Good morning Senator Coleman and Honorable members of the Judiciary Committee,

My name is Patrick Gaynor, President of the Connecticut Council of Police Unions, AFSCME Council 15. I am writing in regards to H.B 5437 AN ACT CONCERNING THE ALVIN W. PENN RACIAL PROFILING PROHIBITION ACT and the misperception that racial profiling is a part of everyday policing.

I believe the provisions of this bill place a large financial burden on cities and towns that are already facing budget problems and cause further division between the public and the police. The software, printers and training for each police car is one cost, but there are ongoing maintenance and replacement costs as well. These costs amount to an unfunded mandate that cash-strapped cities and towns will be forced to adhere to or else face the withholding of state funds.

Since the Racial Profiling Prohibition Project was initiated in October of 2013, there have only been **12** complaints filed alleging racial profiling. That's less than 1 complaint per month even with officers handing out forms to drivers encouraging them to complain and explaining the law. The complaints were investigated and it was determined that the true reasons for the complaint was NOT alleging racial profiling, but that officers were discourteous or didn't explain the reason for the stop to the driver's satisfaction.

The fact that there were only 12 complaints filed since this project began and <u>not a single one</u> established racial profiling shows that there is a disconnect between perception and reality. There is also a gross misunderstanding of what cops do every day--this is undeniable. There definitely IS a concern from many in the community but this bill does nothing to address these concerns. The $2.5 million for electronics equipment would be better spent trying to bridge the gap between the police and the public. It could also be used to provide ongoing training to police officers in "Fair and Impartial Policing" which is based on the science of implicit bias--something common to every human being--and how it can affect an officer's perceptions.

These funds can also be used to raise public awareness of how officers are trained, how officers make decisions to stop cars and how the actions they take during a stop are often guided by their department policy or state statute and how they respond to different use of force situations. This money could fund police-youth sports programs, to create or expand Police Cadet programs, for Citizens' Police Academies and other community-building activities that would better serve the people of Connecticut. There is definitely a lack of awareness and lack of funding for police-community programs.

I urge you to oppose this bill as written and consider using these funds to improve police-community relations instead.

Patrick Gaynor
Meriden