevented teenagers from dying on the roads of our state.

So what prevents motor vehicle crash

deaths? Seat belt laws, we know that, proven; GDL systems; zero tolerance laws with alcohol and other drugs; childhood restraint laws; and safer cars, air bags and antilock brake systems. So we know this works with motor vehicle crashes. It's up to you guys to determine what makes the most sense from a regulatory standpoint to prevent gun deaths in Connecticut.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So the case for sensible firearm policy reforms, I'm going to give you a couple of examples. So this is a paper that I can promise you haven't seen, and it's pretty darn old. But it makes an important point. Those of you who were around in the mid- to late 80s and early 90s know, especially the police officers in the room I'm sure, that the crack epidemic was at its heyday. The other thing that was happening is that the number of -- the guns that were being used in crimes were going from revolvers that carry six bullets to high-capacity handguns like the Beretta 92 and others that have a magazine capacity of 15. What the police in Washington, D.C. observed is that in 1987, about 30 percent of the crime quns that they were getting were these high-capacity handguns, pistols. But over the ensuing six years, that ratio changed, and 70 percent of the handquns that were being collected were the higher capacity magazines. So that's what the

police were observing.

observing. Over that period of time, the number of bullet holes in the people presenting to the trauma center went up. Makes sense. You've got guns on the street with a higher capacity, can fire more bullets, you're going to see more bullet holes in the patients showing up in the trauma centers. And that's exactly what they saw in Washington, D.C.

A little bit about hunters. I know some gun owners are very much opposed to any regulation of firearms. I'm not one of them. And I'll try and explain to you why.

If you decide you want to hunt waterfowl, ducks, and geese in Connecticut, you've got to abide by a lot of rules. You have to buy a duck stamp for \$15 that goes to the federal government to pay for conservation, you have to buy a hunting license in the state of Connecticut, and follow all of the rules that are put forth both by the federal government and by the state. And the point I want to make that I want to emphasize here is that you have to use a shotgun that only holds three shells. So gun owners, especially hunters, are used to these sorts of regulations.

Same thing if you want to hunt white tail deer in Connecticut. You can't hunt with a gun that holds more than three shells. Not that big a deal. Most of the time you only need one bullet anyway. And these are the sorts of regulations that hunters like myself and others in the state live with and don't complain about.

So I'm going to shift from my sportsman's hat to my public health pediatric surgeon hat and tell you a little bit about a Firearm Policy Forum that we held just a couple of blocks from here at the Lyceum where we brought some national experts on gun policy and firearm injury in and talked about the issue for about three hours and came up with what we think are some sensible recommendations that I want to share with you.

So one of the experts there when asked the question do violent video games contribute to the gun violence problem that we have in the United States? So the honest answer to that question is that they may contribute to violent behavior. But if you look at other developed countries like Japan and western Europe and Canada, they have the same violent video games that the teenagers and others in the United States have, but they don't have the same rates of firearm injury in

those countries. So you can't say that it is those video games which are exclusively responsible. I'm not saying that they don't contribute, but you can't say that they're primarily responsible.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

So these are the four recommendations that came out of the Policy Forum that we sponsored. So first, we need to improve universal background checks. We actually have pretty good background checks in Connecticut, but we don't throughout the United States. And I think there's room -- but I do think that there is some room for improvement in Connecticut. They didn't think that it was unreasonable to require showing of an ID if you're going to purchase ammunition. They thought it would be reasonable to limit gun purchases to one per month to avoid straw purchases, which we actually have very good data that this worked in the state of Virginia, preventing a lot of the gunrunning that we saw about a decade ago. And, finally, the recommendation that they had was requiring a permit for all gun owners, not just those who want to have a concealed weapons permit.

And I would like to conclude my presentation by talking about the recommendations that have come out of the medical organizations that I belong to. These are not shooting from the hip, pun

```
1
     intended, types of recommendations; these were
     recommendations that came from experts on public
 2
 3
     health, experts on gun violence that put these
     together. And I'm going to emphasize the organizations
 4
     that I belong to, not many of the others that came out.
 5
                    So one was the American Academy of
 6
     Pediatrics, the other, the American College of
 7
     Surgeons, and the other a position statement that we
 8
     put together at the Connecticut Children's Medical
 9
10
     Center that was endorsed by the medical staff, the
11
     Injury Prevention Center and the Pediatric Trauma
12
     Program.
13
                    So Recommendation No. 1, and I'm going
14
     to read them:
                    "Federal regulation of gun purchases
15
16
     that would include mandatory waiting periods, closure
     of the gun show and Internet sales loopholes, mental
17
18
     health restrictions for gun purchases, and more
19
     comprehensive background checks.
20
                    "Renew the federal assault weapons ban
21
     and close the loopholes in Connecticut's assault weapon
22
     ban.
                    "Ban high-capacity magazines.
23
                    "Allow federal public health agencies to
24
     study firearm violence and make recommendations on
25
```

evidence-based ways to prevent firearm violence." 1 So I'm back to where I started. If you 2 want to forget everything that I've told you, you can, 3 but I do hope that you take these two points home: 4 5 One, guns are more dangerous than protective. And two, firearm injuries and deaths are preventible. 6 And I'll just conclude with a picture of 7 my two daughters. And I want to thank you on behalf of 8 the Connecticut Children's Medical Center, the American 9 10 Academy of Pediatrics, and the American College of 11 Surgeons for the work that you are doing to help make 12 Connecticut a safer place. 13 Thanks very much. 14 MR. CHAIRMAN: Thank you for your time. Questions? 15 16 EZRA GRIFFITH: Doctor, I'd like you to expand on the idea of the mental health requirements 17 18 restrictions that you mentioned at the end. 19 DR. BRANDON CAMPBELL: Well, there's no question that this is one of the most difficult 20 21 elements of trying to restrict access to handquns. I 22 think there almost certainly has to be a better way that we can, with all of the information technology 23 24 that we now have, to integrate databases where information is stored without impacting an individual's 25

privacy so that we can prevent people with known mental illness from buying firearms. So that's one point.

The second point is that gun owners need to be more responsible for the guns that they have. If Adam Lanza's mother had stored her guns in a safe that only she had a combination to, those guns would not have caused the misery that they did. But it's not just Adam Lanza's mother. We know, just the police in the room can tell you better than I can, that those guns that are turning up in the Hartford Shooting Task Force that they're collecting are guns that are coming out of people's homes that are stored in attics, garages, unlocked, and available to criminals and anyone else.

One point -- I know I said I wasn't going to talk about the gun buy-back, but this is a relevant point. A lot of people are critical of gun buy-backs because you're just getting these junk guns that nobody wants. What the Hartford police will tell you is that the guns that we're collecting from people's attics and garages and they don't want are exactly the same types of weapons that are turning up on the streets of Hartford and being used to commit crimes.

So responsible storage of guns by gun

owners is another critical piece. And I don't know how you regulate that or you make that happen, but it's a real problem.

talk about the restrictions with respect to behavioral health problems, you are asserting that there's some connection between behavior of health potential for the use of the weapon to cause violence. And I'm not sure where you got that premise from. But I'm actually, I'm saying that not in a criticizing way; I'm actually asking for amplification so I can understand better how the medical organizations, what the basis was in the medical organizations to make that a connection.

DR. BRANDON CAMPBELL: Well, I think there are a couple of things here. One is -- and this may not be what you're getting at, but I think it's worth pointing out. One of the most effective ways that we have to prevent people from committing suicide is lethal means restriction. So when a patient presents to the emergency department at Connecticut Children's Medical Center, or anywhere, and someone is expressing suicidal ideation, the most effective way to prevent them from going home and acting out on that is to make sure that they don't have access to a gun, which is the most effective way of killing yourself,

making sure that they don't have access to medications from Tylenol to some of the psychiatric medications that they can overdose on. So it's restricting access to them.

I don't know what the best way to identify patients with psychiatric illnesses who are attempting to purchase firearms. What I was suggesting is that there's probably got to be some way with some of the data systems that we have to potentially prevent those types of purchases from happening.

KATHLEEN FLAHERTY: Is there a specific protocol at your hospital for inquiring of parents whether or not they have guns in the home?

DR. BRANDON CAMPBELL: There is not.

One of the challenges of providing care, whether at the Children's Hospital or in a pediatrician or family practitioner's practice, is it's up to the individual provider to decide what types of anticipatory guidance they wish to provide and what types screening questions they wish to ask. There are a whole lot of things which have the potential to harm your kids, whether it's having safety plugs in outlets, to having chemicals stored safely, to making sure that they're wearing seat belts.

But to answer your question, there is

not a specific policy in place to ask those screening
types of questions.

DENNIS McCARTHY: You gave us an excellent presentation, and I appreciate that.

Obviously, you've been involved in this for quite some time. And I think that our concern is that we have a changing public perception that may give us an opportunity to make some of the changes that you've been advocating for for a long time.

Is there any advice that you would give us regarding your past efforts that did not result in change in legislation that we might want to consider as tactics or strategies to be more successful this time around?

DR. BRANDON CAMPBELL: Well, there's a lot of advice, but I'll try and give you the most salient points. I think, one, you have to be inclusive, and I think this commission is very inclusive in who you're involving. I think there are a lot of physicians, a lot of gun owners, a lot of physician gun owners who support these types of things. And I think the more inclusive you can be in getting support behind this, the more effective that you're going to be, is one point.

The other is you have to accept, be

willing to accept compromise. I think there are changes that people on the fringes of issues want that are never going to come into being. You have to take the best available evidence, see what you think is going to be palatable to the general public, and put forward the best recommendations you can that you think have a realistic chance of passing. ALICE FORRESTER: Thank you, Doctor. Ιt

ALICE FORRESTER: Thank you, Doctor. It was a great presentation.

I have a question on victims of gun violence. The Times had a pretty big piece on it this weekend. And I understand there's a program in Ohio that is actually, I guess the stats are that a kid who's been shot might actually have a higher likelihood of going out and shooting again, you know, and so in Ohio they're doing this sort of mental health intervention for the shooters.

Do you know much about that? And I'm wondering if you see any value in any kind of mental health follow-up after the shooting.

DR. BRANDON CAMPBELL: Well, there certainly has been a lot of attention paid to post-traumatic stress disorder in a variety of settings. And I think this is a piece that's -- the mental health piece of what you're trying to accomplish

is very difficult. You know, we're at difficult fiscal times, we don't have a lot of money to create additional programs. But I think you have to pay attention to that piece of the puzzle.

And I think if you look at prisoners who come out of prison and, you know, recidivism is high, they're likely to commit more crimes, they're likely to do many of the same things they did before they went in. So I think the important thing that you need to do is you need to look at programs which have been proven to work through rigorous scientific evaluation and identify those programs, and then invest the limited resources that we have into those types of programs.

But your point is valid and important, that you want to do everything you can to prevent the types of behaviors from occurring that lead to violent crimes.

But the point, one important point is that it is the gun that is the vector of injury in firearm deaths, the same way the influenza virus causes the flu. If you can restrict the vector, you can prevent the disease downstream.

MR. CHAIRMAN: If I might at this point ask Chiefs Reed and Salvatore, as well as Trooper Delehanty, to join the panel. We've gotten a lot of

recommendations today and to be able to inquire of multiple sources is probably going to be helpful to us over the next hour or so.

KATHLEEN FLAHERTY: I have a question for Dr. Campbell specifically.

One of the recommendations or proposals by the Governor that he submitted last week was whether physicians might be included as mandatory reporters on gun safety issues. And especially, you mentioned that Children's Medical Center doesn't routinely ask about gun safety in the home. Do you think perhaps hospitals should or doctors should? And, you know, what do you think about a proposal that physicians, other healthcare providers be mandatory reporters on gun safety issues? Thanks.

DR. BRANDON CAMPBELL: Right. That's a good question. So let me clarify a little bit: We are mandatory -- if someone presents to the Children's Hospital with a gunshot wound, we have to report that, and that happens. So that does happen.

What does not happen is every single patient that comes in is not screened for whether they have guns in their home. That doesn't mean that it does not happen; it just means that it's up to the individual provider.

1 I think there are exciting opportunities 2 to teach gun safety and to screen. You know, we 3 currently are trialing a tablet-based technology where when teenagers come into our surgical practice at the 4 Children's Hospital, while they're waiting for us to 5 come in and see them, they go through a presentation on 6 a tablet about teen driving and about graduated 7 drivers' licensing. We haven't yet proven that it 8 works, but it's an opportunity. And there's nothing 9 10 that says we couldn't develop a similar application on 11 firearm safety; one for parents who have toddlers or younger kids at home, and another for teenagers that 12 13 covers the risk of suicide and the risk of accessible 14 firearms in the home. 15 ROBERT DUCIBELLA: If I didn't buy a 16 handgun, I wouldn't buy one after what I saw. The 17

handgun, I wouldn't buy one after what I saw. The point being that we have an addiction for cigarettes in this country and firearms. And you can't buy a package of cigarettes now or watch a football game on television without being educated about how bad it can be for your health.

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

You've created a presentation, obviously, to create a very particular point and to put, if not fear, trepidation in the mind of someone who might otherwise own a gun to understand what

happens when you use it.

Is it worth considering, in your opinion, a broader reach education program? What you've put together for the commission would be convincing to an awful lot of parents. And short of you having less intelligence than you'd like, and you shouldn't if you don't have that much, have a handgun.

Is there a way that we might think about creating a better public forum about what it means to own a handgun? The basic points, which are you're more likely to create an injury in your own home than you are to protect yourself from an aggressor, or the more graphic representation of what happens to biomass when a bullet passes through that? Is it worth considering the benefit of that? I mean there are a number of ways that that could happen. If you're a firearms dealer, you pay a one-dollar-a-month tax to support a public education program. If you sell ammunition in the state of Connecticut, and you end up needing a license, a certain contribution would be made.

There was -- you remember when we used to get a license to drive in high school, we watched movies that made us vomit, and that was a way to convince us that we didn't drive quickly. We've had that in driving, we've had that for cigarettes. Is

there, in your opinion, a value in instilling the 1 2 notion of concern by education, convincing as you did 3 today, so that there is a better forum for people to understand what it really means to own a handqun? What 4 is your opinion about that? 5 DR. BRANDON CAMPBELL: Well, absolutely. 6 You're asking a leading question almost. 7 ROBERT DUCIBELLA: I know. 8 DR. BRANDON CAMPBELL: Absolutely there 9 10 is value and I think opportunity to do that and there 11 is precedent to do that. You know, one of the things 12 that came out of the legislative changes that Governor 13 Rell signed into law when I was on the Governor's Task Force on Teen Driving was all parents had to 14 15 participate in a two-hour educational component on 16 driving and GDLs as part of their child getting a license. 17 18 If you were going to implement some sort 19 of permit process for gun owners or pistol, when you renew your pistol permit, you know, maybe taking, 20 21 having to see some sort of presentation such as this that emphasized safety, that's the good news. 22 You know, the bad news is that there is 23

some great examples of failure with this sort of thing.

The National Rifle Association put forward Eddie the

24

25

Eagle, which was an educational campaign very different than something that I and some of the public health experts would design, but nonetheless, it showed that it had no effect on gun owners' beliefs.

But I certainly think there is opportunity to educate gun owners on the hazards of having a gun in your home for sure.

ROBERT DUCIBELLA: Thank you.

RON CHIVINSKI: Hi, Dr. Campbell.

Dr. Campbell, you had mentioned at the beginning of your presentation that you yourself personally are a gun owner and a sportsman. You also alluded during the presentation that it seems to me your beliefs changed or have changed over time a little bit towards your attitudes looking at gun ownership.

But I assume, not to be overly personal, but you still have guns stored in your home.

When I look over the recommendations from the Connecticut Firearm Policy Forum and the recommendations you shared with us through the medical organizations you belong to, you know, just my short end, I didn't see any specific recommendations about gun storage or, you know, how you would keep these in your home.

And I ask you: What have you done or

what would you recommend to be added to this list in that area? And I ask you that as someone whose views also have changed over the years and was raised around guns and the father of young children.

DR. BRANDON CAMPBELL: I'll give you a twofold answer to that question. So the guns that I have in my home, and I'm perfectly comfortable saying this in an open forum, are stored in a safe that only I know the combination to and my children, as long as they're in the home, are not going to know that combination. You know, to me, I think the chances, as I said in my presentation, of one of my children or my wife or myself being harmed by one of these guns are greater than the risk of someone breaking into my home. So that's Point No. 1.

The reason why I didn't spend a whole lot of time on emphasizing safe storage is it's an uphill battle getting people to changing behavior. We know this from campaigns on smoking, we know it from campaigns in trying to get people to drive the speed limit. By just telling people to do something, it doesn't work. You know, that's why the recommendations that the medical organizations and the Connecticut Children's Medical Center have put forth deal more with the vector, the firearm, the magazines, assault

weapons.

emphasizing education and responsible firearm ownership. One of the things that we've thought about putting in our policy statement was having every gun owner in the state sign a responsible firearm ownership pledge, which say all these common-sense things that many firearm owners do; keeping their guns stored safely, making sure that their children don't have access to them, and those things. Is there a role for that? Yes. But from a science and public health standpoint, we know that those have been less effective.

MR. CHAIRMAN: This is a question for the panel: What are some areas where you see, again, rational, common-sense solutions that everyone, no matter what side of the debate you may fall on, these are some things that we should look at. Where do you see common ground?

CHIEF ANTHONY SALVATORE: One of our suggestions back in January when we testified before the legislature was on safe storage, that you do have a sufficient gun cabinet to store your weapons in. And I'm not just talking about a wood cabinet with a glass front. And that everybody be required to have such a

```
1
     safe. If there's anyone in the house that would not be
 2
     permitted to own or possess a firearm under state and
 3
     federal law, not just a child under the age of 16, you
     have somebody in the home with some mental health
 4
 5
     issues or some type of person that was arrested for a
     felony, that then you would have to have your weapons
 6
     locked up securely in such a facility.
 7
                    MR. CHAIRMAN: Were there standards?
 8
                                                          Ι
     mean you said not a wooden case with a glass front.
 9
10
                    CHIEF ANTHONY SALVATORE: Right.
                                   That's one exclusion.
11
                    MR. CHAIRMAN:
12
                    CHIEF ANTHONY SALVATORE: A sufficient
13
     type of device that if an individual was looking to
14
     gain access, would not, in essence, be able to.
                    CHIEF MATTHEW REED: Or be able to
15
16
     remove that device from the home. If you have a small
     almost like cash box and you put a pistol in there,
17
18
     that's fine, but what happens if someone just takes the
     whole unit and walks out the door?
19
                    CHIEF ANTHONY SALVATORE:
20
                                              Takes it out
21
     to the garage and cuts it open.
22
                    CHIEF MATTHEW REED: So perhaps not only
     should it be secured, but the device it's secured in
23
     must be anchored or somehow secured in that storage
24
25
     area.
```

And as I review the statute on safe storage of firearms, it deals with the mandate only if you have somebody under 16 in the house. I think someone could read that and construe it to mean that's how you store a loaded firearm. It's interesting. The first line in the statute talks in safe storage of a loaded firearm. So if you have a firearm that's unloaded, does that mean that doesn't apply if you keep your ammunition somewhere else?

So I wonder if there should be an examination of that statute to see if that wasn't the intention of the legislature to apply to all firearms regardless of whether they're loaded or not.

MR. CHAIRMAN: Any other areas of perceived common ground?

CHIEF MATTHEW REED: Well, I thought it was interesting looking at the doctor's slide. You saw the recommendations. There were four recommendations, and one of those dealt with universal background checks and talked about firearm permits in general. In other words, right now, the only permit that's needed, as I testified earlier, we talked about the permit for pistols and revolvers. And there is not a permitting process in existence for any other firearms. And I thought that was some interesting common ground, those

two specific points; one, the universal background checks and, two, the permitting of all firearms as opposed to just the permit to carry for pistols or revolvers as it exists under our current statutory framework.

CHIEF ANTHONY SALVATORE: And we also proposed the elimination of eligibility certificates because there is no suitability for those.

DENNIS McCARTHY: Doctor, your testimony regarding the changed behavior through GDLs makes me think of the change of other epidemics that have affected our society. Fire deaths were epidemic in both homes and in places of assembly. And pervasive and invasive laws and regulations have changed that epidemic. There is no longer -- it's been 25 years since a student died in a school fire because of very pervasive and invasive regulations that are enforced.

Smoking as a habit, as a cultural habit, has changed over the past quarter century because of daily reminders. Drinking and driving -- or drinking, let alone drinking and driving. The cultural norm has changed because we as a society have said: No longer will we accept some of the carnage that was resulting from that. And there are very large organizations that have the almost sole responsibility and authority to

develop some of those regulations and make those changes or help us make those changes in our society.

Can we do the same things with gun violence and gun deaths and the epidemic that we are faced with? Is there the opportunity right now to create that shift that 25 years from now we can claim the same kind of success that we have claimed over these other epidemics in our society?

DR. BRANDON CAMPBELL: The answer is simply yes and absolutely. But it will require comprehensive changes at many different levels. You know, gun violence isn't easily solvable. We would have solved it already if it was easy.

But just simple examples of things that worked in the past, to illustrate the point: You know, No. 1, Bill Clinton when he was president made it more difficult to get a federal firearms license. So rather than paying, you know, \$35 and, you know, having very simple hurdles to cross, you know, they upped the cost and said you have to be a legitimate, more legitimate entity to have a federal firearms license.

By implementing one restricting handgun purchases to one a month in Virginia, they cut down the number of handguns that were showing up in New York City and Hartford and in Boston.

So, you know, those are onerous, they're regulations. Nobody likes regulation. But if we have the political will to implement common-sense evidence-based changes, we can lower the number of people dying and being injured by guns, the same way we've done for alcohol, motor vehicle crashes, and tobacco.

Wanted to know, in one of the slides you had children shot, one every 17 minutes, and died and shot within the one in five minutes. I'm just wondering is there any data, or maybe you shared it, of how many of those are registered guns or permit owners versus non-, illegal guns? Is there any data on that?

DR. BRANDON CAMPBELL: There's no data

I'm aware of. There may be, but, you know,

fortunately, pediatric gun injuries and deaths are much

less frequent than adult gun injuries and deaths, and I

don't know if that data is available. And I'm actually

inclined, as I think about this, that it's probably

unknown. And one important thing, I don't know if

anyone has brought up to the commission yet, is that

there's something called the Tiahrt Amendment which

prevents public health researchers such as our Injury

Prevention Center at the Children's Hospital and

everyone, for that matter, from being able to study gun violence. We can't collaborate with the Bureau of Alcohol, Tobacco & Firearms and track guns; you know, where did they come from, how long did it, you know, the so-called time-to-crime, time from purchase to time being used in a crime. We can't do that. The federal government forbids us from doing that. And that was all NRA gun lobby supported amendment at the federal level.

ROBERT DUCIBELLA: I'm going to direct this to our law enforcement partners in the room.

There are a lot of forms that are filled out whether you're buying a long gun in a sports shop, whether you're coming for a pistol permit, and a lot of the information that's filled out by the applicant, you know, you're somewhat dependent upon that. Is the name spelled right, is the social security number right, or am I checking off all the boxes that really represent the truth or not the truth.

Is there really the dedication and allocation of resources out there in terms of people and funding for that to be done accurately? I'm not questioning the job you have done, but I know you get a lot of applications and I know there's an awful lot of people who don't fill things out necessarily

1 truthfully, and there's always in the computer system 2 opportunities for things to get missed. Do you feel 3 confident that with all the paperwork that's filled out that -- we've emphasized a lot on the permitting 4 process because it has some benefit in eliminating guns 5 to getting into the wrong hands. Do we really today --6 today -- do we really have the resources in terms of 7 manpower and technology to do that well, 8 extraordinarily well, or not? What would be your 9 10 opinion about that? 11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

24

25

CHIEF MATTHEW REED: I would say from a municipal law enforcement standpoint, we're the initial issuing authority for that 60-day temporary permit and we're charged with doing the suitability check, in some departments the answer is yes, they have the resources. In some of the larger departments where they get hundreds of applications in a year, I would testify that perhaps they do not have the resources to be able to go out and knock on doors, to talk to employers, to talk to colleagues, to talk to other people who can help that issuing authority determine if a person is suitable. There is certainly a challenge there. Because this is an administrative function, but, of course, we're charged with the real-life day-to-day detection and prevention of crime and investigation of

crime, and that takes up a tremendous amount of our resources.

One of the challenges we've had through the years is trying to get the permit issued in that eight-week period. And applicants, of course, think eight weeks is a tremendously long time. And we hear about these instant background checks, that you can get your background check done in a minute if you have a common name. You're going to have the results of the background check, why can't I have my permit in a week?

But there has to be an understanding that when we do our suitability check, it's more than just that automated computer database check, that we are going out and trying to assess a person's character. So that takes a long period of time.

I signed 43 permits yesterday on my desk that had been submitted since the end of December.

Those were the ones that were completed. And that's South Windsor, a town of 25,000 people. Where last year I only issued 169 permits in all. And already as of January 1st we had 89 applications pending for this current year. That's a lot of work. And I'm a department that has gone from 43 people down to 39 people. So that is challenging.

So do I feel that we have all of the

1 Could we do more? We could do more. resources? No. 2 I think we do an adequate job checking the applicants 3 that we have. Could we spend more time? I know in our agency we could. 4 You know, Chief Sullivan could certainly 5 talk about what had happened in Hartford through the 6 I mean there's a huge department with a huge 7 8 population. I don't know if they have the resources to be able to do everything that they need to do 9 10 adequately. The same as some of the other large city 11 departments through the state. 12 ROBERT DUCIBELLA: Well, I've heard two 13 things, just to make sure, because I still take notes. The notion of suitability is what you 14 15 use to assess a character that no computer is going to 16 tell you. 17 CHIEF MATTHEW REED: Correct. 18 ROBERT DUCIBELLA: The computer is going to identify a whole series of statistical issues that 19 may or may not be appropriate based on whatever the 20 21 history of the individual is. That's what happened in 22 the past. Predictive crime prevention is 23 identifying opportunities to take a look at legacy, 24

experiences, and say in the future: This is probably a

25

bad risk. So that suitability check at least seems to be an opportunity for a human being to engage another human being in something other than a background fact check.

And I've heard several of the testimonies today come back and say: I think we can do a better job of defining what suitability is, A, and that does no good unless you have the resources to address it, two.

So I'm walking away with those two conclusions; one, improving through an appropriate process the definition of suitability, and, two, once you have that, engaging individuals in the determination of that above and beyond what is simply a statistical background check done on a computer so that there is a human opportunity to evaluate human behavior and make a determination about whether someone is entitled to buy something that could take someone else's life. Okay.

CHIEF ANTHONY SALVATORE: You're probably correct, but I think what you're hearing is that when it comes down to the suitability, we have the ability to do those things today. However, I as a police chief, my definition of "suitability" may not be the same as yours. And when a police chief goes before

the Examiner Board, they may feel that I denying an individual for a permit based on my determination of not being suitable is not sufficient. And I think some of the things that we testified before in the past was looking for some kind of common ground on determination definition of "suitability."

But it's not only a matter of a computer check or suitability. It's the fact that we may have had a number of calls to an individual's residence for incidences that in and of themself would not make them suitable to carry a pistol or revolver. But you're not going to find that if you run that person's name with that kind of check. Or you're not going to find that if I got a hunting license and I'm out buying a long gun. Those are the types of things that we testified before that you're not going to find that you will get.

As Chief Reed pointed out, I mean we can always do more. But I happen to think -- I've been doing, I've been a police chief 21 years -- and I think the system that we have here in this state is pretty good. You're going to find chiefs on both sides of this based on their experiences, based on the workloads that they have. The larger departments, they actually may have even more individuals reporting back to the chief on a determination of whether or not the person

is suitable or should be allowed to have a pistol permit or not. But I think what we do here in the state and some of our laws -- and I've been legislative co-chair since 1995 -- and some of these laws we've testified here in Connecticut very favorable for on behalf of the Connecticut Police Chiefs.

So I happen to think that, you know, in a lot of aspects, we're ahead of the curve compared to other parts of the country. Can we do it better? Can we make it better? I think we can, and I think that's why you're charged by the Governor to be here to see if there are things that we can come up with. And I think we testified to some of the things that we think would make it better and safer here in Connecticut.

ROBERT DUCIBELLA: Thank you. You've confirmed and elucidated on my a little bit improperly worded issue on suitability, that there is a process where it's individually done, but can be overridden by another body that may not own the fidelity of information that you have as a local community representative: We know that neighborhood, we know those people, we've had complaints, we have an instinctive knowledge that this is probably not a good situation, that someone else can say: Well, you don't meet the rules, so guess what, we're going to overrule

1 | you. I hear that and I hear that you can do better.

2 | Everybody wants to do better. And that may be resource

3 | allocation. And what I've heard is additional resource

4 | allocation would help the process. That's what I

5 heard.

Thank you very much.

MR. CHAIRMAN: I would like to make one point: Not every community in Connecticut has a police department. It is not always police officials who are signing the permits. In many cases it is actually first selectmen who sign the permits who may not and usually do not have any experience in this area. So it is certainly something to keep in mind. And I would on that point actually ask the Connecticut State Police for some indication of your experience in dealing with towns that do not have a police force but rather a resident state trooper.

CHIEF MARC MONTMINY: When I was the resident trooper in the town of Haddam, the first selectman, Mark Lundgren, if he got any pistol permit requests would go to my desk and I would do the background checks and do everything that would need to be done. And then I would type up a memo as to whether this person was suitable or not. He was the issuing authority, but he left that up to me to do the

investigation basically. And I'm sure the other chiefs 1 2 have like footwork because you're talking with 3 neighbors. You may not have stuff that come up on a computer, but when you talk to the neighbors and say 4 5 there's always parties going on or, you know, the kids are always drinking in the backyard, or whatever, that 6 kind of stuff doesn't come out on a computer. You 7 actually have to have footwork to go talk to these 8 people. And that could come under a suitability 9 10 question. 11 MR. CHAIRMAN: But that footwork is 12 still done in those communities? 13 CHIEF MARC MONTMINY: Oh, yes. 14 RON CHIVINSKI: This is more of a comment than a question, and it was the second time 15 16 it's come up in our proceedings, it came up twice today it was just mentioned about violent video games. And I 17 18 believe at that Connecticut Firearm Policy Forum, the 19 statement was, Doctor, that you presented that video games may cause violent behavior, but do not cause gun 20 21 violence. And there was a mentioning of Japanese teenagers and the data there. 22 23 And I just speak as a parent. And these 24 kids aren't playing Ms. Pac-Man and Donkey Kong anymore. And I think the hardest core gamer amongst us 25

would agree that you shouldn't have kids under the age of ten, let's say, six, seven and eight-year-olds playing first-person shooter games that were designed originally I believe through the military to enhance killing.

So I think there's a whole lot of data that needs to be collected. I also think that a whole of lot of discussion needs to be had in our country of ours about what we're doing. Because I do believe we have a problem. And if that sounds a little strong or a little off topic, I didn't mean to take us off topic. But I really believe there's many of us out there that feel there's an issue brewing, and I know it's a political topic, but it's not right. So I just wanted a chance to express that.

1	CERTIFICATE
2	
3	I hereby certify that the foregoing 92
4	pages are a complete and accurate transcription to the
5	best of my ability of the electronic sound recording of
6	the March 1, 2013, Sandy Hook Advisory Commission
7	hearing.
8	
9	
10	
11	
12	
13	Melanie G. Collard, LSR RDR-CRR Date
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	