

1           CHAIRMAN JACKSON: -- first selectman who signed  
2 the permits, who may not and usually do not have any  
3 experience in this area, so it's certainly something to  
4 keep in mind. And I would, on that point, actually ask  
5 the Connecticut State Police for some indication of your  
6 experience in dealing with towns that do not have a police  
7 force, but rather a resident state trooper.

8           TROOPER: As the resident trooper in the town of  
9 Hamden, the first selectman, Mark Lungran, if he got any  
10 pistol permit requests, would go to my desk and I would do  
11 the background checks and do everything that would need to  
12 be done, and then I would type up a memo as to whether  
13 this person was suitable or not. He was the issuing  
14 authority, but he left that up to me to do the  
15 investigation, basically. And I'm sure the other chiefs  
16 have, like, footwork, because you're talking with  
17 neighbors. You may not have stuff that comes up on a  
18 computer, but when you talk to the neighbors and say, you  
19 know, there's also parties going on or, you know, the kids  
20 are always drinking in the backyard, or whatever, that  
21 kind of stuff doesn't come out on a computer. You  
22 actually have to have footwork to go talk to these people  
23 and that could come up under a suitability question.

24           CHAIRMAN JACKSON: But that footwork is still  
25 done in those communities?

1 TROOPER: Oh, yes.

2 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Thank you.

3 MR. CHIVINSKI: This is more of a comment than a  
4 question, and it's the second time it's come up in our  
5 proceedings, and it came up twice today, I'll just  
6 mention, about violent video games. And I believe that at  
7 that Connecticut Fire Arm Policy Forum the statement was,  
8 Doctor, that you presented, that video games may cause  
9 violent behavior, but do not cause gun violence. And  
10 there was a mentioning of, you know, Japanese teenagers,  
11 and the data there.

12 And I just speak as a parent. And these kids aren't  
13 playing Ms. Packman and Donkey Kong anymore. And I think  
14 the hardest core gamer amongst us would agree that you  
15 shouldn't have kids under the age of ten, let's say, 6, 7,  
16 8-year-olds playing first-person shooter games that were  
17 designed, originally, I believe, through the military to  
18 enhance killing.

19 So I think there's a whole lot of data that needs to  
20 be collected. I also think that a whole lot of discussion  
21 needs to be had in our country of ours about what we're  
22 doing because I do believe we have a problem. And if that  
23 sounds a little strong or a little off topic, I didn't  
24 mean to take us off topic, but I really believe there's  
25 many of us out there that feel there is an issue brewing.

1 And I know it's a political topic, but it's not right, so  
2 I just wanted that chance to express that.

3 CHIEF MCCARTHY: Chiefs, is there a best  
4 practice or a prescribed process for suitability checks  
5 that are followed, or mandated, or through accreditation  
6 that are out there, and can we get a copy of what those  
7 prescribed -- that prescribed practice is for suitability  
8 checks?

9 And the second question is, in the appeals board  
10 minutes you see that some of the denials don't get  
11 represented by local law enforcement at the denial  
12 hearing, and in those cases the permit is issued.

13 Can you help us understand why, what the reason is  
14 that after issuing a denial there is no representation by  
15 local law enforcement, or in the case of communities that  
16 don't have local law enforcement, why there isn't some  
17 representation at the hearing?

18 CHIEF REED: It's difficult to answer. On  
19 behalf of all -- I will answer on behalf of all the  
20 chiefs, I guess. Every situation, I imagine, would be  
21 different, I would guess, if there is a reason a chief  
22 can't show up. But you have to understand these Board of  
23 Permit Examiner hearings may begin at 9:00 in the morning  
24 and may end at midnight. And you may or may not get on  
25 during a normal business day time and it's very

1 frustrating for a police department, which is limited in  
2 its resources anyways, to send somebody to one of these  
3 hearings that may go on 12 or 15 hours. And I don't think  
4 I'm exaggerating in that at all because they have a  
5 tremendous backup and their agenda is not always tight and  
6 tends to linger through a few meals if you go to one of  
7 those hearings. So sometimes it just doesn't work for the  
8 agency and sometimes the chief will just throw up their  
9 hand because, unfortunately, the reputation of the board  
10 is that they overturn the chief more often than not.  
11 I don't know if the statistics bear that out, but I know  
12 there are times when chiefs are frustrated and say, we'll  
13 send it to the board and if they don't take our written  
14 testimony and my application and my written explanation  
15 for denial, if that's not good enough for them, issue the  
16 permit and let the liability rest with them.

17 I don't know how frequently it happens that the  
18 department is not able to be represented. I also don't  
19 know if it's always the police chief that's not being  
20 represented or if the information you provide also  
21 includes other places where you have a first selectman, a  
22 town manager, or somebody other than a police official who  
23 is responsible for the denial.

24 CHIEF SALVATORE: And there is no criteria for  
25 the suitability.

1           CHIEF REED: One of the points that Chief  
2 Salvatore was making a little earlier, it's not uniform.  
3 Each department, we are very cognizant of the importance  
4 of determining suitability, but every chief takes that to  
5 a different extent because there are some issues with the  
6 interpretation of the statute, so some will knock on  
7 doors. I know chiefs that do personal interviews with  
8 every applicant. I know of one particular chief at one  
9 point said, "I don't think anybody should have a permit,"  
10 and flat out failed to -- refused to issue a permit to  
11 anybody, so there are really extremes. And what we have  
12 proposed through the legislative session dealing with  
13 suitability is a greater articulation in the statute so  
14 that, one, the public is on notice of what the expectation  
15 is and we, as chiefs, have some better guidance as to what  
16 the breadth of our examination can be when we're looking  
17 at suitability.

18           CHIEF MCCARTHY: So it sounds like the system is  
19 broken in some respects that it makes it very difficult  
20 for a department head to defend his denial. Certainly  
21 if --

22           CHIEF SALVATORE: I wouldn't go that far. It  
23 depends on how -- some chiefs have had positives  
24 relationship with the board, others have had negative.  
25 I personally have had positive relationships with the

1 board. It depends on your case preparation and how you  
2 present yourself before the board and how you articulate  
3 yourself when you go before the board and a decision is  
4 reached based on that.

5 So I wouldn't say it's broken, but as I testified  
6 earlier, back in January, I think it bears at least being  
7 examined and to see if it is the best thing that is  
8 serving, you know, the State of Connecticut, or should it,  
9 perhaps, be looked at and maybe be changed in some form,  
10 and we made some suggestions on those. I don't know, but  
11 perhaps now at least is the time to examine it to see if  
12 it's the best. But I wouldn't go so far as to say it's  
13 completely broken.

14 CHIEF MCCARTHY: The reason why I use that  
15 terminology because if a department is required to spend a  
16 better part of the day waiting turn to present its case,  
17 that's a huge demand on that department and makes it  
18 almost impossible to defend their decision. In that  
19 respect, I think that it's a burden on municipalities to  
20 do what we are hoping is going to be an outcome from this  
21 process, is to defend successfully a denial.

22 And should there -- you said that there is not a best  
23 practice or a standard for suitability checks. Should  
24 there be a standard that is held up as the best practice  
25 for local law enforcement to follow to judge their

1 performance against.

2           Obviously, if you're getting a number of permit  
3 applications it becomes very hard to meet that standard,  
4 and I certainly understand the imposition of standards on  
5 delivery of services, but is there -- should there be a  
6 standard that at least can be a guidepost for chiefs of  
7 police in police departments to follow for suitability  
8 checks so they are more uniform. So it's just as  
9 difficult in my community as it is yours -- just as easy  
10 or difficult in our communities. It shouldn't be a -- I'm  
11 going to live in a town where it's easier to get a permit  
12 because the chief has thrown up his hands and said, you  
13 know, "It really doesn't matter," or, "I'm opposed to  
14 everything and let the appeals board handle it."

15           CHIEF REED: I don't think there's ever anything  
16 wrong with adopting best practices. And uniform practices  
17 I think would be ideal, and I think it would be just  
18 collaborating with the right group of people people. It  
19 would be nice to see some outreach from the Board of  
20 Firearm Permit Examiners, whatever forum that ultimately  
21 takes. Perhaps they can have some educational forum to  
22 say, look, these are the things we look at, this is what  
23 we have authority over, and this would be a process that  
24 you should engage in.

25           Now whether that's reenforced through statute, or

1 through policy, our Policy Officer Training Council, which  
2 collaborates for a great many of the issues that we deal  
3 with in law enforcement, I don't think there is anything  
4 wrong with that.

5 And, you know, we want to be led. We want to be told  
6 what the expectation is, or we like to know what the  
7 expectation is, so if we're not meeting that expectation  
8 we can change the way we engage our procedures. And if  
9 when we are meeting that expectation, perhaps it provides  
10 some level of protection for us. In the event something  
11 goes wrong in the future we can say, "Look, we adhered to  
12 all of the best practices that are out there."

13 So we certainly would condone some collaboration and  
14 putting together some practices like that, yes.

15 CHIEF SALVATORE: But I wouldn't make it  
16 absolute, though. Meaning, I'm not saying we have to do  
17 it the same for every individual. If I have known an in  
18 individual for a number of years and we run a criminal  
19 history and the prints come back, in most cases I'm  
20 satisfied and I would issue the permit. If I don't know  
21 an individual or we have had a relationship that's been  
22 questionable within the department on certain types of  
23 calls, then I look even closer and do even more and maybe  
24 assign a detective to do more background on the  
25 individual.

1 DR. BENTMAN: This is a question for  
2 Dr. Campbell. Do you feel that it would be useful for the  
3 mental health professionals evaluating the kids -- and you  
4 can extend this question really to adults as well -- to  
5 have access to information that's available to the police  
6 regarding gun ownership in the homes of the patients being  
7 evaluated for suicidal ideation and homicidal ideation,  
8 and can you comment on the privacy issues and the  
9 acceptability -- your sense of the compromise that you're  
10 talking about.

11 DR. CAMPBELL: I want to qualify this statement  
12 by saying I'm not a psychiatrist and I'm not a lawyer, but  
13 I think that type of information would be useful to mental  
14 health professionals, psychologists, psychiatrists,  
15 evaluating patients if they really want to minimize the  
16 risk of someone carrying out their suicide plan when they  
17 go home, sure, it would be helpful for them to know if  
18 they have guns in the home, or if you have someone with,  
19 worse, homicidal ideations. Someone whose talking about  
20 going out and committing a crime and hurting, you know,  
21 someone besides themselves, yes, it would be helpful.

22 DR. BENTMAN: You're a lawyer as well as a  
23 police chief, yeah, yeah. Do you happen to know what the  
24 laws are that govern, you know, who has access to this  
25 information and how -- and your thoughts about the issue

1 of balancing privacy and safety?

2 CHIEF REED: I guess I would just ask you to  
3 clarify which information, the treatment information or  
4 the mental health information?

5 DR. BENTMAN: No, a gun in the home of somebody  
6 whose deemed to be at risk of homicide or suicide.

7 CHIEF SALVATORE: When we're doing an emergency  
8 committal, the officer that's been assigned to that  
9 incident is going to do the emergency committal form, and  
10 more likely than not state that the individual has access,  
11 and in all likelihood we will probably attempt to seize  
12 all the weapons in that residence if an individual has  
13 attempted or has expressed a desire to commit suicide by a  
14 firearm.

15 DR. BENTMAN: Right. That's when you folks go  
16 to the homes first, but probably more often what happens  
17 is patients arrive at the hospital without the police  
18 being involved and I'm asking about that circumstance.

19 CHIEF SALVATORE: You mean under a volunteer?

20 DR. BENTMAN: Yes.

21 CHIEF REED: I can't speak to the legal aspect  
22 of that, I'm not sure how that stands from both a civil  
23 and statutory standpoint. I would think that common  
24 sense has to prevail at some point, and we have certainly  
25 had practitioners, who have reached out to us in the past,

1 and said, "I believe this person is at risk, either at  
2 risk of harming themselves or harming somebody else, and  
3 therefore I'm letting you know that this person lives at  
4 this house, I believe they have a weapon, and I think  
5 something has to be done to render them safe."

6 We have certainly gotten those calls in the past. We  
7 had a situation not that long ago that dealt with a  
8 student at one of our schools, and the information was  
9 passed on by the clinician and we were able to intercede  
10 and get in touch with the parents and work collaboratively  
11 with the school and with the social workers and the other  
12 clinicians, and we were able to make sure there was no  
13 bona fide threat.

14 So there are certainly circumstances where that  
15 information is revealed to us. Where that stands from a  
16 moral standpoint, or a medical ethic standpoint, or a  
17 policy standpoint for that treating physician, I guess  
18 I don't really know what that standing is. But it seems  
19 to make sense if the ultimate goal is the welfare of the  
20 patient and anybody else that resides or is in close  
21 proximity to that person, I would think they would be  
22 immune from issues.

23 MR. CHIVINSKI: Just going back to that  
24 suitability issue, you mentioned best practices. Are  
25 there -- I would assume the other states have suitability

1 rules and, if so, what are -- is there any language we  
2 could look to?

3 CHIEF SALVATORE: We're not really sure what  
4 other states are doing, at least I'm not.

5 CHIEF REED: I mean, we put together some very  
6 comprehensive language that's been included in some  
7 proposed legislation now, and I will certainly get ahold  
8 of that and forward it to the clerk or to the governor's  
9 staff so that can be shared with the commission. It was  
10 very comprehensive. Connecticut is very -- we have a  
11 relatively good system. The one thing we don't do is we  
12 don't delineate the difference between open carry and  
13 concealed carry, where in some states you're required to  
14 carry it open, and if you want to carry it concealed you  
15 have to go through a whole different permitting process.  
16 Connecticut doesn't do that. They just issue the permit  
17 and then it's up to the person to decide whether they're  
18 going to carry it open or whether they're going to carry  
19 it concealed. That's not a well known --

20 MR. DUCIBELLA: Also, the detective can answer  
21 that question.

22 DET. MATTSON: We are one of the few states, at  
23 least I'm aware of that have suitability within our  
24 statutes, so no, absolutely not, not all states have that.  
25 I think we're one of the few.

1           And I just want to touch earlier on one of your  
2 questions when I believe you were asking about the  
3 confidentiality. Permit information is confidential.  
4 That is only shared with law enforcement for law  
5 enforcement purposes, so that might help to answer your  
6 question.

7           DR. BENTMAN: That helps a lot.

8           DET. MATTSON: Thank you.

9           CHIEF SALVATORE: Yeah, but she was asking if we  
10 can share it with the doctor, correct? And that's a fine  
11 line that we have to walk. We have to walk a fine line if  
12 the person is a danger to themselves or to others. Would  
13 you agree?

14          DR. BENTMAN: Right.

15          DET. MATTSON: You're absolutely correct.

16          DR. BENTMAN: Yes, I understand that we can ask  
17 you for help if we are told that there are guns in the  
18 home, especially with underage children. But I was  
19 wondering whether we did have access to that information,  
20 and the answer is no.

21          DET. MATTSON: Well, the answer is no until it  
22 becomes a law enforcement issue.

23          DR. BENTMAN: Right.

24          DET. MATTSON: If it becomes a law enforcement  
25 issue, we can proceed through the risk warrant. So we do

1 have an avenue to pursue to seize those guns from people  
2 who are an imminent danger to themselves or others, and we  
3 often, at times, get it from a doctor, you know, a  
4 hospital, or something, and we do get that information.

5 CHIEF REED: But I -- just a point here. I  
6 think we're talking two different things. The permit  
7 holder information is exempt from disclosure. Gun owner  
8 information is a whole different thing. Because we don't  
9 have gun registration, we theoretically don't know who  
10 owns a gun and who doesn't, and if we do have information  
11 on someone who has a gun, I don't know if that gun  
12 information is public at all or not.

13 CHIEF SALVATORE: If we run it through the state  
14 police we're not allowed to give that information up.

15 DET. MATTSON: And that is correct. And by  
16 disclosing about pistol, you could be disclosing  
17 inadvertently about permits so we don't disclose that  
18 outside our law enforcement.

19 CHIEF SALVATORE: So it's a fine line, but the  
20 bottom line is if the doctor has an individual that's  
21 expressed a desire and he contacts us, it's a case-by-case  
22 basis.

23 CHIEF REED: We look to see, one, if they have a  
24 permit because we'll know if they have a permit, and then  
25 if they have a permit, we look to see if they have a gun,

1 and then that's how we gauge what our response is going to  
2 be. So I just don't want us to use interchangeably gun  
3 possession and permitting, because they really are two  
4 different things.

5 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: I'm going to jump in for a  
6 minute because there's something I just feel like we're  
7 not really talking about. We're talking about permits,  
8 we're talking about access, and if you would take a look  
9 at sort of the Manhattan story, dramatic decrease in gun  
10 violence, also there's controversial stop and frisk. We  
11 heard earlier that there are probably millions of guns in  
12 the State of Connecticut that we do not know about. We  
13 have this issue of gun violence, much of it handgun, much  
14 of it illegal, an illegal gun in an illegal hand. What  
15 else can we do? What else can we do from a law  
16 enforcement standpoint to abate this rising trend of gun  
17 violence?

18 CHIEF REED: Well, I think the issue of gun  
19 registration has been brought up before. Do we mandate  
20 registration of all firearms and mandate updated  
21 registration so if somebody moves you know where those  
22 guns are and eliminate any existing statutory bars to  
23 tracking the movement of guns? You're right. Is a  
24 criminal going to be the person who goes through the  
25 process of having a suitability check and making sure that

1 they have their fingerprints on file?

2 It's these backdoor sales, it's these trunk-lid sales  
3 of the small deadly firearms that are killing people in  
4 the inner cities and being used to commit crimes. So do  
5 we make a mandatory registration process so anyone who is  
6 caught in the possession of a gun, not only do they have a  
7 violation of the permit statute, if they're not permitted,  
8 but it becomes contraband because the gun is not  
9 registered. And then the gun is seized and sent, I don't  
10 know, for destruction perhaps.

11 DET. MATTSON: That would make life a lot easier  
12 for us on the law enforcement side. If there was  
13 mandatory registration it would be certainly be able to  
14 know exactly what a person should own, what is lawful to  
15 own. And if we come across something, as the chief said,  
16 that was not registered to them we could take the  
17 appropriate action; absolutely.

18 MR. CHIVINSKI: Going back to that interesting  
19 conversation we had about confiscation of weapons.  
20 Adrienne, I believe you were asking for reaching out for  
21 help and the fine line between disclosing of information.

22 Just for clarification, was that for concerning the  
23 seizure of guns from a person, we're talking about  
24 suicidal ideation, for somebody who might imminently harm  
25 themselves if they owned the gun, or if there was any gun

1 in that home?

2 CHIEF REED: Well, I think it may encompass  
3 both. I think it starts with the person who discloses  
4 some ideation to hurt themselves or hurt others, and then  
5 we, from a law enforcement aspect we look to the premises,  
6 and we look to see who do we know that lives in the home.  
7 And, of course, people aren't required to register that  
8 they live in a particular home either so we don't always  
9 know who lives in the home. But of the known people in  
10 the home, do we have any permit holders there and do we  
11 have any information that indicates somebody in that home  
12 has purchased a weapon.

13 Right now, we receive notification when somebody  
14 purchases a weapon. You recall earlier there were all  
15 sorts of forms that the state police showed and they have  
16 to provide a copy of that form to the chief law  
17 enforcement officer in the community where they live, but  
18 if that person moves we never have any updated  
19 information. So although it's kind of a pseudo registry,  
20 it's not a true registry in that once the person moves we  
21 have no way of knowing where they moved to and the fact  
22 that they have that gun, so therein lies part of the  
23 issue. We're not able to track them and if we need to  
24 seize it because somebody is a risk, we would certainly  
25 look at weapons in the house.

1           Oftentimes we get voluntarily compliance on these  
2 types of issue. We'll go to the home, and we'll knock and  
3 we'll talk, and we'll say, "Listen, you just brought this  
4 person back from the hospital. You know that they are a  
5 risk, but I know that you have a firearm in the house.  
6 Why don't you let us take it and we'll hold it until this  
7 all goes over."

8           Oftentimes, people are willing to give the weapon up.  
9 There are other times where they refuse to disclose that  
10 they have a weapon or we actually have to get the risk  
11 warrant and compel them to provide us with any other  
12 weapons in the home.

13           CHIEF MCCARTHY: Dr. Campbell spoke earlier  
14 about evidence-based regulations and the issue of  
15 registration of guns. Where else in the country is it  
16 being used and is there evidence that that is a successful  
17 deterrent to gun violence?

18           CHIEF SALVATORE: Registration? New York City.

19           DET. MATTSON: Some states don't have mandatory  
20 registration. Some states don't have any.

21           CHIEF SALVATORE: And understand, if it hasn't  
22 been said before, I think prior to 1994 -- '94, right, for  
23 handguns, those weapons are not registered unless they did  
24 it voluntarily.

25           MS. FORRESTER: We've been talking about the

1 suicidal, but there is also a regulation around  
2 domestic violence, and are there any -- what you have been  
3 talking about, is that sort of the same standard procedure  
4 around if a clinician --

5 CHIEF SALVATORE: I'll tell you, there's a lot  
6 of specific regulations and things that we have to do and  
7 the individuals have to do when it comes to firearms.

8 MS. FORRESTER: Is it any different than a duty  
9 to warn on a suicidality case? Are there any more  
10 specific interventions from a domestic violence  
11 perspective than there is from a suicidality?

12 CHIEF REED: I think it's different in that the  
13 statute specifically states weapons have to be turned over  
14 in domestic violence cases where when we have suicide and  
15 other risk cases, the same set of mandates aren't there.  
16 I think we still have the authority to go in with the risk  
17 warrant and to seize the weapons, but when it comes to  
18 domestic violence there are very specific statutes that  
19 govern our conduct in seizing the weapons.

20 CHIEF SALVATORE: And if they don't, we can  
21 charge.

22 CHIEF REED: Detective Mattson, was there  
23 anything further or --

24 MS. FORRESTER: I'm sorry. Go ahead.

25 Is it the same for if someone else is in the house

1 who has a gun, or is it just for the specific perpetrator  
2 of the domestic violence?

3 DET. MATTSON: It is specifically for the party  
4 who is prohibited under the domestic violence court order.  
5 We hear from the court daily in regards to anybody who is  
6 a positive match for somebody that we're aware of who  
7 possesses a gun or who has a pistol permit. So then we  
8 generate out letters to that party who now becomes  
9 ineligible and we notify the chief of police in the town  
10 where that party resides, and that gets the ball rolling  
11 right away. And we have two business days from the  
12 issuance of that court order to have that party in  
13 compliance.

14 And the only two options for that is to sell that gun  
15 to an FFL, or any and all guns, or to surrender the  
16 firearms to police. That is the only option you have when  
17 you're under a domestic violence court order.

18 CHIEF SALVATORE: And that was a change that was  
19 enacted a couple of years ago because you used to be able  
20 to surrender your weapons to any licensed permit holder  
21 previously.

22 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: We have a couple of minutes  
23 left, time for a couple of questions.

24 Bob?

25 MR. DUCIBELLA: I will do this as quickly as I

1 can. What we're really talking about is prevention. I  
2 know there's been a lot of talk about post-event  
3 interdiction, emergency management. Do you -- anyone of  
4 you feel that as part of the famous word of the day,  
5 suitability, is there adequate information available to  
6 you as part of the suitability determination with respect  
7 to information about an individual's mental health or  
8 public health? Do you feel that there are adequate  
9 opportunities to find that information without  
10 obstreperous --

11 CHIEF SALVATORE: Well, we can't get the  
12 information that the detective can get only because that's  
13 the way it was worked out -- I'm talking about mental  
14 health.

15 MR. DUCIBELLA: That's correct. That's the  
16 question. Some of the individuals that have been involved  
17 in school events showed a history of mental disturbance,  
18 others have not, according to the testimony that we've  
19 been given in the written materials. So the very simple  
20 question I have that appears to be a quite complex subject  
21 is, in determining suitability do you, in the law  
22 enforcement community feel you have access to as much  
23 information as you feel is appropriate with respect to the  
24 mental health of the folks who are applying to or who are  
25 in possession of a weapon?

1 CHIEF SALVATORE: The short answer --

2 MR. DUCIBELLA: Short answer, go ahead.

3 CHIEF REED: Well, one of the problems is there  
4 is no centralized clearinghouse of data for people who  
5 have mental health issues that would affect their ability  
6 to possess a weapon because the only thing the statute  
7 allows us to look at is have they been committed by the  
8 probate court within the last 12 months to a psychiatric  
9 facility. That's one of the standards. And then have  
10 they been discharged and found not guilty by reason of  
11 mental defect within the last 20 years.

12 Other than that, if you voluntarily committed  
13 yourself for three months because you had some  
14 instability, there is no way we're ever going to know  
15 about that because there is no central clearinghouse that  
16 I'm aware of that every person who is a mental health  
17 patient whose name is -- you know, there is no database  
18 that controls or that you could ever access to find that  
19 out.

20 MR. DUCIBELLA: Because I want to be clear,  
21 would it make sense to consider a further study where law  
22 enforcement and mental health professionals caucus, sit  
23 down and evaluate what's available within the mental  
24 health profession from those people who manage it, and  
25 those people in law enforcement who have responsibility to

1 grant suitability and create less of a silo and more of a  
2 shared information opportunity. Does that make sense?

3 CHIEF REED: That would be beneficial.

4 MR. DUCIBELLA: Thank you very much.

5 CHIEF O'CONNOR: That's sort of a segway to my  
6 question because as I'm listening to the conversation I'm  
7 thinking about Virginia Tech, and we know what happened  
8 with Virginia Tech because that information was in Silos.  
9 And that folks who had information were reluctant to share  
10 it because first of all this, or you know, this protection  
11 and that protection, and Virginia went through this whole  
12 process after that mass murder to try to sort through what  
13 can't we give out?

14 And Matt, you've heard me testify that the behavioral  
15 threat assessment model we do at universities, I really  
16 see as very applicable in towns that you have, you know, a  
17 multi-faceted team approach and you're getting in a room  
18 and you're talking and sharing information so that your  
19 high school student or your elementary student who is  
20 showing information, you are there to talk about what's  
21 going on in the family. The mental health person is there  
22 to talk about what that might mean down the road.

23 And so when I heard you talk about the pistol permit  
24 part, because we're faced with this daily at UConn, as we  
25 assess students who are at risk. We talked about how we

1 can't share that. And we dance around that issue as a  
2 police agency, sharing information about, "Well, there is  
3 reason to be concerned about what this person may have  
4 access to or not have access to," without saying they have  
5 a pistol permit or there's guns in the home. But I do  
6 think we need to kind of sort through that stuff, as Bob  
7 has sort of suggested. And what is out there that  
8 prevents us from -- or prevents you all from sharing that  
9 information because I have no doubt that eventually this  
10 is going to be a recommendation, you know, from once we  
11 get into the mental health piece of it that we kind of  
12 model that sort of behavior.

13 So I'm curious if, Chief Reed, you thought about that  
14 or if you have any thoughts about that. A long question,  
15 I apologize.

16 CHIEF REED: That's fine. Your testimony in the  
17 past has been very intriguing in what you have experienced  
18 in the university environment and this -- you know, it's  
19 kind of a profiling but it's a profiling behavior. It's  
20 an analysis of behavior, not people because of their race,  
21 creed, or origin. It's the behaviors and being able to  
22 identify those behaviors and plot them against risk --  
23 known risk behaviors.

24 And I think some of this goes to that partnership we  
25 talked about earlier in collaboration with our schools and

1 our school social workers. They are certainly in a better  
2 position to be able to evaluate behaviors of students.  
3 But for us to be able to have access to that, nobody wants  
4 to label a child and nobody wants to stigmatize them that  
5 way, but I think we're seeing that there has to be some  
6 sharing of information, especially when it comes to an  
7 analysis of some of these behaviors that are risk  
8 behaviors, identified as risk behaviors.

9 So that has all been very intriguing to me and to my  
10 colleague chiefs in municipalities around the state, and  
11 I know some have tried to implement or are working toward  
12 implementing similar types of identification systems. And  
13 so I think as we move forward from these events, we will  
14 start to come together and see some more data that says,  
15 yes, these systems are workable, and that they we, as  
16 police agencies, what, again, are more best practices.  
17 How can we implement these? Do we train all of our  
18 officers? Do we train a target group of officers to be  
19 able to identify these adverse behaviors, and thus  
20 identify individuals that we should be tracking and kind  
21 of keeping watch over. And that's alarming to a certain  
22 extent because, you know, we don't want to have dossiers  
23 on certain members of the community and follow them and be  
24 aware of their every movement, but nonetheless it is  
25 intriguing to think of how we can use these behaviors to

1 identify those who can present a risk in the future.

2 CHIEF SALVATORE: If I remember correctly, that  
3 was part of the concerns from the mental health field.

4 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: We seem to have hit on a  
5 topic that is interesting.

6 MS. FLAHERTY: I have been sitting here for the  
7 last few minutes kind of more than than troubled because  
8 I think even the word suitability in the statute has  
9 really -- it's disturbing on so many levels. And I think  
10 even just hearing that there was one police chief who just  
11 decided arbitrarily and rather capriciously, "I'm just not  
12 going to issue any permits to anybody," for whatever  
13 reason. I can understand why that chief might have had  
14 some issues with the Board of Firearms Permits, where  
15 somebody who might have made more reasoned and thoughtful  
16 reasons for denying would not.

17 But as a person who is a lawyer, but a person living  
18 with bipolar disorder, the thought that having some kind  
19 of centralized clearinghouse of mental health information  
20 is more than profoundly disturbing to me on lots of levels  
21 because that seems like it's profiling people solely based  
22 on having a psychiatric history.

23 I always thought that the rule was that if you were  
24 ever involuntarily hospitalized you couldn't get a permit,  
25 so I'm just like, I don't want a permit anyway, but

1 I always thought I couldn't get one, I never applied for  
2 one. My husband has one, great, we have a gun in the  
3 house. And I don't know where it is, I don't want to know  
4 where it is. And he keeps saying he wants to give me a  
5 gun for my birthday, I can't, but I don't want one anyway,  
6 but that's okay.

7 But the main thing is, that really concerns me, is  
8 that they started to talk about mental health as  
9 behavioral health, when people do things, when people  
10 conduct themselves and behave in a certain way that's one  
11 thing. But when you start talking about because somebody  
12 has an illness and label them because they have an  
13 illness, that's completely something different.

14 When you talk about somebody who might be on this  
15 list or be denied because of the NGRI, how many ever years  
16 ago, it's because they did something. When you ban  
17 civilly committed, you had to reach a certain standard  
18 under the law. That's fine, too. But when you just talk  
19 about the fact that somebody has a diagnosis and you're  
20 collecting information about them, simply because of that,  
21 it's something I and a lot of other people have a huge  
22 problem with. Thanks.

23 CHIEF SALVATORE: If Reed and I are saying that  
24 would be an automatic disqualifier, we're definitely not  
25 saying that.

1           CHIEF REED: We know that that's a challenge. I  
2 mean, we have, you know, we all are human beings and have  
3 family members that may be of questionable status, and  
4 you're right, that is difficult. But to answer the  
5 question, would that make it helpful to us to have that  
6 such a clearinghouse, it would. I'm not saying that it's  
7 practical or that it's -- you know, that our community as  
8 a whole has an appetite for that, but yeah, it is  
9 definitely challenging, but we try to look at behavior as  
10 being predictive. And if we're going to prevent an act of  
11 violence in the future, we have to look at what we know.  
12 And what we know is the behavior that a person has  
13 exhibited. And as a result, you may be stopping somebody  
14 from enjoying a certain right or privilege that other  
15 people enjoy simply because of their past behavior, but I  
16 guess that's what we call prevention.

17           UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: I would just suggest as a  
18 panel we consider a session specifically relating to  
19 HIPAA, other privacy laws, mental health legislation in  
20 Connecticut and throughout the country to make sure that  
21 we all have a good solid grounding of the same fact base.

22           MS. FORRESTER: I just want to say, Kathy, sort  
23 of the same issue working with children who may or may not  
24 have a mental health disorder documented or a DSM disorder  
25 in that, you know, we really look at children and their

1 behavior. And I think that, Doctor, you said that guns  
2 are the vector and I have been sort of sitting with that  
3 and thinking about that. And I understand, they certainly  
4 are, they're dangerous, you know, similar to the points  
5 you made, but I think that behavior is a vector also. And  
6 understanding what drives retribution, what drives the  
7 violence that we're seeing in our community in, you know,  
8 New Haven that I live with every day, and what are the  
9 behaviors and the thinking and the feeling that the child  
10 may be having when they go out with an illegal gun and  
11 shoot someone.

12         And I think someone said it earlier this morning  
13 around -- it's about relationships. It's about  
14 understanding the driving -- and, you know, we have the  
15 Community Policing Program down in New Haven around  
16 knowing the kids, knowing who are on the street to be able  
17 to intervene after a shooting has occurred, knowing who to  
18 go to, who would be the retribution group after.

19         And I just wondered if any of you would think that --  
20 I know mental health may not be your forte, but developing  
21 the relationship and trying to intervene on predicted  
22 behavior helps, or is it too time-consuming, or, you know,  
23 maybe it's different in different towns. But I guess the  
24 question is how much -- we're talking about suitability  
25 and the time it takes for suitability. Is there time and

1 money for relationships?

2 CHIEF SALVATORE: Yeah, I mean, relationships  
3 though our school resource officers, definitely. They  
4 develop relationships all the time with students. Some  
5 that have problems. But again, it's a fine line that we  
6 walk even in that area because of what the schools can  
7 provide us for information.

8 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Thank you. And that notion  
9 of school resource officers drives us to our next panel,  
10 which is on the use of human assets in schools as a  
11 protective device.

12 So are there any final questions for the troopers or  
13 for Dr. Campbell?

14 MR. GRIFFITH: I just wanted to frame a half  
15 comment, a half question, about the premise because the  
16 conversation seems -- and when you answer the question  
17 about, yes, it would be nice to have access to this  
18 information, for me it seems as though you're basing it on  
19 some already established premise and that's been  
20 troublesome for me all afternoon. I don't know where the  
21 premise is clearly established, this connection between  
22 the possession of the weapon, the violence, and a mental  
23 health history. I don't know where this is coming from or  
24 where it is really intending to go and I'm still seeking  
25 some clarification about this because I don't want to make

1 the assumptions, and I just don't see how these aspects  
2 are connected in the way in which you all reach your  
3 conclusions.

4 So you have information about what? Somebody has got  
5 a mental health history, somebody may have a weapon in the  
6 home, and so what? Nothing has happened yet.

7 And you all tell us all the time, the psychiatrists,  
8 and so on, mental health professionals, that we're  
9 terrible predicting everything else, and perhaps the best  
10 aspect of the prediction is past conduct. But we're not  
11 talking about past conduct. We're, in fact, talking about  
12 anticipated conduct.

13 And therefore, the word which has not been used very  
14 much this afternoon is really the concept of risk. And  
15 I don't understand how you all are make your connections  
16 when you're talking about this issue of risk. Because  
17 I don't know where you get it from, that there is this  
18 clear risk between the possession of the weapon and the  
19 intent on the psychiatric history.

20 CHIEF SALVATORE: I don't think we ever said  
21 that. Maybe you're misunderstanding us.

22 MR. GRIFFITH: I want to be sure I'm not  
23 misunderstanding.

24 CHIEF SALVATORE: First of all, we do not have  
25 access to anything with regard to an individual's mental

1 health.

2 MR. GRIFFITH: I understand that, but I thought  
3 I heard a statement, at least twice, that you would like  
4 to have it or it would be nice to I have it, and I want to  
5 know --

6 CHIEF SALVATORE: Before I issue a permit  
7 I think it would be helpful.

8 MR. GRIFFITH: Helpful in what way? This is  
9 what I'm not understanding.

10 CHIEF SALVATORE: To determine if the individual  
11 is suitable for a permit for a pistol or a revolver.

12 MR. GRIFFITH: But if you're talking about  
13 suitability in that way, you are therefore suggesting that  
14 it will help you make a judgment of what the potential  
15 conduct of the individual will be. I mean, otherwise  
16 what's the point of the suitability, as I understand the  
17 suitability criteria.

18 CHIEF REED: I think -- we're not saying that  
19 any mental health history it and of itself is going to  
20 make the final decision, but information is power, and if  
21 the information is out there and that information may  
22 provide us a piece of the puzzle, a piece of the puzzle  
23 that says no, this person doesn't exhibit any propensity  
24 for violence, it doesn't look like there's any indicators  
25 that the person is going to be violent in the future.

1 Maybe this person just sought some sort of mental health  
2 treatment to deal with something that has nothing to do  
3 with their ability to possess a weapon. That's fine.  
4 Then that would be regarded to the level it should be  
5 regarded. In other words, it may have no impact on the  
6 decision.

7 But, on the other hand, that information from the  
8 clinician may be one of, yeah, he has some thoughts of  
9 killing people, and that's kind of interesting, and maybe  
10 you, as an issuing authority, should know that I see what  
11 looks to be some sort of a personality disorder here and  
12 I'm going to treat him this way because these are some of  
13 the statements he made.

14 Again, here you have somebody -- and this is just, I  
15 guess, generally we're saying that's a mental health  
16 history. I mean, that may mean something to me and it  
17 probably means something completely different to a  
18 clinician, that may mean there's been a bona fide  
19 diagnosis made and there is some sort of course of  
20 treatment. In my mind that mental health history is much  
21 more broad than that. It means has this person sought out  
22 treatment for some sort of challenge that they've had in  
23 their mental health world.

24 But just having access to the information doesn't  
25 mean we're going to use that information to say, "Oh, you

1 saw a psychologist, or you saw a psychiatrist, well, you  
2 can't have a gun." No.

3 CHIEF SALVATORE: I'll add this qualifier. It  
4 may mean today, the way the system works, that I'm going  
5 to issue the permit on the local level, and then when they  
6 go over to get their state permit they're going to run the  
7 individual and find out that they're not qualified based  
8 on what they've learned with the information that they  
9 have. And that's today. That's how the system works  
10 today.

11 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: It appears obvious that we're  
12 looking at this today, via the law enforcement prism, and  
13 we're going to have to invert that vision when we have the  
14 mental health professionals on the other side of the table  
15 to say, look, there's -- the law enforcement folks feel  
16 like there is a gap here. How can we address that gap or  
17 should we address that gap. But clearly these are not  
18 mental health professionals, they don't look at it in that  
19 regard. They look at it from the long perspective.

20 CHIEF SALVATORE: Just because an individual  
21 seeks mental health help that we're saying they're  
22 automatically disqualified, we're not saying that.

23 CHIEF REED: If we know that, then perhaps we  
24 can get a release to either speak with the clinician or  
25 provide them a form and say, "Bring this to your treating

1 clinician and they need to understand that you've applied  
2 for a permit, what the implications of that are," and they  
3 can sign off on that that says, "There is no reason,  
4 I have no medical reason to believe this person should be  
5 disqualified."

6 As an issuing authority, I don't need to even know  
7 all the issues, but if the person who is treating you  
8 signs a release and says, "I understand they want a gun  
9 permit and none of the issues I'm treating them for have  
10 anything to do with violence or their inability to have a  
11 permit." I mean, now, that's great. But the fact that we  
12 knew they were seeking mental health treatment, that's  
13 what points us in that direction and allows us to go to  
14 that clinician and say, "Listen. This person wants a gun  
15 permit. Is it okay to have a permit?"

16 And if that clinician can put pen to paper and say,  
17 "I have no problem with that," then we, as the issuing  
18 authority, feel much better. Yes, they were seeking  
19 issues for mental health, but the clinician has said they  
20 see no problem with them having a permit.

21 CHIEF SALVATORE: And under law we're not  
22 allowed to release that information, it's exempt, it's not  
23 releasable.

24 And let's keep something in mind. To get a CDL, a  
25 commercial drivers license, you have to get a medical. To

1 get a firearms permit you don't need a medical.

2 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: One comment, Kathy?

3 MS. FLAHERTY: Just one final question I have.

4 If, you know, because Dr. Campbell was going on  
5 evidence-based practices. If evidence -- if the evidence  
6 base shows that people with mental health histories are no  
7 more likely to be violent than anybody else, I'm just  
8 curious, and I respect the experience of you having to go  
9 from the perspective you are coming from, but I am just  
10 curious if whether the assumptions you make in terms of  
11 the investigative background you do, that people with the  
12 mental health history -- or that should be looked into as  
13 a basis for the suitable determination, that we need to  
14 know more information. Even if you're going to their  
15 provider to say, "Is there any issue?"

16 I just put this out there for consideration because  
17 the very first question I was asked by the Connecticut Bar  
18 Examining Commission when I said, "I have a history of  
19 bipolar disorder," the very first thing another lawyer  
20 said to me was, "Are you violent?" And there was no  
21 history of any violent behavior. Because that's the  
22 assumption that is automatically made when you have a  
23 history of any kind of mental health problem that you are  
24 violent.

25 So I just leave that for you in your thinking about

1 do we the need to do that questioning if there hasn't been  
2 any history of any actual behavior or things that they've  
3 done.

4 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Thank you. Great  
5 conversation this afternoon. We do have a little bit  
6 more. Dr. Campbell, thank you so much for your time. We  
7 do have Trooper Burke scheduled for the panel on school  
8 officers.

9 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Dr. Campbell, can you  
10 make sure we get a copy of your presentation?

11 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Since we have discussed guns  
12 today, I'm also going to take this opportunity to  
13 distribute, at the same time as Dr. Campbell's  
14 presentation, recommendations from the Connecticut  
15 Conference of Municipalities. It's the umbrella  
16 organization for chief elected officials. Last month they  
17 came out with a series of recommendations to reduce gun  
18 violence as well, that I will be sharing.

19 CHIEF MCCARTHY: Mr. Chairman? Mayor Jackson?  
20 Will we be getting copies of all of the presentations that  
21 are presented? I think there is some detail in some of  
22 the presentations and would hope that we would be able to  
23 get copies.

24 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Yes, we collect for the  
25 archive which is at [www.ct.gov/shac](http://www.ct.gov/shac), so as they come in

1 they're posted to the website.

2       Okay. For the final panel discussion today we're  
3 talking about school security, human assets in the  
4 schools, what we do now and what recommendations we may  
5 seek in the future.

6       Bernie, do you want to kick this one off?

7               MR. SULLIVAN: In particular, we have had a lot  
8 of conversation here about physical security, locks, and  
9 that kind of stuff. We're kind of looking at the school  
10 resource officer issue, and the issue, as an example, New  
11 Bedford, Mass., where you're able to develop a rapport  
12 with kids, get information ahead of time, and to divert  
13 bad things from happening by having those kind of  
14 relationships established between the police and the  
15 school body.

16              CHAIRMAN JACKSON: So, gentlemen, can you start  
17 off by sort of just given us the state-of-the-art in  
18 schools of school resource officers, what you see  
19 communities doing effectively, where some of the best  
20 practices may lie, and what modeling we can do for  
21 schools, large and small, and districts large and small.

22              CHIEF REED: I don't know if you had a prepared  
23 presentation on this issue, you wanted to do on this  
24 issue, nothing? Just going to answer it in general.

25       Okay. From the municipal police standpoint, school

1 resource officers are certainly nothing new. They have  
2 been in existence for many years in some form or another.

3 I know in our community, more than 25 years ago we  
4 had a youth service officer that was assigned to our  
5 schools and would frequently travel not just to our high  
6 school but our middle school and five elementary schools.  
7 And I think if you polled the chiefs around the state  
8 you'd see it's existed, in some form or another, for  
9 decades in municipalities because we, as chiefs, have  
10 always seen the importance of establishing relationships  
11 with the educational foundation in our communities and  
12 building a bridge between law enforcement and the kids,  
13 the students.

14 The School Resource Officer Program really came into  
15 vogue probably about 20 years ago and the federal  
16 government started to fund a lot of these positions  
17 through their COPS programs, the Community Oriented  
18 Services Program and their Safe Schools Initiative that's  
19 been going on in many communities throughout the years.

20 Each town who has a School Resource Officer Program  
21 will deploy them in different ways. Most of the time  
22 there is some sort of a written agreement between the  
23 police department and the school, or the school board, so  
24 that they understand what the expectations are of the  
25 school resource officer, an understanding of what the

1 program is about. It's not really a byproduct of the SRO  
2 program, there has been some level of school security, but  
3 the initial intent of the School Resource Officer Program  
4 was not school security at all, it was to create exactly  
5 that, a resource for student/staff/faculty and the  
6 students. By putting a police officer into the school  
7 they could provide information on whether it's a laws of  
8 arrest class, or whether it's drug abuse prevention,  
9 whatever it might be it was to provide a resource in the  
10 school.

11 It also provided agencies an opportunity to have an  
12 investigator in the schools to handle the occasional  
13 criminal complaint that would occur, or perhaps, to assist  
14 Department of Children and Families in a child welfare  
15 investigation, so certainly having an officer stationed in  
16 the school would be helpful.

17 We know there was a school resource officer in the  
18 school in 1999 when Columbine happened. His goal at that  
19 school was not one of school security, but he was there at  
20 the time that the shooting occurred and became an integral  
21 part of the response when he arrived at the scene once the  
22 shooting started, but he was there as a resource, so  
23 that's really the state of school resource officers  
24 throughout the country.

25 And in light of more recent incidents people have

1 looked to the School Resource Officer Program as a  
2 security resource, and I don't know as law enforcement  
3 officials if that's really what we want that program to be  
4 or to become. We know there is a movement afoot to,  
5 perhaps, put armed personnel in the schools, but as you  
6 can imagine with the department the size of Chief  
7 Salvatore's or the size of mine, where you're having only  
8 40 people, and of those 20 people are dedicated to patrol,  
9 how do you put a police officer in all of your schools.

10 South Windsor, we're a small community of 25,000, but  
11 we have six schools. We have seven schools, a high  
12 school, middle school, and five elementary schools. There  
13 is no way we could deploy an officer effectively in every  
14 one of those facilities. And anyone who knows law  
15 enforcement security knows that one security guard is not  
16 really adequate to protect the building and all of the  
17 grounds.

18 So we use our school resource officers right now to  
19 try to educate facility staff so that they know, they  
20 understand some basic crime prevention techniques, target  
21 hardening techniques, and we also encourage the use of  
22 crime prevention through environmental design, prevention  
23 techniques in order to harden the target and make schools  
24 more impenetrable to somebody who -- what we call is an  
25 abnormal user. In other words, somebody who is not

1 supposed to be there.

2 When we get the final review of the Newtown situation  
3 as Chief Keough alluded to this morning, you'll see that  
4 their school did everything right. They had all of those  
5 in place.

6 But to talk about school resource officers, I can't  
7 say that every community has them. Many communities have  
8 contemplated them. Many communities do have them in use,  
9 and I know the state police can talk about what they have  
10 from their trooper ranks that are currently used as school  
11 resource officers in the communities that are covered by  
12 the state police, so I can speak from the municipal end.  
13 Chief Salvatore --

14 CHIEF SALVATORE: Just if I may, I have one more  
15 important thing that I have found. I have had a school  
16 resource officer for 13 years and before that they used to  
17 be -- we also have a youth officer/ now it's youth  
18 detective, but there was always previously youth officers,  
19 but specifically one of the important things that I get  
20 out of my SRO is intelligence because of the relationships  
21 that they build with the children and with the staff to  
22 head off problems before they end up existing. And that's  
23 huge in my opinion today, that they have these types of  
24 relationships where staff and/or the student body come to  
25 that person to tell them about potential problems that are

1 going to exist and we're able to head it off before it  
2 becomes a criminal matter.

3 CHIEF REED: A good school resource officer  
4 becomes so engrained into the DNA of the school that they  
5 essentially become a staff member of the school and a  
6 trusted member of the staff. And we find that when we  
7 have children whose behaviors are identified as risk  
8 behaviors, the social worker is able to confide in the  
9 school resource officer and we're able to get some  
10 information that, historically, prior to these types of  
11 relationships we may not necessarily have gotten. That's  
12 one of the big benefits of the school resource officer  
13 program that you now have a trusted member of the law  
14 enforcement community engrained in the everyday operation  
15 of the schools and we're able to take a great deal away  
16 from that in the way of intelligence that helps us  
17 prevent, detect, and make arrests in certain criminal  
18 cases, but also to help when it comes time to identifying  
19 at-risk youth.

20 I will turn it over to --

21 TFC BURKE: Thank you. He's exactly right.  
22 I concur with everything he's saying.

23 My name is Mike Burke. I'm a -- or was a school  
24 resource officer for ten years. In the year 2000,  
25 I started at Litchfield High School, spent five years

1 there. 2005, I went to Lewis Mills High School, which is  
2 in Burlington, and spent five years there.

3       Unfortunately, in 2010, due to lack of resources and  
4 manpower, the state police had to end their SRO program.  
5 Since then, the superintendent over there has been working  
6 feverishly trying to get this program back. Just probably  
7 about three weeks ago, after not really getting anywhere  
8 with the state, they went with a constable, who is working  
9 there now full-time. And I'm glad they have somebody  
10 because it is -- in my opinion, it's the biggest bang for  
11 your buck when it comes to a lot of different issues. And  
12 the chief really talked about -- both chiefs, actually,  
13 hit on a lot of different things.

14       We're there to provide traditional police services as  
15 need be, but you are also very embedded within the school  
16 community itself.

17       I mean, there's plenty of stories. I have had  
18 several cases where kids came to me and were disclosing  
19 information that they typically would not be calling the  
20 police about. And the ones that stick out in my mind are  
21 a 12-year-old that was involved sexually with a  
22 21-year-old; and another, 13-year-old that was,  
23 unfortunately, involved with her grandfather, knew it was  
24 wrong, didn't know who to trust, couldn't go to a parent,  
25 couldn't go to -- just didn't trust anybody with such a

1 delicate situation, but yet they knocked on the school  
2 resource officer's door. Those are a couple of cases that  
3 I will always remember and will stick out in my mind.

4 Again, I mean, how do you put a price on something  
5 like that. Who knows how long this would have gone on if  
6 she wasn't able to go to somebody that she trusted.

7 I heard a couple of things today that I just wanted  
8 to touch on a little bit. Arming teachers? I think it's  
9 a bad idea. Okay. I got -- I've gotten to know a lot of  
10 them over the time I have been a resource officer and I'm  
11 telling you these people are the best at what they do, but  
12 don't put a gun in their hand, okay. That should be left  
13 to law enforcement who is properly trained.

14 Trooper Delehanty told you today that we'll spend 127  
15 hours in the Connecticut State Police training. And as  
16 everybody in law enforcement knows, on top of that we go  
17 every year for additional in-service. So there is a  
18 constant training involved in something like that. There  
19 is a lot of stress in having a gun strapped to your hip  
20 all day. To put the burden on a teacher I think is  
21 unfair. Let them do what they do, let us do what we do.  
22 I hope that's the way it goes, I really do.

23 The other thing I just wanted to talk about, too, is  
24 a couple of weeks ago I was involved with a subcommittee,  
25 and there was a lot of suggestions thrown out there as far

1 as what to do to enhance school security. And obviously,  
2 if anything gets done, it's a positive. I mean, any  
3 little bit will help because our schools do need it. The  
4 beauty of the school resource officer is the fact that he  
5 can look at his individual facility and tailor what needs  
6 to be done.

7 It would be difficult for, say, the Commissioner of  
8 Education or the board to come out and say, "All schools  
9 in the State of Connecticut will do XYZ." That might work  
10 for this district, but it won't work for this system. So  
11 that's where your law enforcement professional comes in  
12 and is able to say, "This is what we need to do to make  
13 school security better for our system or our district."

14 Each facility is different. I can't stress it  
15 enough. And that's another benefit of a school resource  
16 officer.

17 Again, they talked about some of the relationships  
18 that were made, some of the resources. In addition to  
19 what Chief Reed had said, the school resource officer is  
20 also a resource for the parents. I would get a lot of  
21 phone calls from parents who had pretty much had it up to  
22 here with their teenager, and they were losing them and  
23 they were looking for help, and they didn't know quite who  
24 to turn to and they ended up calling the school and the  
25 school puts them in touch with the school resource

1 officer. You start to work with that parent a little bit  
2 to help them in how to make a connection and communicate  
3 effectively with their child.

4 The job list just goes on and on, and that's why I  
5 said in the beginning this is the biggest bang for your  
6 buck right here.

7 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Thank you.

8 At this point I ask Mr. Kline to join us at the  
9 table. As we start to talk about, you know, how some of  
10 these, you know, you mentioned training, you mentioned --  
11 in fact, thank you Trooper Burke for your thoughts on  
12 teachers. There's this notion of a gun in the school.  
13 Now maybe it's affiliated with a badge and maybe it's not,  
14 maybe it's affiliated with a teacher or with an armed  
15 security officer of some other type.

16 Does anyone else have thoughts on the notion of armed  
17 security that is not tied to a badge?

18 CHIEF SALVATORE: We think it's a big mistake.

19 CHIEF REED: In our written testimony, and I  
20 think you all have copies of the written testimony we  
21 prepared on school security, we know there are many  
22 districts that want to explore that. And our simple  
23 advice is explore that with caution because we go both in  
24 the municipal training academy and the state training  
25 academy, as you heard, a tremendous amount of hours in

1 weapon handling, weapon retention, and how to deal with  
2 situations where you may have to have a handgun. So to  
3 have a teacher with a handgun, I think, is not wise.

4 To bring in other types of armed security, I think  
5 it's fair to examine that, but really, I think you have to  
6 look at is that really going to be the answer to a threat  
7 that shows up on campus. One armed security guard, 1200  
8 high school students in a high school that could be  
9 anywhere from 8,000 to 180,000 square feet plus, you know,  
10 these huge, huge facilities. I don't know that that's the  
11 best deployment of a resource.

12 And any time you're going to introduce a firearm into  
13 the school, I think we always have issues of how it's  
14 maintained, how it's retained, and what happens to it if  
15 for some reason it gets loose, if you have somebody who is  
16 not a certified police officer that is there with it.

17 Regarding school resource officers, I just want to  
18 hit on there's a 40-hour resource training course that  
19 officers who are selected as school resource officers go  
20 through. Connecticut does have a Connecticut association  
21 of school resource officers, so that the school resource  
22 officers are able to collaborate, work together on some of  
23 the issues that they face in schools, so those departments  
24 that choose to take advantage of the School Resource  
25 Officer Program, there are certainly opportunities for

1 them to have training, advanced level training, and a  
2 level of certification when it comes to school resource  
3 officer activities.

4 Certainly Mr. Klein can speak to what happens through  
5 the Police Officers Standards and Training Council and  
6 what kind of training our municipal basic level police  
7 officers get.

8 CHIEF SALVATORE: Mr. Chairman, if I may, before  
9 Mr. Kline speaks, you're not going to get the same  
10 benefits from armed teacher or from armed security that  
11 you presently get from a school resource officer assigned  
12 to a school or a school district. It's important to  
13 remember that.

14 TFC BURKE: If I can just add to that, what also  
15 needs to be considered, too, is simply perception. I  
16 would have a lot of students come up to me and say, "I'm  
17 glad you're here." These kids grew up with Columbine and  
18 some of the other mass shootings that have gone on. They  
19 see it on TV. They are concerned. They view it as a  
20 legitimate threat. These school, especially high school,  
21 they are not like school when we went through school.  
22 They have changed a lot. These kids have been exposed to  
23 quite a bit. So their perception when they see a police  
24 officer, or a trooper, they know that individual is not  
25 only credible but trained. Okay. And that's what makes

1    them feel safe.  And like I said, countless kids would  
2    come up, "Glad you're here."  I don't know if they would  
3    do the same with a civilian that is carrying the wrong  
4    gun.  I don't know what credibility they bring.

5                   CHAIRMAN JACKSON:  Mr. Kline, can you give us an  
6    understanding of the post and certification process.

7                   MR. KLINE:  Well, it's a twofold process.  
8    Actually, it's threefold for -- are you talking about an  
9    individual to become a certified police officer?  It's  
10   threefold.  We are not a hiring agency so we service, by  
11   statute, 162 municipal police departments and law  
12   enforcement agencies, so the first onus is on the police  
13   department.  They have to fulfill our standards, our  
14   hiring standards, so all potential police officers have to  
15   be -- they receive a polygraph examination, they receive a  
16   psychological evaluation where the clinician has to give a  
17   statement of suitability to become a police officer, so  
18   there has to be a statement by that clinician.  They have  
19   to have a fingerprint check, a background investigation, a  
20   drug tox screen.  They have to take a written entry  
21   examination and they take a physical fitness agility test.  
22   And we have adopted the National Cooper Institute Fitness  
23   Testing for police officers.  They also have the  
24   medical -- they need a medical certificate from their  
25   physician saying that they would be able to participate in

1 all of our physical fitness training, including ground  
2 fighting, baton, and OC sprays, and things like that.  
3 They have to give a statement that everything on their  
4 application is true and there has to be an FBI -- there  
5 has to be a fingerprints sent down to the FBI to  
6 doublecheck on their criminal history. No police  
7 department or law enforcement agency can hire an officer  
8 with a Class A -- any felony arrest, Class A or B  
9 misdemeanor arrest, or any misdemeanor or felony statute  
10 if it involved domestic violence cannot be hired.

11       Once the department determines we're going to hire  
12 this candidate, then the second step is they have to  
13 register them for our academy, our police academy. In  
14 this year, the minimum amount of hours of training at our  
15 academy is 1880 hours.

16       After they successfully complete our graduation, they  
17 are then released back to their police departments wherein  
18 they would have to -- they have to receive training from a  
19 certified field training officer for a minimum of 400  
20 hours.

21       Once the field training officer and/or the chief  
22 sends us notice that the candidate completed his FTO  
23 training, it is at that point that that person, that  
24 candidate, is now considered certified, and he will get a  
25 post-certification identification number from my shop with

1 a card, an identification card. That's the certification.

2 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Thank you. Questions from  
3 the panel?

4 MS. FORRESTER: Officer, I appreciate your  
5 conversation and description of the disclosures that came  
6 to you as the school -- or someone that you knew, I don't  
7 know if it was to you directly around abuse and neglect  
8 and kids saying to you, "We're glad you're here," or  
9 hearing SROs being told that.

10 Living in an inner city and talking a lot about the  
11 school prism pipeline that we have, you know, in a lot of  
12 our larger urban settings there has been some discussion  
13 that SROs lead to greater amount of arrests for children,  
14 and, in particular, around maybe more school discipline  
15 issues that might have one day been handled by a -- you  
16 know, the vice-principal, or things like that, whereas,  
17 you know, for truancy or petty theft, or things like that.

18 I wonder if there is any discussion on a state level  
19 around that issue of more arrests for youth if there is an  
20 SRO in the space?

21 TFC BURKE: I can really only kind of share my  
22 own experience in what I have seen in everything. I can  
23 tell you that I was at one school, at one point, and the  
24 perception of that school was that this was a really clean  
25 school and this was a really good school and nothing bad

1 ever happened here and everything was really kept kind of  
2 in-house, et cetera, et cetera.

3 I moved the program in 2005 because the school I was  
4 heading to had a reputation in this community as having a  
5 drug problem. When I got there and was working in that  
6 new school and reflecting back on things, what I realized  
7 is there wasn't any more of a drug problem at the school I  
8 was at versus the school that I came from. It was about  
9 the same per student, if you will. It was equal. The  
10 difference was the old school kept things quiet and kept  
11 things low key. The new school was out -- was forward  
12 about it, was -- they didn't sweep things under the rug.  
13 They didn't keep things quiet. They let everybody know  
14 what was going on. The appearance was that there was more  
15 arrests or more of a problem over here when it was  
16 actually about the same.

17 It's a great question. I think if you put an SRO in  
18 the school, I think it starts to hold kids to a certain  
19 level of accountability.

20 One of the things a superintendent was always telling  
21 me, day in and day out, was, "You set a tone here and that  
22 tone is more conducive to the educational environment."

23 Again, it kind of ups the accountability for the  
24 students. There is an expectation of behavior. And  
25 that's just some of the benefits.

1 I hope I answered your question.

2 MS. FORRESTER: I think so. Honest, I think  
3 your point is well taken around expectation and behavior.  
4 I think, you know, the national data is looking a little,  
5 you know, is a little concerning on urban settings with  
6 more police presence and I think police officers are more  
7 costly than guidance counselors. And we heard from the  
8 woman from the Unified Police District last week, and  
9 actually I think there is 5100 police officers in UCLA, in  
10 schools in LA, and only 3,000 guidance counselors. So you  
11 know, we tend, you know, I guess if the school district  
12 supports it then there is more resources being put toward  
13 police than guidance counselors.

14 TFC BURKE: I would hate to see what that school  
15 was like if those police officers weren't there.

16 MS. FORRESTER: Agreed. Or if there were that  
17 many counselors.

18 So I think the other issue I have is have you seen a  
19 decrease of training dollars and training around child  
20 development with the Office of Safe Schools being closed  
21 on the federal level?

22 CHIEF REED: I think, certainly, the federal  
23 grants for the hiring of officers for their presence in  
24 schools has evaporated, and that funding does not exist to  
25 the level that it did at one time, and any funding that is

1 there is very competitive. It used to be if you put in  
2 for the money and you wrote a reasonable program, you were  
3 going to get the funds, but now, unless you are a high  
4 density community with a lot of reported UCR crimes, then  
5 the money is not available.

6 Just to go back to the previous conversation about  
7 the SROs in the schools. Some of it is the matter of  
8 presence. In other words, if you took all the police  
9 officers out of South Windsor, our UCR statistics would  
10 drop dramatically, and it would look like there was no  
11 crime in our community. But if you put 40 police officers  
12 there and suddenly crimes shoot up, well, aren't police  
13 supposed to prevent crime? No, police are there and they  
14 detect crime and they may make arrests when they detect  
15 crime.

16 So you put a police officer in a high school and  
17 suddenly they find the kids smoking marijuana in the  
18 parking lot and they get arrested. And that shouldn't be  
19 a disciplinary issue, they should get arrested. That's a  
20 crime, they need to know that and there needs to be a  
21 consequence for it. How they deal with it, whether they  
22 utilize a diversion program, like the juvenile referral  
23 board, review board as opposed to sending them to court,  
24 again, that goes back to that whole relationship issue.

25 But we know, as chiefs, we are cognizant of the fact,

1 we know the ACLU has looked at this and said, listen, we  
2 have police officers that are in schools making arrests  
3 for school policy violations. We, as chiefs, don't want  
4 that to happen and we find ourselves struggling sometimes  
5 with our administrators saying, "That's not a police  
6 issue. We know you like the person with the badge there,  
7 but you need to get a stronger associate principal out  
8 there to handle this as a disciplinary issue, it's not a  
9 police issue."

10 So sometimes, depending on the administrators, we  
11 have to kind of hammer down exactly what the expectations  
12 are and say, "Listen. We're not going to go to every  
13 single disciplinary issue just because a kid had a --  
14 burst out in class, that needs to be something that your  
15 staff handles."

16 So we are battling that, I think as long as we have  
17 police officers or as long as we have had them in schools,  
18 and as long as we continue to have them in schools that  
19 question will always be raised.

20 But all our officers know if they see a criminal  
21 violation, for example, they cause injury to somebody in a  
22 fight, people are quick to criticise and say, "Well, don't  
23 arrest them, they'll get suspended." But the victim says,  
24 they come to us and say, "That's against the law. Your  
25 child, that child, punched my kid in the face and caused

1 an injury and had to go to the hospital. Why isn't that  
2 student being arrested?"

3 So we have to deal with both ends of it. We try to  
4 be sensitive to our position in the school, but at the  
5 same time we have to speak for the victims, too, and stand  
6 up for them.

7 And if something is a criminal violation, we use our  
8 discretion to make an arrest, we'll stand by that  
9 oftentimes.

10 CHIEF SALVATORE: You don't, for the most part  
11 in Connecticut, see arrests being made for violation of  
12 school policies. But years ago, and I agree with Chief  
13 Reed, very rarely did we get parents complaining to us  
14 about a fight between two individuals. But definitely  
15 today, if there's injuries, we're getting complaints and  
16 somebody is getting arrested and it's whether the police  
17 officers are in the schools or not.

18 TFC BURKE: If I can add to that, too, as far as  
19 what they're talking about with why having them there.  
20 You know, in a lot of communities, and even the one that  
21 I was coming from, on the campus where I was working  
22 between students, staff, faculty, you include everybody,  
23 you're talking about 2800 people. And in the two towns  
24 this school district was covering is the largest  
25 concentration of people on any given business day, on any

1 given Monday through Friday business day hours, why not  
2 have a cop there? That's where all your people are.  
3 Everybody else is gone to work. The neighborhoods are  
4 empty. That's where everybody is.

5 DR. BENTMAN: I'm not exactly sure how to frame  
6 this question, so I'll offer a comment and then invite you  
7 to speak.

8 We're clearly hearing a lot about the need for a  
9 collaboration among groups of people who used to not have  
10 relationships much with one another, so we talk about  
11 police, fire, emergency services, schools, and mental  
12 health practitioners, that's actually who we all are. And  
13 so to that extent, it makes sense to me to hear you speak  
14 on behalf of having a school resource officer in the  
15 school.

16 Alternatively, when you put a police officer in a  
17 school, it communicates something about the capacity of  
18 the culture of the community to manage its differences.  
19 It speaks to the fact that the community has to now manage  
20 its differences with the force of the law rather than with  
21 the capacity to do it through relationships and  
22 conversation and the creation of a culture of safety that  
23 would allow the kind of information you're talking about  
24 to come forward to other individuals, and that its force  
25 rather than relationships that create safety.

1           And so I understand that there are certain locations  
2   in which that would be -- it would be a must, but I worry  
3   about -- I worry about us making a uniform recommendation  
4   because of what it says about our really giving up on  
5   relationships and other means of creating safety. And so  
6   I really offer that for your consideration.

7           TFC BURKE: On the contrary, I think the  
8   relationships are actually built between the police  
9   officer and the student. You talk about force. I think  
10  in the ten years I was an SRO, I actually only had to put  
11  my hands on somebody I think twice, and it was an  
12  off-of-medication kind of episode and they were hurting  
13  themselves or trying to hurt themselves, whatnot. But the  
14  rest of the time, anytime there is an issue, which was  
15  always through communication to get compliance.

16          Yes, like the chief said, you know, a lot of times we  
17  will arrest kids for a violation of the Connecticut  
18  General Statutes, it happens. But it sets a tone and we  
19  go back to the expectation of behavior.

20          When I first got to that second school, I was very  
21  busy. I was making a lot of drug arrests. There is no  
22  question about it. There was some behavioral arrests,  
23  two. There was fights going on.

24          It wasn't long that after the students saw that this  
25  is -- the line in the sand was basically drawn, that the

1 behavior started to correct itself and the superintendent  
2 was very happy because now they got back to learning more.

3 It's amazing just what one police officer, the impact  
4 that they can have on a school system.

5 MR. SANDFORD: We were told a couple of weeks  
6 ago the total number of schools that were in the State of  
7 Connecticut and it's kind of amazing how many there are.  
8 What scares me in what you're saying is that if we were to  
9 say, yes, every school should have a school resource  
10 officer, the Connecticut Department of Public -- well, I'm  
11 sorry, that's my old mentality, the Department of State  
12 Police would have to double, if not be larger than that in  
13 size to put a school resource officer in every school  
14 that's in the area that you guys protect.

15 So what will most likely happen is schools will look  
16 for other than law enforcement to be school resource  
17 officers, and then we'll end up with a number of  
18 individuals that are school resource officers that maybe  
19 are not exactly up to the 900 hours that we heard about,  
20 that are trained, and they're going to be in that school  
21 possibly with a gun. That kind of scares me a little bit.  
22 I mean, you know, I understand what you're saying about  
23 having a law enforcement person, but I really don't think  
24 that, right now in the State of Connecticut, we have the  
25 resources within the law enforcement departments

1 statewide, both locally and at the state level, to put a  
2 resource officer in every school. Can you talk about  
3 that? I mean, I realize that at the state police level,  
4 I mean, I don't know how many state police school resource  
5 officers you have right now and how many schools you  
6 protect, but there is no way that you have one per school  
7 at this particular time.

8 TFC BURKE: You're absolutely right. There are  
9 no state police -- well, the School Resource Officer  
10 Program ended with the state police so we're really --  
11 with the exception, I think of two that are working at a  
12 couple of state schools, you're right. But other than  
13 that, I mean the state police, I mean, we have really kind  
14 of gotten out of that business.

15 And you're correct, I work out of Troop L. Troop L's  
16 area between public, private, elementary through high  
17 school, there's 31 different schools. There's no way our  
18 troop could do that. We just wouldn't have enough people.

19 And just to make sure, that's private, too. Out in  
20 the western part of the state there are a lot of private  
21 schools. A lot of them are kind of like college campus  
22 settings and stuff.

23 I believe that a school -- well, it would be  
24 difficult to put a certified police officer in an  
25 elementary school a lot of times. That would be a hard

1 thing to do. You have trained somebody, you have put the  
2 hours into training somebody, to have them watch the front  
3 door of an elementary school, it's probably really not  
4 what they signed up to be a police officer for.

5 Speaking of my own experience, when I went to the  
6 elementary schools it was only a couple of times a year  
7 and it normally involved a protective order or an abuse or  
8 neglect case that we would get involved with.

9 Other than that, any behavioral issues at the  
10 elementary school was always administrative and the school  
11 would handle that.

12 So I'm not exactly sure what the answer is. I think  
13 maybe the first thing you have to do is ask what level do  
14 we want to get our schools secured to and then go from  
15 there.

16 CHIEF SALVATORE: If I may, I don't think your  
17 commission should actually mandate school resource  
18 officers for every school. I think that's a decision that  
19 has to be reached on the local level between the  
20 legislative body of the municipality along with the Board  
21 of Education.

22 I have one school resource officer that handles four  
23 schools, including the elementary, and she is in there all  
24 the time with the kids, she has programs, reading  
25 programs, developing relationships.

1           We're in the process now of debating whether or not  
2 in our community we want to put on more. That's a  
3 decision the community is going to have to make and then  
4 they have to budget for it.

5           And my opinion is that if those other areas covered  
6 by the state police, if they want school resource  
7 officers, then budget for it and hire state police as  
8 school resource officers.

9           But if my community decides that they want one in  
10 every school, then that's a community decision, but  
11 I don't think it should be mandated by the state.

12           CHIEF REED: But I think an endorsement of the  
13 School Resource Officer Program by the commission would  
14 certainly say a lot. But, you know, there are things that  
15 you can do beyond -- or, you know, if you can't get to the  
16 level of putting in a school resource officer in every  
17 school, there are things that communities can do to help  
18 enhance the police presence in that school.

19           In our community we have seven schools and we have a  
20 resource officer at the high school and the middle school.  
21 And the way we handle our elementary schools is we have a  
22 school-directed patrol policy that says at least once  
23 doing your shift if you have an elementary school that's  
24 in your district you will stop there, and you will park,  
25 and you'll get out, and you'll walk around the school and

1 greet the teachers. You may be there 20 minutes, you  
2 might be there for an hour if the activity allows.

3       And it really does two things. One, it gets staff  
4 used to seeing a police officer in a school where maybe  
5 they have never seen them before, but the second thing it  
6 does, from a tactical perspective, it now gives that  
7 officer the opportunity to see what the inside of that  
8 school is like. So in the event they are the officer or  
9 the trooper that's called to that school they have at  
10 least experienced the layout of that particular school.

11       So that's something that -- I certainly can't speak  
12 for the state police, but where they have troopers  
13 patrolling these huge vast geographical areas that's a way  
14 they can at least get somebody in the school. And I know  
15 that's what we do in our community and colleagues  
16 throughout the state that do the same thing. They  
17 require, as long as activity permits, that their officer  
18 get to that school even though they can't be there the  
19 entire day, they make an appearance and they get an idea  
20 what the school looks like on the inside and they have an  
21 opportunity to meet and greet some of the administrators  
22 and staff.

23       Because, you know, one of our challenges when we show  
24 up at a school is, who are the good guys, who are the bad  
25 guys, when you show up to a crisis. And if you have some

1 sort of working knowledge of who the staff members are, at  
2 least you have some idea of who to go to, to figure out  
3 what's happening at that school once a crisis occurs.

4 CHIEF SALVATORE: That's a huge benefit, again,  
5 of the SRO. Because my SRO, if I ask him, we have a  
6 situation, they know exactly who we're talking to at  
7 whatever school it is.

8 CHIEF REED: And part of this is school  
9 security, and I know we're running out of time, and I talk  
10 a lot about that in the document we provided to you, but  
11 things like identification. How do you identify the staff  
12 that's supposed to be on site. When you show up at a  
13 crisis, how do you know that the person that you're  
14 confronting is a staff member, a member of the public, or  
15 one of the bad guys.

16 So I know one of the things we do in our district,  
17 everybody has to have an ID and it's got to be displayed  
18 all the time, even if you're senior staff, a junior level  
19 teacher so when the police show up they know who to go to,  
20 to get help and to get information on a facility, and  
21 information on what is going on, that intelligence  
22 gathering function.

23 So I hope you are able to read that document because  
24 there are a lot of good common sense things that can be  
25 applied there to help enhance the security of every school

1 from elementary to senior high.

2 CHIEF MCCARTHY: We often refer to what's  
3 changed or what school is like now compared to when we  
4 were in school, and there was a lot of authority, whether  
5 a public or parochial school. There was a lot authority  
6 in school when I was going to school. Mother Superior had  
7 to rule the environment. And I think that environment and  
8 the latitude teachers and administrators has, has changed  
9 dramatically that has led to the need for an authority  
10 figure that can't be vested -- that authority can't be  
11 invested in a teacher.

12 And I'm wondering what kind of feedback you get from  
13 teachers, especially those who have served and seen the  
14 transition where their ability to intervene has changed  
15 because society has changed and has that led to the need  
16 for an SRO to deal with issues that used to be dealt with  
17 by the vice principal, which are evaporating in most of  
18 our schools, or the latitude that teachers used to have to  
19 deal with it independently.

20 CHIEF REED: We certainly hear those comments  
21 from teachers. Every year we're invited to participate in  
22 the convocation that our school system does so I go and  
23 present some general security information and it provides  
24 them a good reminder we're always there to help. And then  
25 in the conversations I have afterwards and throughout the

1 school year I run into different teachers, and one,  
2 they're glad we're there, they know there are risks that  
3 are far beyond them as educators to deal with because --  
4 I would challenge you that educators in today's classroom  
5 have a lot more demands on them from an educational  
6 perspective than they did 20 or 40 or 60 years ago as far  
7 as what's expected from them in a classroom. And then you  
8 put on top of that this whole security aspect and identify  
9 at-risk behaviors and dealing with kids that are  
10 disruptive in the classroom, I think it really compounds  
11 all of their responsibilities.

12 So I think yes, they don't hesitate to send  
13 disciplinary problems off to the assistant or associate  
14 principals and the administration of the school, and I  
15 think at the same time I think the administration of the  
16 school is happy to have a law enforcement officer there to  
17 step in when they do have those issues that cross the line  
18 from a school discipline issue to a criminal matter.

19 CHIEF SALVATORE: I would agreed. Today staff  
20 wants us there in the building, especially from the  
21 standpoint of understanding what the law is and what their  
22 rights are. You know, years ago teachers could lay a hand  
23 on you and get away with it. Today, you can't do those  
24 sorts of things and we understand that, and so the police  
25 officer is the authority figure. And in my community,

1    though, we will support and assist the school district,  
2    but the violation of school policies is left to the  
3    appropriate administrator, in most cases the  
4    vice-principals to handle.  So we don't -- while we will  
5    assist the administration, they're in charge with handling  
6    the discipline of school policies.

7           TFC BURKE:  I would agree with that.  I know  
8    when I was pulled out in 2010, I guess the governor's  
9    office received quite a few letters to get the school  
10   resource officer back in Lewis Mills High School, from  
11   what I was told, and those letters came from the staff and  
12   faculty at the troop -- at the school.

13           And like the chief said, you know, if a kid is late  
14   to class they're not sent to the school resource officer,  
15   it's the dean of students or vice principal.  Those  
16   administrative violations are handled by the school.  Just  
17   having the presence of somebody with the authority of a  
18   police officer, again, sets the tone within the school.

19           MR. KLINE:  If I may, on the certification side,  
20   on providing advice, a lot of police departments are  
21   calling me.  They are thinking about -- several  
22   communities are thinking about rehiring retirees, once a  
23   police officer is certified and what the requirements  
24   would be to recertify them.  They're going to be hired on  
25   a per diem basis during the school year rather than hiring

1 a more expensive SRO. I have heard from the town of  
2 Enfield, they're going to go with armed security guards.  
3 The chief called me to see if we have an issue with that.  
4 I said, "We don't certify security guards so there's no  
5 issue with me, just check with your town attorney."

6 And --

7 CHIEF SALVATORE: One second. We do under  
8 7-294(x), if I remember correctly. We train school  
9 security in post, in-service. There's training for  
10 schools -- security officers under post, and we do it  
11 every year down in Meriden. They're unarmed, yes.

12 However, armed security is left up to the district,  
13 whether or not they want armed individuals on their  
14 campuses or not. That's left up to the school district.

15 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Final question? Comment?

16 MR. CHIVINSKI: Again, that Connecticut Police  
17 Chiefs Association document, I can't thank you enough for  
18 it. I think it's very well written. Reading over the  
19 directed school patrols, I think that would be an  
20 excellent way to break down some barriers in schools  
21 without appointing a full-fledge school resource officer.

22 Also under the school resource officer section it's  
23 important to point out that when it was created it wasn't  
24 really meant for security, although that's kind of where  
25 we are at now. It was meant -- I don't think just anybody

1 can just be an SRO, I think it has to be a special type of  
2 person to interact with students on a daily basis.

3 But with that said, regarding the SRO program, what  
4 can you tell us about standard or how different towns  
5 implement this program? For instance, I mean, do any SROs  
6 in the State of Connecticut have the ability, God forbid,  
7 if it's necessary to call a lockdown, or is that just  
8 strictly a school administrative procedure? Do any SROs  
9 have -- I don't know what the right term would be, a gun  
10 locker on site in case there was an attack where they  
11 could fight back with more than what's on their hip. What  
12 can you tell us about best practices or standard operating  
13 procedures for SROs?

14 CHIEF REED: There is the School Resource  
15 Officer Training Program that introduces -- first of all,  
16 the selection process. I think you'll find that most  
17 communities have a selection process. It's not just, "Hey  
18 you, you're going to go and be a school resource officer."  
19 The officer has to show a desire and an aptitude to be  
20 appropriate in the school environment so that they can be  
21 put into the selection process.

22 The selection process, I know in our community and in  
23 many of the neighboring communities, because we share our  
24 services with each other, you go through an interview  
25 panel that is comprised of not just police professionals,

1 but people from the schools where they're going to work.

2 We use principals -- representatives of the  
3 superintendent's office, and the principal from the other  
4 school to participate in the interview process so that  
5 when somebody is selected we know that they are a person  
6 who is fit to be a school resource officer. And then we  
7 do a further diagnosis to figure out which are they more  
8 appropriate for the middle school, or more appropriate for  
9 the high school because some officers may connect better  
10 with middle school age kids as opposed to high school age  
11 kids. There is a vetting process that goes on in the  
12 communities as far as who is going to be the school  
13 resource officer and where they're going to be stationed.

14 As far as their practices, right now, it's really  
15 left between the community, the Board of Ed, or whoever  
16 governs the school district, and the police department, to  
17 met out some sort of agreement as to what the school  
18 resource officer's duties are going to be, what the  
19 expectations are and, in turn, what our expectations are  
20 of the school.

21 In other words, we don't expect our school resource  
22 officer to be on bus duty out in the parking lot directing  
23 traffic at bus time because all the parents never listen  
24 to the teachers when they're out there. We discourage  
25 that type of activity from the school resource officer.

1 We want them to be more of an asset inside the school. We  
2 don't want them to be on lunch duty necessarily, but we  
3 encourage them to go in and have lunch with the students  
4 as often as they can. We want them to interact, but we  
5 don't really want them to intervene unless it becomes a  
6 criminal matter, a matter of safety, otherwise you want  
7 them to be there as a matter of resource.

8 We leave that right now, that's left up to the  
9 administration of the police agency and the administration  
10 of the school to decide what exactly the school resource  
11 officers role is going to be. It may come down to a  
12 signed, almost like a contract, or it may be a verbal  
13 understanding, or it may be a memorandum of understanding,  
14 or some exchange of ideas where everybody has -- there's  
15 been a meeting of the minds as to exactly what the  
16 expectations are.

17 So that's really how it stands right now. There is  
18 not statutory language. Actually, there was just a  
19 proposal that has been raised recently that there should  
20 be statutory language that requires there to be a written  
21 agreement between the town and the Board of Ed, or the  
22 police and the schools, as to -- although the statute  
23 doesn't talk about what the elements of that agreement  
24 would be, so there has been some contemplation of some  
25 standardization.

1           CHIEF SALVATORE: But it's really not necessary  
2 because we're there at their invitation. I mean,  
3 theoretically they could tell us to leave tomorrow and we  
4 would leave.

5           First and foremost, you have to understand these are  
6 sworn police officers that are taking these assignments  
7 and we would be opposed to any mandates that would require  
8 them to be certified as SROs, initially. I think that's  
9 something that comes along as a result of -- by virtue of  
10 their assignments. But first and foremost, these are  
11 sworn police officers assigned to these positions.

12           CHIEF REED: So we don't want to have to be  
13 told, "You have to hire school resource officers." We  
14 will make them from within if you want to provides us with  
15 something that says we have to provide so many school  
16 resource officers. That's difficult, too. We don't like  
17 mandates on our personnel system, but that's not to say  
18 there can't be some best practices or uniform practices.  
19 But I think the needs of every community are a little bit  
20 different, too.

21           CHIEF SALVATORE: It has to be a  
22 community-by-community basis.

23           TFC BURKE: To throw my experience into the mix,  
24 I know that if I had walked into the office or met with  
25 the principal at any point and I all I said was, "Lock the

1 school down," there wouldn't be a question. She would  
2 pick up the phone and she'd lock the school down, or  
3 secretary, they would lock the school down. Now the same  
4 point, if a trooper -- or a constable from the town said,  
5 "Hey, lock the school down," she might have a few  
6 questions before she did that. It's those relationships  
7 that's built, that trust, that if that SRO says Boom,  
8 there is no question. They're going in the lockdown.  
9 She'll find out why later on and I'm sure she'll ask, and  
10 there will be a reason for it, but when seconds count ...

11 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Thank you very much for your  
12 testimony. It's been a long day. I appreciate you  
13 staying with us this long and I thank the commission for  
14 their attention. These full days can be grueling,  
15 I understand that, but I appreciate you hanging in with us  
16 as well.

17 We have a couple more items on the agenda, other  
18 business and discussion. I would like to let you know  
19 what the intentions are moving forward toward March 15th.  
20 I would like to have available for review and some  
21 discussion next Friday, a consolidation of recommendations  
22 that we have received so far, and take a few hours on the  
23 15th to fully go through those recommendations and  
24 determine what, at this point, we're willing to pass along  
25 to the governor.

1           We do have an emergency management session scheduled,  
2 and we will be moving into mental health after that.

3           I would like to get some sense of the folks about  
4 what they think about -- I mean, obviously the March 15th  
5 deadline was driving some of these long days. Do you want  
6 to continue doing full days or is it a little bit too much  
7 for your schedules?

8           MS. FORRESTER: Mayor, so the clarifying  
9 question is recommendations will only be covering the  
10 topics we have covered in this large group meeting,  
11 I assume, and leaving out mental health then?

12           CHAIRMAN JACKSON: That is accurate. Now, we  
13 have made some forays into that topic, specifically last  
14 week, so -- but in terms of the delivery of mental health,  
15 I don't think we've gotten far enough to achieve any  
16 meaningful consensus on that. It's just a much more  
17 challenging issue.

18           So what I would say is when we start to look at some  
19 of these recommendations, there may be a mental health  
20 component to it, but I think in terms of an overview of  
21 the delivery of however we decide to silo those  
22 discussion, I just don't think we're there yet.

23           MS. FORRESTER: Agreed. But we can talk about  
24 it when we're writing the report, but I want to make sure  
25 that the report is clear, that that's not included because

1 we haven't addressed it, not because we don't think it's  
2 important.

3 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Absolutely. It's important  
4 to note that this is an interim report based on what we've  
5 gotten thus far.

6 MS. FORRESTER: Part one.

7 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Exactly. There will be a  
8 much more --

9 MS. FORRESTER: Part two will come.

10 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: A much more significant  
11 document toward the end of our process.

12 MS. FLAHERTY: In terms of the full day, I think  
13 if we're coming to Hartford we may as well stay for the  
14 full day and work until 4:00. That would be my  
15 suggestion.

16 DR. BENTMAN: I'd would agree. I'd say if we're  
17 not going to have a full day -- I would rather have full  
18 days than partial days and have days off so --

19 MS. FORRESTER: Same here.

20 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: It seems like that's the  
21 consensus. If we're here, we're here. I happen to agree,  
22 but I wanted to raise the question.

23 Chief?

24 CHIEF MCCARTHY: On the issue of the March 15  
25 deadline, I think that I would be comfortable with making

1 some recommendations that are very general, but not  
2 entirely inclusive. I think that our understanding of  
3 some of the issues are evolving. And especially as it  
4 relates to guns and ammunition, I would hate to say, okay,  
5 we have made those recommendations, we're done with that.  
6 I would want the opportunity to augment some of those  
7 recommendations as we move through the rest of the process  
8 because I think they will evolve and change a little bit  
9 once we hear some of the other testimony.

10 So I think that interim is really a -- for me, at  
11 this point, a general direction that I think I'm  
12 comfortable with heading, but I don't think it's  
13 definitive.

14 MR. SULLIVAN: Just so everybody knows, I got  
15 Barbara to volunteer with me, we're going to put together  
16 a couple of pages based on the gun stuff based on what you  
17 heard here, plus our vast experience on law enforcement.  
18 We'll submit it to the chairman so he can show it to the  
19 panel and see if we have consensus on it. Just to let you  
20 know so everybody else doesn't have to run off in that  
21 same direction.

22 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: But that's not to say that  
23 others can't put their thoughts together, just as Bob, our  
24 security expert here, is in a primary position to really  
25 kind of ferret out those recommendations from safe school

1 design, and Chris and Dave, who chaired -- or who managed  
2 last week's panel, are also the folks to really kind of  
3 focus in on the recommendations made at that panel.

4 We all have equal say, equal vote. We are here to  
5 achieve consensus from a rational person's standpoint.

6 And in direct response to what Chief McCarthy, that  
7 sometimes changes, so that's got to be acknowledged, it  
8 has to be recognized, and the final comprehensive report  
9 may have some modifications from the interim  
10 recommendations. That very well may happen.

11 MS. FORRESTER: Mayor, I wonder if we avoid  
12 using the word recommendation. If we -- because once a  
13 recommendation is made and stated as such, you know, in  
14 this world it lives unto its own, you know, it's done, you  
15 know, even though a later report might retract it or have  
16 a different conversation.

17 I know that we were directly asked on two  
18 recommendations of the governor's gun report, but I just  
19 would hesitate to actually publish recommendations at this  
20 time. It just feels short and that could be my only --  
21 I could be the only one with that opinion, but I would  
22 recommend that it would be a report rather than -- or an  
23 update rather than recommendations.

24 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: We can do an initial response  
25 to the material that we have been presented.

1           MR. DUCIBELLA: You know, after spending ten  
2 years working at the United Nations I have learned two  
3 things. No one ever hears the same thing when you ask  
4 them what it is they thought they heard. We always had to  
5 have three different language translators for each of five  
6 different languages because in each language the  
7 translation was potentially different.

8           I think what I'm doing is supporting the chief by  
9 saying we may have heard something, but I don't know that  
10 we all heard the same thing. And I think there is benefit  
11 in this broadband intellectual resource to say, "Did you  
12 hear that? I thought I heard this."

13          So some dialogue back amongst ourselves to get these  
14 -- and we'll talk about whether it's a recommendation or  
15 not, consensus driven is probably important, A; and B,  
16 another thing I found is just what you said, you make a  
17 recommendation in front of the UN Council and it's there  
18 in perpetuity so they are considerations.

19          I mean, what we've heard are a number of things to  
20 consider. And a consideration is different than a  
21 recommendation, and since we're in this interim phase  
22 where -- if I get this right -- we are going to all going  
23 to use our best ability to codify that which it is we  
24 thought we heard, which in our opinion might be  
25 appropriate for consideration by the balance of the

1 commission members, and we codify that somehow, maybe we  
2 use Microsoft Word, or whatever you're conveniently  
3 capable of doing, and that then gets from each one of us  
4 over to the Chair.

5       There is going to be a lot of repeat. A lot of us  
6 feel passionately about subjects that we shared amongst  
7 ourselves, so there is likely to be an extensive amount of  
8 repeating. And it's this process of consideration and  
9 consensus development which, you know, Chairman Jackson,  
10 I have to ferret through and say, you know what, we as a  
11 group have an obligation to the governor, I think maybe  
12 what we can say, Bernie and Scott is, we're really at a  
13 point where we have 30 considerations which this group of  
14 people have agreed are appropriate for subsequent review.  
15 I don't know that they're considerations -- I mean,  
16 recommendations at that point. They don't become that  
17 until the chair or the vice-chair and everyone here  
18 believes they're appropriate for subsequent transmission.

19       So for me, and I'm being myopic, and I don't mine,  
20 you know, you can throw darts at me, that's fine, what  
21 I would think I'm going to do is -- and I'm sort of a  
22 veterate note-taker because that's the way the engineering  
23 profession works, I have a list of things which I thought  
24 I heard, which -- many of which focus on safe school  
25 design or safe school environments. I'm going to propose

1 I write those up, submit them to you electronically. And  
2 some of them, I heard some very explicit things about  
3 guns. I heard some other things that some of the  
4 commission members, when I thought I had a really clear  
5 understanding, my colleague next to me made me re-think  
6 that, which is the benefit of the commission, but I will  
7 pass them on to you, Chairman Jackson. They'll just be  
8 individual items, one, two, three, four, five, six. I'll  
9 try to write it in as brief a paragraph or sentence as I  
10 can that expresses what I thought I heard or I thought  
11 from my experience was the substantive issue which was  
12 presented, and then everybody else can take a shot at it.  
13 At least that begins to create a process whereby through  
14 consensus and information exchange maybe something comes  
15 out a week later that says that the commission has 38  
16 things that are currently under consideration, but they  
17 are by not all means inclusive but a thought.

18 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: But we must monitor our level  
19 of detail. If we get into the process of wordsmithing, to  
20 a certain degree, it's going to be a very challenging  
21 process.

22 DR. BENTMAN: Regarding the issue of  
23 consideration, I think that this is -- this commission has  
24 been charged in a highly charged atmosphere, and I think  
25 that there are some things, really, that shouldn't be put

1 to paper at all at this point because I think we can call  
2 it considerations as much as we want and I think it can be  
3 interpreted in any way that those who read it choose, and  
4 so I think there are some things, among them some of the  
5 things that are -- some of the misconceptions that arose  
6 today, and the consequences of those misconceptions, that  
7 if written as considerations it would be very problematic.

8 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: We have the assistance of  
9 a recorder and perhaps the recorder can record a draft  
10 outline without too much content in it, and then we can  
11 shape what our consensus points might be without putting  
12 out too much definition right now, I agree.

13 CHIEF McCARTHY: Is it possible to receive a  
14 draft document that is not FOI-able? As a draft, at a  
15 local level we can use drafts with some degree of security  
16 prior to releasing it publicly?

17 Counselor?

18 ATTORNEY WAGNER: So there is an exemption in  
19 FOI preliminary drafts. Usually, and it's sort of a fine  
20 line between where something is a preliminary draft and a  
21 draft ready for consideration by a body. Once --  
22 certainly once a draft is circulated amongst all the  
23 members, that gets a little fuzzier. So you know, it  
24 would really depend on the purpose of the draft, whether  
25 it's ready for final delivery beyond the body. Whether

1 it's a continuing working draft, it can be considered a  
2 preliminary draft. If it's a working draft and the body  
3 decides that it's best not to disclose it, it's not a  
4 confidential document, but a preliminary draft is  
5 something where the public agency, if it determines that  
6 it's in the public interest to withhold it, can be  
7 withheld. If that helps.

8 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: However, I think we need to  
9 be cautious not to overthink this. We had a controversial  
10 subject come up today. It's out. It's in the public  
11 record already. Our question now is do we want to do  
12 something with it right now and the answer may be yes, the  
13 answer may be no, but we have already actually discussed  
14 it. The information has already been presented. So from  
15 a standpoint of potentially damaging the process or  
16 affecting the outcomes, I don't necessarily see the  
17 value -- or the additional value of trying to protect the  
18 document.

19 MR. DUCIBELLA: To go back to your specific  
20 definition of the commission reviewing it, the proposition  
21 I made, which is one we ran into at the UN we submitted to  
22 the secretary general. That's a communique between a  
23 member of the UN and the secretary general and is not out  
24 in forum. Does that allow us the opportunity to  
25 individually craft our thoughts or considerations, and by

1 sending it to the chair, and the chair only, who then  
2 could orally discuss this, does that put us within the  
3 bracketed realm of preliminary draft?

4           ATTORNEY WAGNER: So again, the statute doesn't  
5 provide a lot of guidance in this area, but when looking  
6 at specific instances where the commission has ruled,  
7 generally if, for instance, a staff draft, a staff member  
8 is working on the draft of something and asks other people  
9 for help in formulating the draft, that is considered a  
10 preliminary draft. But once circulated to certainly the  
11 commission level or senior staff, it gets a little less  
12 clear whether it's a preliminary draft.

13           So with regard to what you specifically just  
14 suggested, it's possible that the commission would see  
15 that as similar to a staff member working on their own  
16 draft before being circulated to the body, or because  
17 you're all potentially considered senior staff, maybe the  
18 commission would see that as different than a staff member  
19 just developing a document.

20           It's not clear, is the best thing that I can tell  
21 you.

22           MR. DUCIBELLA: I'm sorry to do this to you,  
23 I apologize.

24           ATTORNEY WAGNER: No, that's okay.

25           MR. DUCIBELLA: So what can we do --

1           ATTORNEY WAGNER: I wish I had a simple answer  
2 for you.

3           MR. DUCIBELLA: -- to share amongst ourselves  
4 that which it is that we heard, that we all want to opine  
5 on so that we're taking into account every one of our  
6 individual areas of expertise to come up with a consensus  
7 developed initial idea of what the chair will present to  
8 those who will get it as an initial report on where we  
9 are? What can we do to do that most effectively without  
10 offending the process? I'm sorry because I don't  
11 understand it.

12           ATTORNEY WAGNER: Well, I mean, I guess it  
13 depends on what your goal is.

14           CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Can I take a stab at that  
15 one?

16           ATTORNEY WAGNER: Please.

17           CHAIRMAN JACKSON: We discuss it. We have had a  
18 series of recommendations. We have had an opportunity to  
19 look around the table and we see each other nodding at  
20 some things and taken aback by others, but it's okay to  
21 discuss. Discussion is fair. We have some important  
22 things in front of us and we are not seeking unanimity,  
23 we're seeking consensus. I think it's important to  
24 discuss these things. I think that's what the statute  
25 contemplates. I think our challenge over the next couple

1 of days is making sure that we have our arms wrapped  
2 around the total of recommendations that have been made.  
3 But beyond that, I believe it becomes discussion.

4 MR. SULLIVAN: I think what the Chairman said  
5 before, if we keep these things brief, we're less apt to  
6 get into a controversial area.

7 And I think all of us, as he said today, I don't  
8 intend to put anything in writing that I'm afraid to have  
9 get out in public or afraid to have somebody disagree  
10 with, but I will do my best for the bullets or little  
11 sentences that I will put together, to do it in such a way  
12 that it will be probably most us won't have any problem  
13 agreeing with.

14 Beyond that, there is a lot of stuff that requires  
15 more in depth work down the road. This is strictly for  
16 the preliminary report and I think we keep it as brief as  
17 we can and as precise as we can.

18 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Do we bring evidence of  
19 that as discussion as opposed to creating a document and  
20 submitting it, because I hear discussion creates the same  
21 environment for consensus development, but doesn't put us  
22 in the position of being in FOI violation because we  
23 haven't written it down and exchanged it.

24 MR. SULLIVAN: I think that's who we do it, get  
25 my list, however you want to describe it, to the chairman.

1 Let the chairman take my list, your list, everybody else  
2 that has a list, take a look at it and then maybe he can  
3 bring it together and bring to the body these are the 10  
4 or 15 things that we want to see if everybody agrees on it  
5 for the short-term report to the governor.

6 UNIDENTIFIED SPEAKER: Thank you for the  
7 clarification.

8 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Ron?

9 MR. CHIVINSKI: You want to go first?

10 MS. KEANEY-MARUCA: We have -- in terms of our  
11 charge, if we are responding to the terrible incident at  
12 Sandy Hook, we have so little information about what  
13 happened. So, for example, let's say we came to a  
14 consensus on an SRO issue, is there any evidence at all  
15 that an SRO at Sandy Hook would have made any difference  
16 at all? And I'm just throwing that out. I'm not taking  
17 an opinion one way or another, but before we make a list  
18 of considerations or quasi recommendations, I don't know,  
19 I feel like we're functioning in kind of a vacuum.

20 Everything we heard certainly relates to how we could  
21 fortify our schools and make them safer in a number of  
22 ways, make our communities safer, but are we charged with  
23 responding to that particular issue or the big broad issue  
24 of schools?

25 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: The broader issue. We were

1 brought together under the auspices of this tragedy, but  
2 our first presentation was the prosecutor who said, "Look,  
3 you're not going to have any information," which, to me,  
4 liberated us. It allowed us the opportunity to really take  
5 an all-hazards approach. So we do not have -- we are not  
6 obligated to link everything back to the tragic events of  
7 that day. We are able to look forward, to look at the  
8 spaces and say what can we do to make the spaces safer.  
9 And it's not just schools, it's public spaces. So it  
10 creates a very broad umbrella of potential discussion, but  
11 it does de-link us from the event.

12 MR. CHIVINSKI: Just to respond to that, I agree  
13 with you, it was liberating, but like Patricia was hinting  
14 at, I think, and I can't speak for everybody, I can speak  
15 for myself, though, I would feel a lot more comfortable if  
16 we had some information. And I think one of the elephants  
17 in the room is that we don't have much information about  
18 what happened that day. I think more would be helpful, if  
19 it could be released.

20 Without trying -- to not sound naive, concerning our  
21 data and our considerations, recommendations, preliminary  
22 drafts, has anyone ever used Google Documents? Hands?  
23 Yes? I know that when I took over as treasurer of our  
24 pack Cub Scouts, I took in eight massive binders of about  
25 two years of work with more little handwritten notes and

1 figures and it almost drove me nuts in two days. And  
2 I just -- I focused on Google Documents to really bring it  
3 all together so there wasn't all these drafts out there.  
4 I don't know if that could help us because the information  
5 is going to be out there when it gets out there. Like you  
6 said, maybe we'll have discussions. Maybe that will keep  
7 it in one place and get it tighter sooner.

8           CHAIRMAN JACKSON: What I would say is this:  
9 The mechanics of consolidating the information into a  
10 single document, I will take on that challenge. So  
11 I would ask that you -- those items that you feel strongly  
12 about, those items that you want to -- that as  
13 commissioner you say we must -- we must address this  
14 consideration, please forward those to me and I will  
15 consolidate them and make sure they're in a singular  
16 document. Like I said, I don't think we should be  
17 contemplating the creation of a document that needs  
18 massive wordsmithing. We need to identify the concepts  
19 that the state legislature should be considering as they  
20 come to the close of their session. And we don't even  
21 need to have all the answers. We need to identify some of  
22 the questions, though.

23           MS. FORRESTER: You said that you were librated  
24 by not having information. I have learned a new term "all  
25 hazards." That's a term that I think I use now once a

1 day. But I feel like in some ways because we don't have  
2 specific information, that we are free to contemplate  
3 different areas. So that if we could think about, you  
4 know, and think about children's mental health, even  
5 though we don't have specifics to actually, you know,  
6 bring ourselves, hypothetically, closer to some issues we  
7 think might have been, you know, taking part in Sandy  
8 Hook, so, you know, with the perpetrator. So I guess my  
9 question to you is can we get close to some hypothetical  
10 situations as part of the all-hazards exploration of this  
11 issue?

12 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: I think we're going to have  
13 to deal hypothetically, but I would avoid making the  
14 assumption that anyone of these hypothetical circumstances  
15 is, in fact, accurate. I would -- you know, something  
16 that we discussed today I would avoid correlating mental  
17 health with behavior, so I think we need to be careful.  
18 But I think it's our job to create some of these  
19 hypotheticals. We're doing it with the school structures  
20 themselves, so I think we need to also do it with the  
21 other aspects of the school.

22 DR. BENTMAN: Is there any hope before a final  
23 draft in December that we would have access to the report?  
24 I ask that only because I have found the testimony from  
25 the commissioners who were present in Sandy Hook and the

1 police chief, I found there's something quite grounding  
2 about the event that brought us together, along with the  
3 liberation that you're describing of not having it, and so  
4 I wondered whether we will be able to read it before a  
5 final report.

6 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: That is beyond our control.  
7 We can keep in touch with the prosecutor's office for  
8 status updates, but I cannot promise either way.

9 MR. GRIFFITH: I just would like to say it,  
10 I think you noticed this is part of my theme as I tried to  
11 engage in a discussion with those giving testimony, the  
12 event is still only -- and I agree with the major, this  
13 event is still only the number of one, and I agree it's  
14 grounding, but it's like all case reports that we talk  
15 about all the time in journals. It's only one case. And  
16 certainly in the area which they're all reputedly talking  
17 about the area of management of risk. One example doesn't  
18 help you much in extrapolating from what happened to the  
19 generalizations about how you would make changes in your  
20 broader institutions because of what you've learned. It's  
21 very disconcerting. I know it's very disconcerting, but  
22 this whole connection between what has happened in one  
23 case and to the business of generalizing is extremely  
24 difficult and the mathematicians tear us apart all the  
25 time when we -- when we try to do that. It just isn't --

1 it just isn't mathematically acceptable because the base  
2 rate is too low and that's a big problem for people who  
3 have to think about this stuff and for psychiatrists these  
4 days and forensic psychiatrists like myself, the  
5 management of risk is a major issue. And you just can't  
6 do much with a case of one, because no two cases are  
7 alike. That's part of the problem also.

8 DR. BENTMAN: I think this is a wonderful  
9 example of mishearing each other because my desire to hear  
10 the report has something to do with breathing life into  
11 what feels like death, but nothing --

12 MR. GRIFFITH: I'm sorry. I wasn't being  
13 catholicized in my head by what you said as much as the  
14 previous speaker about understanding what has happened and  
15 trying to extrapolate from that. I wanted to -- I'm  
16 extremely curious about what happened. You know, I would  
17 like to think it would inform my thinking better and all  
18 that sort of stuff, yet we all know very well what are we  
19 going to do with the information? There is no  
20 psychiatrist that I have met who wouldn't want to know  
21 what happened, that one individual, what was in his head,  
22 so on and so forth, and yet we all know the minute we turn  
23 away from the discussion, we all know that that is going  
24 to tell you nothing about how you could plan for the next.  
25 I mean, nothing. It's a sad disconnection in the way we

1 do the work but it's just not the way we can say this  
2 stuff. All we can say is some of these people are in high  
3 risk categories. We know some of these people are going  
4 to fall into high risk categories, but we cannot say  
5 anything about the individuals within those high risk  
6 categories, and that kills us all the time when we try to  
7 teach this stuff to students. It's so basic and yet it's  
8 so complicated to conceive.

9 I was very concerned, obviously, today, and I don't  
10 know if everybody understood that, I was concerned with  
11 the facility with which certain principles were being  
12 iterated and I've got enough common sense to know  
13 reiteration solidifies it and makes it sound as though  
14 that's what the experts really think. And you know, that  
15 was bothersome to me so I apologize for trying to cement  
16 that more clearly in our discourse. But that's where we  
17 are and I'm trying to make the rest of the panel feel the  
18 same way to feel my dis-ease with not knowing the  
19 information, but at the same time it's part of my  
20 profession, you know, but when I go home I say, What am I  
21 talking about? Why do I want to know that information?  
22 What is it going to tell me? It's not going to tell me  
23 much of anything. And that's the sad part about it. But  
24 that doesn't mean we don't want to know, all of us want to  
25 know. I'm just talking now of the human dimension of it.

1 The school stuff, and so on, that's not my expertise so I  
2 don't want to make any statements about that.

3 MR. CHIVINSKI: One of the reasons I want to  
4 know is because, as you've known, I've talked about a  
5 fairly simply concept which is door locks. And I want to  
6 know the specific events that occurred that day. There  
7 was a lot of speculation, and we're talking the press. We  
8 don't have an official report. We have press reports.  
9 Probably a million by this point. About was it one  
10 classroom unlocked. If so, why? What happened? Where  
11 was the breakdown? Is it true or is it not true? You  
12 know, did the teacher have the ability to lock that door?  
13 I think there is a lot we could learn just in that small  
14 facet from that report for the issue, whatever you want to  
15 call it. I really want to know that information.

16 CHIEF O'CONNOR: From a law enforcement  
17 standpoint, you always debrief issues from the lessons  
18 learned. And after Columbine we learned a lot. We  
19 changed how we approached things. We learned the facts  
20 after Virginia Tech. We always debriefed, there's a  
21 report. We learned from that. And I think not to have  
22 the facts to present some learning outcomes from the  
23 incident is important is really what you're saying, Ron.

24 And on my Blackberry yesterday, and this is what  
25 really troubles me, there was a training session going on

1 somewhere in Massachusetts and the colonel of the state  
2 police is addressing Newtown, so I think I want to go  
3 because I might learn it there versus learn it here.

4 We heard today we're not going to talk about the  
5 specific investigation piece of it, but if he's out in a  
6 public venue talking about Newtown, I mean, we're entitled  
7 to hear those same sort of things. And if we don't have  
8 access to him by that time, I'm going to go to the  
9 training in Massachusetts on March 28th and I'll circulate  
10 to all of you and we can go together and hear what the  
11 colonel has to say about Newtown.

12 MS. FLAHERTY: Colonel Stebbins was here today?

13 SPEAKER: (Inaudible)

14 MS. FLAHERTY: Yes, he was here, in and out all  
15 day.

16 MR. GRIFFITH: Because this is so much my  
17 business I really am absolutely fascinated because even  
18 this example, now you remember the testimony we heard  
19 about this example of the locks, because since it's not my  
20 arena I naturally can say this is fascinating to me. So  
21 actually, if you can lock the door from the inside, and  
22 then five minutes later somebody else said, but, you know,  
23 if you lock the door from the inside the people on the  
24 outside may not be able to get in, it's true, but the good  
25 guys also may not be able to get in.

1           And then, as I reflected driving home, I found the  
2 whole thing absolutely fascinating, just this little  
3 example, because as a psychiatrist I can tell you that  
4 when you lock the door from the inside, and then you're  
5 under stress, now you think you can open the door, but you  
6 may not be able to open that door. And, we only are going  
7 to know how people are going to respond to this closed  
8 door under stress when we have a good pool. One incident  
9 is not going to teach you very much.

10           Now, I think your comeback is beautiful and I will  
11 concede it, so we don't lengthen the conversation, I will  
12 concede that we can actually find examples in this  
13 discourse where my theory is wrong. And naturally I'm  
14 going to concede it in areas particularly where I know I  
15 don't know or I'm not familiar with, but even with that  
16 simple example I still think I can run you around the  
17 block, the track, a few times, and make you think because  
18 I don't think the conclusions are as easy as you might  
19 think in the beginning. And our testimony here, if you  
20 remember the testimony actually turned out later on to be  
21 contradictory because some people wanted them locked,  
22 other people said, "Let's not lock them because you think  
23 you can open them once you lock them, and in fact that may  
24 not be true."

25           TROOPER O'CONNOR: (Inaudible) -- faculty about

1 door locks or not have door locks, and then you get into  
2 conversations about, "Are you kidding me?" With adjunct  
3 faculty we install this blue button and nobody knows what  
4 that is? I mean, so that, to me, isn't the lessons  
5 necessarily we will learn and not learn, but there's  
6 broader lessons. You know, we do business differently now  
7 because of Columbine. We save lives now because of  
8 Columbine and that's even an evolving process. So  
9 initially first it was wait for SWAT. Now it's no, wait  
10 for four you before you go in. Now it's, you're the  
11 first, go in. And we're training officers to go in  
12 knowing you may not come out alive, but the sooner you get  
13 there, the better. But that's always an evolving process.

14 But for me, to not be able to sit there -- and it's  
15 my training, I am going to admit this, but to be able to  
16 sit there and have very fact specific inquiries about how  
17 the first responders handled it, how did we connect  
18 parents with their child, all that sort of stuff that we  
19 can learn from and sort of make some recommendations or  
20 even just present them out there, I mean, we do this all  
21 the time. It's part of that, you know, Hurricane Sandy  
22 happened, how do we respond, what are we going to learn.  
23 It's with that experience we get better as first  
24 responders. And I just don't want to miss that -- I don't  
25 want this commission to miss that opportunity.

1           CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Yes, there must be an  
2 after-action report. Now, given the circumstances of this  
3 event and the timelines involved, we have to contemplate  
4 the detailed after action may not be done by us. Not to  
5 say it won't be done, but it may not be done by us.

6           MR. CHIVINSKI: Here is where I was going with  
7 this hypothetically. Let's assume one of the classrooms  
8 could not have been locked from the outside. We know it  
9 could have been locked from the inside, but couldn't be  
10 locked from the outside because, let's say,  
11 hypothetically, say that teacher did not have a key.  
12 There is speculation that a teacher may not have had a  
13 key. You know, I'm sitting here today, I have been  
14 sitting here every Friday, and I have had a substitute  
15 teacher in my classroom. I am almost a hundred percent  
16 confident that that teacher, who was replacing me, I have  
17 known who it is every time, has a key to lock my classroom  
18 door. Can we say with a hundred percent certainty that  
19 that situation exists throughout the State of Connecticut  
20 today? Does every substitute teacher that serves in the  
21 State of Connecticut have the ability to lock their  
22 classroom in the case of a lockdown, inside, outside, any  
23 side.

24           I would really like to see that report, and  
25 regardless of what it says, hypothetically, I really

1 believe all teachers should be able to lock their door,  
2 whether they're a regular teacher or the substitute  
3 teacher. And so I think there is a line and there's a  
4 very direct example of something we may be able to pull  
5 out of that report.

6 CHIEF McCARTHY: My approach to this problem,  
7 yes, and I agree that the report is necessary because I  
8 believe we need to learn and make specific recommendations  
9 regarding the response and all of the associated elements  
10 of the response and the recovery as part of our  
11 recommendations because that's how the community will  
12 learn, whether it's the school community or the public  
13 safety community, or the mental health community.

14 But, and I agree with you, Mayor, about the  
15 liberating effect of not having that information now  
16 because the way that I am approaching it, and I hope we  
17 approach this subject, is that we want to make the  
18 environment safer every day. We don't want to make it  
19 safer for the one-time, one-off occurrences. We want to  
20 make it safer for every day. So when I hear presentations  
21 about L-shape classrooms, I think about bullying. And are  
22 we making it safer to hide kids from a shooter, but making  
23 it easier for bullying.

24 And when they talk about bathrooms, and bathroom  
25 configurations that are lockable bathrooms that are havens

1 for inappropriate activity, or bullying, or violence, or  
2 drug use. I don't want to make a school safer for a  
3 one-off incident, but unsafe every day.

4 And I think that throughout this entire discussion  
5 I'm thinking more globally of making the environment,  
6 whether the environment is for responders, or the  
7 environment is for schools systems, is making it safer  
8 every day. And I think if we make it safer every day and  
9 we prepare people for everyday emergencies, they're better  
10 prepared in an all hazards approach for the one-off types  
11 of events.

12 MR. DUCIBELLA: I agree with the chief  
13 completely, and we still have law enforcement in the room  
14 and one of the things I think I can tell you after 40  
15 years of practice is, criminals are adaptive. No matter  
16 what this commission comes up with, every time we  
17 institute a counterterrorism approach in lower Manhattan  
18 the consideration by a thousand people in the NYPD  
19 counterterrorism division is, what will the criminal now  
20 learn from the event that they try and foil because they  
21 will counter surveil. I have no idea whether Adam Lanza  
22 planned this in advance, spent six weeks coming and going  
23 from the school and making a determination about what was  
24 there for security and how he might, in fact, circumvent  
25 it. We will never know that, I don't think, but there is

1 value in understanding the event to determine whether that  
2 happened, irrespective, at least from my perspective.

3 It seems as though some recommendations -- and I will  
4 read you one from one of the documents that was given to  
5 us day, and it's, I hope, not impeachable. "Encourage  
6 local emergency personnel to visit local schools and test  
7 their communication abilities throughout the school  
8 building."

9 There is nothing -- well, there are many things, but  
10 there are a few things more important than law enforcement  
11 and school personnel to be able to talk to one another in  
12 a crisis event, but one can look at that and say, "Bernie,  
13 that makes a lot of sense." It is situation agnostic.  
14 It's criminally adaptive. Criminal adaptation to that  
15 isn't going to compromise the viability of that happening.

16 And so I think that becomes something that might show  
17 up as a recommendation or a consideration that is one  
18 bullet, one line, make sure this happens, and it's going  
19 to have universal value. And it might be that the event,  
20 if we knew more about it at Sandy Hook, as we learned at  
21 the Trade Center site, as we learned in reading the  
22 Columbine report, that communications were difficult and  
23 they did hinder. And by hindering it took time, and over  
24 time people were lost.

25 So I think there is a supportive opportunity to look

1 into what happened at Sandy Hook and provide greater  
2 justification, but one doesn't necessarily need that  
3 justification to make that recommendation because it makes  
4 good common sense. I think some of the other shadier  
5 areas that there are different opinions about, as you  
6 proved today, I think those are subjects for discussion.

7       What I'm suggesting after the diatribe is, I'm going  
8 to try from my perspective, and I use this, again, as a  
9 dart board, identify those things that we know, we've  
10 heard, or we have been given as reasonable testimony that  
11 makes great common sense. Because at the end of the day,  
12 my sense about it, Chair, is if we go to the legislature  
13 with a thousand recommendations, the chances are that that  
14 is too big a plate and too large a pill to swallow. But  
15 I'm making this number up. If we go with 30 that are  
16 extraordinarily well thought out and agreed to, we might  
17 actually get something done.

18       So I don't want to discourage conversation. I don't  
19 want to limit the all-hazards approach and I don't want to  
20 suggest that learning about Sandy Hook isn't important, I  
21 think all of those things are important. But what I feel  
22 you're looking for from us in a week is a selective group  
23 of individual subjects which we think we each heard, which  
24 make good sense to us to be expressed as clearly and as in  
25 few words as possible so that they can then be opened up

1 to the floor for discussion. I think that's what I'm  
2 hearing. That's what I'm hearing, okay.

3 MR. GRIFFITH: Just so that we're clear, I like  
4 your example, and I don't think it's impeachable, and I  
5 wasn't trying to, as you so cleverly did, I wasn't trying  
6 to say my own logic couldn't be used so that I could be  
7 hoisted on my own petard, but having said all that, it's  
8 very clear in my head the distinctions I'm making in my  
9 argument? And I'm not trying to be ridiculous. If we  
10 were looking at the tsunami incident, for example, the  
11 wall of water comes in, travels a mile and a half inland  
12 and takes all the houses out, and I'm going to come along  
13 and say this is one incident, we can't conclude that water  
14 comes in with a tsunami and can potentially go a mile  
15 inland and take out the houses? Surely that's not what  
16 I'm trying to argue. I mean, I think you look at the  
17 water, you see it, you see the boats moving from close to  
18 the shore a mile and a half in, I think you can reach a  
19 mathematical conclusion that a tsunami can take a boat a  
20 mile and a half in. I hope we can agree on that. I was  
21 talking much more about the whole business of trying from  
22 a single incident to extrapolate and say a lot of things  
23 about human behavior, which I'm particularly interested  
24 in.

25 MR. DUCIBELLA: Which I know less about.

1           MR. GRIFFITH: That's all right. That's all  
2 right. We all know lots about some things and I'm  
3 granting that. It's just my fear -- it's just my fear  
4 about the cavalier language that's commonly used when we  
5 start talking about people with mental illness. And  
6 that's really my concern and that's where I was really  
7 addressing my line of argument. That's all.

8           But I'm not going to sit here -- I mean, even I  
9 understand a teeny weeny bit about physics and when water  
10 moves something inland, I get that point. I get that  
11 point.

12           MS. FORRESTER: I just want to ask a clarifying  
13 question. I know that we have been advised by the  
14 prosecutor we would not get the report, I thought until  
15 June, but -- and I understand that the chief was advised  
16 that he were not -- he wasn't going to speak in detail of  
17 what happened, but I think there are incident command  
18 questions that might happen even post the event itself and  
19 things that you mentioned, that that would not be included  
20 in this prosecutor's report is -- am I confused, or is  
21 there another report, sort of like a debriefing report,  
22 what happened, how it worked, and that we're not allowed  
23 to think about or look at, to see.

24           TROOPER O'CONNOR: You had the investigative  
25 report, that is sort of going around on, you know, who did

1 what, where, when, how, criminally. But then you also  
2 have how did the police respond, how did they get on the  
3 scene, how do they organize themselves, where do they  
4 stage, how did they coordinate their activities, what were  
5 inter-operatability issues, those sort of things that we  
6 can, in our profession, learn from and adapt and apply.  
7 That is completely different than examining the mental  
8 health issues of Adam Lanza.

9 MS. FORRESTER: Understood. Who does that  
10 report?

11 TROOPER O'CONNOR: I believe, ultimately, it  
12 sounds in this case talking to the chief, I think it's  
13 coming under the purview of the state police. I'm  
14 guessing that, I don't know that for a fact, that, you  
15 know, they would do that sort of thing.

16 MS. FORRESTER: I just think clarity on that  
17 would be very important and because, you know, having been  
18 involved in the first responder and after the event and  
19 the evening forward, I think there are a lot of people who  
20 have a lot of thoughts and questions and would like to  
21 have some room for conversation, and I just need to know  
22 are we not allowed to talk about that, is that something  
23 that we can bring in?

24 TROOPER O'CONNOR: Well, the Columbine -- I'm  
25 sorry.

1           CHAIRMAN JACKSON: I'll seek clarification on  
2 that.

3           TROOPER O'CONNOR: In the Columbine report,  
4 having read that, it looks like they did some of that  
5 work. They did that sort of, you know, can you come and  
6 tell us this, this, this, and they reported that out. And  
7 that's a good question. Is that going to be done and by  
8 whom? And, you know, if we do it, great; if not, we just  
9 want to know and be debriefed on that.

10           MR. CHIVINSKI: So are you saying that we should  
11 invite in, what's his name, I was thinking Vance, the one  
12 I see on TV all the time from the state police?

13           TROOPER O'CONNOR: I shouldn't say just the PO,  
14 because he did a great job, there was a lot going on then.  
15 I mean, he would be a key player of that, but I think that  
16 the colonel of the state police and probably the chief,  
17 and, you know, then the various staffs. When you have one  
18 of these incidents you have an incident commander, you  
19 have operational periods, and they should be generating  
20 reports through each of those operational periods.

21           MS. FORRESTER: The FBI?

22           TROOPER O'CONNOR: They were on the scene,  
23 but --

24           MS. FORRESTER: And the Red Cross. I mean,  
25 there were quite a few people on the scene.

1 TROOPER O'CONNOR: Right.

2 MS. FORRESTER: And there were a lot of issues  
3 in terms of communication on that area.

4 TROOPER O'CONNOR: Right. So I think your point  
5 is well taken as to whether we do that or somebody else is  
6 going to do that, but -- and that's my overwhelming point,  
7 someone needs to do that, it would be such a lost  
8 opportunity.

9 CHIEF MCCARTHY: When Emergency Management or  
10 Department of Emergency Protection -- Emergency Services  
11 Public Protection comes, maybe we can ask about that  
12 operational effort action review, separate from the  
13 criminal investigation. I think that if we let them know  
14 in advance that we're curious about some of the findings  
15 about the operations that can help us make  
16 recommendations, that would come from the deputy  
17 commissioner for Homeland Security, and that might be  
18 helpful for us to understand some of the operational  
19 issues of the subjects that you refer to, Chief. And if  
20 it's not ready now, when it might be ready for our  
21 consideration.

22 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: Friends, we've kept you an  
23 hour past what we said we would. It's been a long day.  
24 It's been a good day.

25 MR. SANFORD: I have been waiting awhile because

1 of this ongoing conversation. I want to ask a different  
2 topic.

3 The legislature is, obviously, working on a number of  
4 bills, and I think someone mentioned earlier that so far  
5 we have been operating in a vacuum. Will we have an  
6 opportunity to hear from maybe someone from the Public  
7 Safety Committee, that can give us an update of what is  
8 going on legislatively? This session they've had a lot of  
9 testimony, they've heard a lot of testimony, and there may  
10 be some things that were raised there that they have heard  
11 that maybe we haven't heard yet from the people that we've  
12 had presenting and it might open our eyes up to some  
13 different areas.

14 So I just thought that maybe someone from within the  
15 Public Safety Committee may offer -- I don't know if  
16 that's the right place or not, but might be able to offer  
17 us some insight into what they're doing.

18 CHAIRMAN JACKSON: We'll evaluate that. Thanks  
19 for your time, everyone. Unless we have three or four  
20 more panels today, I think it's time for an adjournment.  
21 Have a great weekend everyone.

22

23 (Hearing adjourned.)

24

25

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

CERTIFICATION

I hereby certify that the foregoing 109 pages are a complete and accurate transcription to the best of my ability of the electronic sound recording of the March 1, 2013 Sandy Hook Advisory Commission Hearing.

*Kathleen S. Norton*

Kathleen S. Norton, LSR

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date