



**Connecticut  
Sentencing  
Commission**

[www.ct.gov/opm/csc](http://www.ct.gov/opm/csc)

## **TESTIMONY IN SUPPORT OF SB 259**

**AN ACT CONCERNING THE RECOMMENDATIONS OF THE CONNECTICUT SENTENCING COMMISSION REGARDING THE ENHANCED PENALTY FOR THE SALE OR POSSESSION OF DRUGS NEAR SCHOOLS, DAY CARE CENTERS AND PUBLIC HOUSING PROJECTS.**

By Andrew Clark, Acting Ex. Director, Ct. Sentencing Commission  
Additional testimony: Dr. Robert Painter, M.D. and Dr. Steven Block, Criminologist, Central CT State University

Good morning Senator Coleman, Representative Fox, Senator Kissel, Representative Rebimbas and members of the Judiciary Committee.

Thank you for the opportunity to present the Sentencing Commission's recommendations regarding Connecticut's drug-free zone statutes.

In a letter dated June 26, 2012, the Judiciary Co-Chairs' requested the Commission explore "the effectiveness of these laws and how they are applied." Subsequently a working group of the Legislative Committee was formed for the aforementioned purposes. Members included: Dr. Robert Painter, Legal Counsel/Executive Assistant Public Defender Deborah Del Prete Sullivan, Deputy Chief State's Attorney Len Boyle, and Legislative Committee members: Alex Tsarkov and LaResse Harvey.

The working group was assisted by Andrew Clark, Sentencing Commission Acting Executive Director; Louise Nadeau, legislative attorney from the Legislative Commissioners' Office; Chris Reinhart, Chief Attorney from the Office of Legislative Research; James Orlando, Associate Analyst from the Office of Legislative Research; and Jason DePatie, policy specialist at the Institute for Municipal and Regional Policy.

First passed by the CT General' Assembly in 1987, this legislation initially created a safe zone of 1000 feet around elementary and secondary schools. The distance was increased by further legislation to what it is now: 1500 feet. Committing drug offenses, including simple possession of drugs or drug paraphernalia, within this zone made the offender eligible for a two year enhanced penalty to be served sequentially.

Because the legislation created the same 1500 feet drug-free zone around licensed child day care centers and public housing properties, overlapping drug-free zones blanketed urban centers. Nearly 100% of larger cities became drug-free school zones. New Haven does have one significant area that is not a drug-free zone – a golf course. By contrast, Durham has only four distinct drug-free school zones in the entire town. The concept driving the legislation has been lost—that of a special, differentiated sanctuary of safety around the school.

**The Honorable  
David M. Borden, Chair**

**Undersecretary  
Mike Lawlor, Vice Chair**

**Andrew J. Clark, Acting  
Executive Director**

**MEMBERS**

**Garvin G. Ambrose**

**Vivien K. Blackford**

**The Honorable  
Patrick L. Carroll, III**

**The Honorable  
Robert J. Devlin, Jr.**

**William R. Dyson**

**James Dzurenda**

**Stephen Grant**

**Peter M. Gloia**

**Kevin Kane**

**Tracey L. Meares**

**Mark A. Palmer**

**Susan E. Pease**

**Maureen Price-Boreland**

**Patricia Rehmer**

**John Santa**

**Dora B. Schirio**

**David Shepack**

**Susan O. Storey**

**Erika M. Tindill**

**Thomas J. Ullmann**

**The Honorable  
Gary White**

Imposition of the legislation has been inconsistent. In Hartford, only 11% of those arrested in the school zones have been assigned the enhanced penalties. In Meriden, 41% carried the school zone charge; in Wallingford, less than half of one percent. Clearly the decisions by police and prosecutors as to whether to invoke the statute has had little or nothing to do with keeping drugs away from school children in the way the legislation intended. This disparity erodes trust between law enforcement and the communities they serve. Ultimately, this trust is the cornerstone of maintaining the criminal justice system's legitimacy-- people across the state must believe that laws will be applied fairly and equally.

The Judiciary Committee has previously, as now, looked at affirming this special status - raising the area around the school to the status of a safe sanctuary -just as many states have done. Distances used by other states have varied markedly. Vermont, declares only school grounds, property adjoining the school grounds, and buses as drug-free zones. Alabama has established 15,840 feet as the proper distance. Most states and researchers looking at this issue in depth have felt that a lesser distance such as 200 feet measured from the perimeter of the school more effectively creates the intended sanctuary effect. Such was the recommendation of the Commission's working group, which was affirmed by consensus by the Sentencing Commission at its December 20, 2012, and December 19, 2013 meetings. As such,

**The Sentencing Commission recommends that the law be amended to clearly state the zone be measured from the periphery of the properties described in the legislation and that the zone should extend 200 feet from this periphery.**

Although it has been generally accepted that persons driving through school zones and subject to drug arrests because of possession or use of illegal substances are not also subject to the enhanced penalties of this law, there has not been clarity with regard to this issue. In order to establish such clarity:

**The Sentencing Commission recommends that State v. Lewis be codified to make clear that 'intent to violate' is considered and that proof is offered that the offense occurred in a school zone. Those merely driving through the area with illegal substances would not be subject to the enhanced penalty.**

Last legislative session a number of legislators asked us for statistics on actual arrests for these statutes. We requested information through the Criminal Justice information System and have attached a breakdown of this data to our testimony. We would be happy to answer any questions you have about this data and any other aspect of our testimony.

**Connecticut Drug Free School Zone Charges Data  
(October 2011 to October 2012)**

	<u>21a-267 (c)</u>  Delivering / possessing with intent to deliver / manufacturing with intent to deliver drug paraphernalia.		<u>21a-278(b)</u>  Sells / possesses with the intent to sell)1 to another person any controlled substance in or on school / public housing project / licensed child day care center		<u>21a-279 (d)</u> Possession of a controlled substance		
	Non- White	White	Non- White	White	Non- White	White	
<b>Hartford</b>	0	3	301	242	236	362	1144
<b>Bridgeport</b>	2	0	185	100	11	6	304
<b>New Haven</b>	73	60	598	242	483	285	1741
<b>West Haven</b>	1	1	68	41	33	26	170
<b>Waterbury</b>	3	3	27	30	193	192	448
<b>Norwalk</b>	30	32	100	60	117	93	432
<b>Ansonia</b>	8	9	30	12	32	26	117
<b>Stamford</b>	1	0	30	12	18	14	75
<b>New Britain</b>	0	2	27	83	3	3	118
<b>9 town TOTAL</b>	118	110	1366	822	1126	1027	4569
<b>OTHER 86 TOWNS COMBINED</b>	65	176	283	448	246	526	1744
<b>TOTAL CONNECTICUT</b>	183	286	1649	1270	1372	1553	6313

\*Non-White refers to Black, Asian, Pacific Islander, Native American, Alaskan, and Unknown Races.

\*Data received from a request to the Criminal Justice Information System by the Drug-Free Zone Working Group of the Sentencing Commission

