



2275 Research Blvd, Suite 500, Rockville, MD 20850  
O: 202.280.8942 | F: 240.715.9637 | [www.aegisarmor.com](http://www.aegisarmor.com)

Chairwoman White  
Senate Committee for Government Operations  
Vermont State House (RM 4)  
Montpelier, Vermont 05633-5301

April 8, 2014

Dear Mrs. White,

I wanted to provide the Senate Committee for Government Operations with the following information that I believe would be most beneficial to include in the hearings this week regarding conducted electrical weapons (CEWs).

Please find attached excerpts of a scientific report that I believe you will find most interesting and directly related to the issue of electroshock weapon safety and performance.

The LEAB has acknowledged in their proposed policy for CEWs that only properly functioning weapons should be deployed. Yet, this policy does not include any meaningful performance standard or measurement method to ensure these potentially deadly weapons are operating within the manufacturer specifications.

This is significant. If these weapons are not measured prior to deployment to ensure proper operation and weapon records are sealed and secured after a deployment proximal to death, as was done in the MacAdam Mason incident, how is the public to ever know what the electrical output of these weapons is and whether these weapons are operating properly and within a manufacturer specification? Without measurement, where is the accountability for the electrical current delivered by these weapons?

CEW manufacturers' are now claiming that the latest generation of "smart" weapons "measure" themselves. Yet, as the latest independent and scientific research reports have disclosed, ***"Although the [manufacturer software] records some of the electrical parameters of the [CEW], they are ambiguous and therefore independent electrical testing of the [weapons] should continue."***



2275 Research Blvd, Suite 500, Rockville, MD 20850  
O: 202.280.8942 | F: 240.715.9637 | [www.aegisarmor.com](http://www.aegisarmor.com)

The evidence and findings contained in this report directly contradict the claims that “smart” weapons do not need to be measured. This report was published by the Defence R&D Canada and published just last year. The full report can be found at [http://cradpdf.drdc-rddc.gc.ca/PDFS/unc140/p538085\\_A1b.pdf](http://cradpdf.drdc-rddc.gc.ca/PDFS/unc140/p538085_A1b.pdf).

While I am sure the LEAB has done some preliminary research on the need to measure, I do not believe they have seriously considered the findings in this report that specifically recommend independent measurement of these weapons needs to be done to ensure proper operation within the manufacturer specifications.

Another reason the LEAB policy should include measurement is the latest manufacturer warning that states, "***It is the user's responsibility [to ensure that] the CEW is working properly before any use.***" Essentially, the liability as to whether these weapons are operating within a manufacturer's specification or not falls on the agencies, officers, and municipalities that deploy them.

So, it is obvious that the measurement of these weapons is important. And if it is not included in the LEAB policy, I would strongly urge the Committee members to amend H. 225 to include the need to measure these potentially deadly weapons to ensure officer and public safety is maximized and the liability of agencies, officers and municipalities are minimized.

Finally, the “smart” weapon argument does not even apply to the majority of CEWs deployed throughout Vermont that are older and do not have this capability.

Thank you very much.

Best regards,

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "K. Stethem".

Kenneth Stethem