

From: Susan <supataat@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:13 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Susan P Atkins and I live at 211 Rantoul Street Beverly MA 01915. As a constituent, I write to express my opposition to Senate Bill 2820. This legislation is detrimental to police and correction officers who work every day to keep the people of the Commonwealth safe. In 2019 the Criminal Justice System went through reform. That reform took several years to develop. I am dismayed in the hastiness with which Bill 2820 was passed.

I am asking you to stop and think about the rush to reform police and corrections in such haste. Our officers are some of the best and well-trained officers anywhere. Although, improvement is always welcome, it should be done with dignity and respect for the men and women who serve the Commonwealth. I ask that you think about the police officer you need to keep your streets safe from violence, and don't dismantle proven community policing practices. I would also ask you to think about the Correction Officer alone in a cell block, surrounded by up to one hundred inmates, not knowing when violence could erupt. I'm asking for your support and ensuring that whatever reform is passed that you do it responsibly. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Susan P Atkins

From: Natalie May <natalie.may.g@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:09 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony for S.2820

Dear members of House leadership,

I am writing you to say that S.2820 does almost nothing to prevent state violence against Black people or stop the flow of Black people into jails and prisons.

I believe S.2820 will cause more harm than good by increasing spending on law enforcement through training and training commissions, expanding the power of law enforcement officials to oversee law enforcement agencies, and making no fundamental changes to the function and operation of policing in the Commonwealth. Real change requires that we shrink the power and responsibilities of law enforcement and shift resources from

policing into most-impacted communities. The definition of law enforcement must include corrections officers who also enact racist violence on our community members.

If the Massachusetts legislature were serious about protecting Black lives and addressing systemic racism, this bill would eliminate cornerstones of racist policing including implementing a ban without exceptions on pretextual traffic stops and street stops and frisks. The legislature should decriminalize driving offenses which are a major gateway into the criminal legal system for Black and Brown people and poor and working class people. Rather than limiting legislation to moderate reforms and data collection, the legislature should shut down fusion centers, erase gang databases, and permanently ban facial surveillance by all state agencies including the RMV. I also support student-led efforts to remove police from schools.

The way forward is to shrink the role and powers of police, fund Black and Brown communities, and defund the systems of harm and punishment which have failed to bring people of color safety and wellbeing. S.2820 does not help us get there.

Thank you,
Natalie May
17 Pond Street
Boston, MA 02130

From: caitw6@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:05 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: MA police reform bill

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the recently passed S.2820. I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment of a standards and accreditation committee, which includes increased transparency and reporting, as well as strong actions focused on the promotion of diversity and restrictions on excessive force. These goals are attainable and are needed now.

I am, however, concerned at the expansion of this legislation, targeting fundamental protections such as due process and qualified immunity. This bill in its present form is troubling in many ways and will make an already dangerous and difficult job even more dangerous for the men and women in law enforcement who serve our communities every day with honor and courage. Below are just a few areas, among many others, that concern me and warrant your rejection of these components of this bill:

(1) Due Process for all police officers: Fair and equitable process under the law demands the same rights of appeal afforded to all citizens and fellow public servants. Due process should not be viewed as an arduous impediment, but favored as a bedrock principle of fundamental fairness, procedure and accountability.

(2)?Qualified Immunity: Qualified Immunity does not protect problem police officers. Qualified Immunity is extended to all public employees who act reasonably and in compliance with the rules and regulations of their respective departments, not just police officers. Qualified Immunity protects all public employees, as well as their municipalities, from frivolously lawsuits. This bill removes important liability protections essential for all public servants. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open officers, and other public employees to personal liabilities, causing significant financial burdens. This will impede future recruitment in all public fields: police officers, teachers, nurses, fire fighters, corrections officers, etc., as they are all directly affected by qualified immunity protections.

(3)?POSA Committee: The composition of the POSA Committee must include more rank-and-file police officers and experts in the law enforcement field. If you're going to regulate law enforcement, up to and including termination, you must understand law enforcement. The same way doctors oversee doctors, lawyers oversee lawyers, teachers oversee teachers, experts in law enforcement should oversee practitioners in law enforcement.

In closing, I remind you that those who protect and serve communities across Massachusetts are some of the most sophisticated and educated law enforcement officials in the nation. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2820 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Thank you,

Caitlan Williams / 611 A East 8th street Boston, Ma 02127 /

caitw6@gmail.com From: Emiv711 <emiv711@aol.com>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:08 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives: I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership. Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP. To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated. SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated. Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status. Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers. I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation.

Sincerely,

Emily Chaves

From: Louis Ferraro <louisferraro@comcast.net>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:08 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership.

Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP.

To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated.

SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated.

Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status.

Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers.

I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation.

Sincerely,

Patrice FerraroFrom: Louis Ferraro <louisferraro@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:08 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership.

Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP.

To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated.

SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated.

Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status.

Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers.

I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation.

Sincerely,

Lou Ferraro
From: Shawn P. Cronin <spcronin44@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:06 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Input

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the recently passed S.2820. I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment of a standards and accreditation committee, which includes increased transparency and reporting, as well as strong actions focused on the promotion of diversity and restrictions on excessive force. These goals are attainable and are needed now.

I am, however, concerned at the expansion of this legislation, targeting fundamental protections such as due process and qualified immunity. This bill in its present form is troubling in many ways and will make an already dangerous and difficult job even more dangerous for the men and women in law enforcement who serve our communities every day with honor and courage. Below are just a few areas, among many others, that concern me and warrant your rejection of these components of this bill:

(1)?Due Process for all police officers: Fair and equitable process under the law demands the same rights of appeal afforded to all citizens and fellow public servants. Due process should not be viewed as an arduous impediment, but favored as a bedrock principle of fundamental fairness, procedure and accountability.

(2)?Qualified Immunity: Qualified Immunity does not protect problem police officers. Qualified Immunity is extended to all public employees who act reasonably and in compliance with the rules and regulations of their respective departments, not just police officers. Qualified Immunity protects all public employees, as well as their municipalities, from frivolously lawsuits. This bill removes important liability protections essential for all public servants. Removing qualified

immunity protections in this way will open officers, and other public employees to personal liabilities, causing significant financial burdens. This will impede future recruitment in all public fields: police officers, teachers, nurses, fire fighters, corrections officers, etc., as they are all directly affected by qualified immunity protections.

(3)?POSA Committee: The composition of the POSA Committee must include more rank-and-file police officers and experts in the law enforcement field. If you're going to regulate law enforcement, up to and including termination, you must understand law enforcement. The same way doctors oversee doctors, lawyers oversee lawyers, teachers oversee teachers, experts in law enforcement should oversee practitioners in law enforcement.

In closing, I remind you that those who protect and serve communities across Massachusetts are some of the most sophisticated and educated law enforcement officials in the nation. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2820 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Thank you,

Shawn Cronin
2275 Lewis St. Dighton, MA

From: Michael O'Neill <mistamoneill@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:02 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Scaccia, Angelo - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: Please support S.2820

Dear Chairman Michlewitz and Chairwoman Cronin,

I am emailing you with regards to my support for S. 2820 An Act to reform police standards and shift resources to build a more equitable, fair and just commonwealth that values Black lives and communities of color.

We need strong use of force guidelines for police in Massachusetts, public records of police misconduct, a duty to intervene policy, and bans on no-knock warrants, choke holds, tear gas, and other chemical weapons.

Please pass a bill that includes each of these critical reforms.

Mike O'Neill

240 Kittredge Street, Unit 2

Roslindale MA, 02131

From: Jeffrey Weir <callaweir15@hotmail.co.uk>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:59 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership.

Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP.

To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated.

SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down qualified immunity in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated.

Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status.

Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers.

I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, and 52, as well as amend Section 63 to have more police representation.

Sincerely,

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Scott Sullivan <sulliaft@bc.edu>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:59 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Public Testimony

Hello, my name is Scott Sullivan with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 8 Ashwood Terrace, Apart 1, Roslindale, MA 02131. I am writing to urge you and the House to pass police reform that includes:

- * Implement Peace Officer Standards & Training with certification
- * Civil service access reform
- * Commission on structural racism
- * Clear statutory limits on police use of force

* Qualified immunity reform

Thank you very much.

--

Scott Sullivan '13
Sulliaft@bc.edu
P: 508-320-4634

8 Ashwood Terrace, Roslindale, Ma 02131
From: Alison Bennett <abennett218@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:53 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Scaccia, Angelo - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: An Act to Save Black Lives by Transforming Public Safety

Chairman Michlewitz and Chairwoman Cronin,

Massachusetts can take a bold step towards ending systemic racism in policing by passing S. 2820, An Act to reform police standards and shift resources to build a more equitable, fair and just commonwealth that values Black lives and communities of color.

We need strong use of force guidelines for police in Massachusetts, public records of police misconduct, a duty to intervene policy, and bans on no-knock warrants, choke holds, tear gas, and other chemical weapons.

Please pass a bill that includes each of these critical reforms.

Alison Bennett

240 Kittredge St, Roslindale

From: Bob C <whitehouse115@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:45 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a

commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership.

Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP.

To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated.

SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated.

Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status.

Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers.

I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation.

Sincerely,

From: santib@verizon.net

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:44 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); santib@verizon.net

Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives: I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership. Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP. To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated. SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated. Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status. Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers. I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation. Sincerely,
From: Melissa Larson <melissalarson11@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:42 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Letter from MA Resident regarding S2800 or S2820

I understand that there was a deadline for this e-mail. I hope that this will still make it into the hands of someone that will be making decisions about the future of our communities.

As a taxpayer and registered voter in Massachusetts I am against bill S.2800 S2820. I do not disagree that to some degree racism exists in this state, we must address it logically and not just react to the current climate in the country.

Additionally to pass a bill which will impose restrictions and eliminate protection against civil suits on law enforcement, the very people that provide us with a blanket of security from bad people of all walks of life, is a dangerous path to choose. We need to support and protect the men & women who report daily to keep us safe in our communities and our state. There are far more good police than bad in my opinion and to create road blocks to the daily jobs they perform is unfair and dangerous. Here is a concept for you, reward good behavior and consequence bad behavior, regardless of the color or occupation of the individual exhibiting the behavior.

It's time to bring some common sense back into politics and government. At the very least you should be telling your voters what you are doing.

Sincerely,

Melissa Larson

Middleboro Resident

From: Misael <misael.moscat@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:41 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: S.2820 Vote

Dear Chair Michlewitz, Chair Cronin, and members of the House Ways & Means and Judiciary Committees,

I'm writing in favor of S.2820, to bring badly needed reform to our criminal justice system. I urge you to work as swiftly as possible to pass this bill into law and strengthen it.

I believe the final bill should eliminate qualified immunity (a loophole which prevents holding police accountable), introduce strong standards for decertifying problem officers, and completely ban tear gas, chokeholds, and no knock raids like the one that killed Breonna Taylor.

Misael Moscat & The City of Haverhill

From: Jorge Ceballos <jleandro.cebillos@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:41 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Bill S.2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz, Chair Cronin, and members of the House Ways & Means and Judiciary Committees,

I'm writing in favor of S.2820, to bring badly needed reform to our criminal justice system. I urge you to work as swiftly as possible to pass this bill into law and strengthen it.

I believe the final bill should eliminate qualified immunity (a loophole which prevents holding police accountable), introduce strong standards for decertifying problem officers, and completely ban tear gas, chokeholds, and no knock raids like the one that killed Breonna Taylor.

Sincerely, Jorge Ceballos. Dracut MA.

From: john bookston <john.bookston@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:40 PM

To: Livingstone, Jay - Rep. (HOU); Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Strengthen the Police Reform Bill

A veto proof majority can still be attained if the House removes the 1 year pass given to officers brought before the new review board.

Otherwise the Senate bill is terrific. As a past public defender, I have experienced multiple abuses of police authority done with impunity. The ability of an officer to put off any proceeding for a year is a game-changer.

From: grace moscat <gracemoscat@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:39 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: S.2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz, Chair Cronin, and members of the House Ways & Means and Judiciary Committees,

I'm writing in favor of S.2820, to bring badly needed reform to our criminal justice system. I urge you to work as swiftly as possible to pass this bill into law and strengthen it.

I believe the final bill should eliminate qualified immunity (a loophole which prevents holding police accountable), introduce strong standards for decertifying problem officers, and completely ban tear gas, chokeholds, and no knock raids like the one that killed Breonna Taylor.

Grace Moscat. Haverhill, MA.

From: dbardei@comcast.net

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:39 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Police Reform

Dear Chair Michlewitz, Chair Cronin, and members of the House Ways & Means and Judiciary Committees,

I'm glad the issue of police reform has finally made it to the attention of the country. Action on this topic is long overdue.

I'm writing in favor of S.2820, to bring badly needed reform to our criminal justice system. I urge you to work as swiftly as possible to pass this bill into law and strengthen it.

I believe the final bill should eliminate qualified immunity (a loophole which prevents holding police accountable), introduce strong standards for decertifying problem officers, and completely ban tear gas, chokeholds, and no knock raids like the one that killed Breonna Taylor. In addition police need additional training in de-escalation; they can't do well what they are not trained to do!

Yours Truly,
Deborah Barolsky
Arlington MA

From: Ricardo Ceballos <ceballosricardo10@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:37 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz, Chair Cronin, and members of the House Ways & Means and Judiciary Committees,

I'm writing in favor of S.2820, to bring badly needed reform to our criminal justice system. I urge you to work as swiftly as possible to pass this bill into law and strengthen it.

I believe the final bill should eliminate qualified immunity (a loophole which prevents holding police accountable), introduce strong standards for decertifying problem officers, and completely ban tear gas, chokeholds, and no knock raids like the one that killed Breonna Taylor.

Ricardo Ceballos
Wakefiled, MA
From: ginny@gingar.us
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:35 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership.

Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP.

To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated.% 0A SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated.

Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status.

Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers.

I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation.

Sincerely, Virginia Babin, Groton, MA
From: Summer Turner <sumttime@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:33 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Create Police Reform

Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Chairperson, House Committee on Ways and Means
Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Hello, my name is Summer Turner with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 342 Allston Street in Cambridge. I am writing to urge you and the House to pass police reform that includes:

- Implement Peace Officer Standards & Training with certification
- Civil service access reform
- Commission on structural racism
- Clear statutory limits on police use of force
- Qualified immunity reform

Thank you very much.

Summer Turner
Sumttime@aol.com
6178767030

Sent from my iPhone

From: eva.moscat@gmail.com

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:32 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S.2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz, Chair Cronin, and members of the House Ways & Means and Judiciary Committees,

I'm writing in favor of S.2820, to bring badly needed reform to our criminal justice system. I urge you to work as swiftly as possible to pass this bill into law and strengthen it.

I believe the final bill should eliminate qualified immunity (a loophole which prevents holding police accountable), introduce strong standards for decertifying problem officers, and completely ban tear gas, chokeholds, and no knock raids like the one that killed Breonna Taylor.

Eva Moscat, Dracut MA

Sent from my iPhone
From: Jay Macomber <jaymac00@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:30 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2820

Honorable Representatives,

I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the recently passed S.2820. I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment of a standards and accreditation committee, which includes increased transparency and reporting, as well as strong actions focused on the promotion of diversity and restrictions on excessive force. These goals are attainable and are needed now.

I am, however, concerned at the expansion of this legislation, targeting fundamental protections such as due process and qualified immunity. This bill in its present form is troubling in many ways and will make an already dangerous and difficult job even more dangerous for the men and women in law enforcement who serve our communities every day with honor and courage. Below are just a few areas, among many others, that concern me and warrant your rejection of these components of this bill:

Due Process for all police officers: Fair and equitable process under the law demands the same rights of appeal afforded to all citizens and fellow public servants. Due process should not be viewed as an arduous impediment, but favored as a bedrock principle of fundamental fairness, procedure and accountability.

Qualified Immunity: Qualified Immunity does not protect problem police officers. Qualified Immunity is extended to all public employees who act reasonably and in compliance with the rules and regulations of their respective departments, not just police officers. Qualified Immunity protects all public employees, as well as their municipalities, from frivolously lawsuits. This bill removes important liability protections

essential for all public servants. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open officers, and other public employees to personal liabilities, causing significant financial burdens. This will impede future recruitment in all public fields: police officers, teachers, nurses, fire fighters, corrections officers, etc., as they are all directly affected by qualified immunity protections.

POSA Committee: The composition of the POSA Committee must include more rank-and-file police officers and experts in the law enforcement field. If you're going to regulate law enforcement, up to and including termination, you must understand law enforcement. The same way doctors oversee doctors, lawyers oversee lawyers, teachers oversee teachers, experts in law enforcement should oversee practitioners in law enforcement. There are only six law enforcement members on this committee of the fifteen members.

As a tax payer I am also greatly concerned with the cost of this bill which is not articulated in the bill.

The following Commissions are created by this bill with many of them allowing staffers to include lawyers being hired, reimbursement for expenses to include obtaining office space, and contracts with academic institutions. Many of these Commissions are allowed to take donations to subsidize themselves and carry funds over from one fiscal year to the next.

Commission of the Status of African Americans- 11 members
Commission of the Status of Latinos- 9 members
Police Officer Standards and Accreditation Committee- 14 members
Community Police and Behavioral Advisory Council- 21 members
Criminal Justice and Community Support Trust Fund
Justice Reinvestment workforce Development Fund- 14 members
Commission to Review and Make Recommendations for training protocols- 15 members
Law Enforcement Body Camera Task Force- 17 members
Special Commission to study Facial Recognition- 14 members
Commission to study to dismantle structural racism- 31 members

These new ten commissions have at least 150 positions and each commission has a mission assigned to it which will cost the tax payer. There is no price tag in this bill for this because the price tag is unknown. Where are the tax dollars going to come from to fund all of this? Even with a low ball figure of a cost of 3-5 million per commission we are at 30-50 million dollars. But we all know that the cost will be much higher. This bill is being advertised as a Police Reform package but policing is only a small part of this bill. Five of the ten Commissions have nothing directly to do with law enforcement.

This bill allows for the Colonel of the State Police to be hired from outside the agency with a minimal requirement of ten years in law enforcement or the military and only five years of senior management experience. This will make the Colonel of the State Police a political appointee and not someone who has worked their way through the ranks of the State Police. When you look around at some of the best police chiefs

around the country the majority have come up the ranks from inside that organization. Further, why would the Commonwealth want to hire a Colonel who has no allegiance to the organization? Why would we want the Colonel of the State Police to have no police academy training as is outlined in S2820 on Lines 788-790:

"No person, except the colonel, shall exercise police powers as a uniformed member of the department until they have been assigned to and satisfactorily completed the training program."

The creation of a State Police Cadet program as created in lines 674-722 and 732-741 has me very concerned. What is going to be their function? Has this been negotiated with the State Police Association of Massachusetts? Will the cadets be performing functions that a fully trained trooper should be doing? Further, these cadets can be hand selected to enter the State Police Academy by the Colonel who by S2820 passing will be a political appointee. I can fathom that many of this new Colonel's selections will be to appoint friends of friends so as to avoid the Civil Service Testing process.

I remind you that those who protect and serve communities across Massachusetts are some of the most sophisticated and educated law enforcement officials in the nation. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2820 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they have earned and deserve.

Please consider the ramifications of this bill on the ability of our police to do their job.

Jason Macomber
26 Sandy Pine Road
Templeton, MA 10468

From: 7815897281@pm.sprint.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:28 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Sent from my mobile.

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the recently passed S.2820. I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment of a standards and accreditation committee, which includes increased transparency and reporting, as well as strong actions focused on the promotion of diversity and restrictions on excessive force. These goals are attainable and are needed now.

I am, however, concerned at the expansion of this legislation, targeting fundamental protections such as due process and qualified immunity. This bill in its present form is troubling in many ways and will make an already dangerous and difficult job even more dangerous for the men and women in law enforcement who serve our communities every day with honor

and courage. Below are just a few areas, among many others, that concern me and warrant your rejection of these components of this bill:

(1)?Due Process for all police officers: Fair and equitable process under the law demands the same rights of appeal afforded to all citizens and fellow public servants. Due process should not be viewed as an arduous impediment, but favored as a bedrock principle of fundamental fairness, procedure and accountability.

(2)?Qualified Immunity: Qualified Immunity does not protect problem police officers. Qualified Immunity is extended to all public employees who act reasonably and in compliance with the rules and regulations of their respective departments, not just police officers. Qualified Immunity protects all public employees, as well as their municipalities, from frivolously lawsuits. This bill removes important liability protections essential for all public servants. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open officers, and other public employees to personal liabilities, causing significant financial burdens. This will impede future recruitment in all public fields: police officers, teachers, nurses, fire fighters, corrections officers, etc., as they are all directly affected by qualified immunity protections.

(3)?POSA Committee: The composition of the POSA Committee must include more rank-and-file police officers and experts in the law enforcement field. If you're going to regulate law enforcement, up to and including termination, you must understand law enforcement. The same way doctors oversee doctors, lawyers oversee lawyers, teachers oversee teachers, experts in law enforcement should oversee practitioners in law enforcement.

In closing, I remind you that those who protect and serve communities across Massachusetts are some of the most sophisticated and educated law enforcement officials in the nation. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2820 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Thank you,
Eileen Stockus
196 Bailey Street
Canton, MA
Emstockus@gmail. com

From: Kelly Keefe <kellykeefe25@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:24 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2820 opposition testimony

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the recently passed S.2820. I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment of a standards and accreditation committee, which includes increased transparency and reporting, as well as strong actions focused on the promotion of diversity and restrictions on excessive force. These goals are attainable and are needed now.

I am, however, concerned at the expansion of this legislation, targeting fundamental protections such as due process and qualified immunity. This bill in its present form is troubling in many ways and will make an

already dangerous and difficult job even more dangerous for the men and women in law enforcement who serve our communities every day with honor and courage. Below are just a few areas, among many others, that concern me and warrant your rejection of these components of this bill:

(1) Due Process for all police officers: Fair and equitable process under the law demands the same rights of appeal afforded to all citizens and fellow public servants. Due process should not be viewed as an arduous impediment, but favored as a bedrock principle of fundamental fairness, procedure and accountability.

(2) Qualified Immunity: Qualified Immunity does not protect problem police officers. Qualified Immunity is extended to all public employees who act reasonably and in compliance with the rules and regulations of their respective departments, not just police officers. Qualified Immunity protects all public employees, as well as their municipalities, from frivolously lawsuits. This bill removes important liability protections essential for all public servants. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open officers, and other public employees to personal liabilities, causing significant financial burdens. This will impede future recruitment in all public fields: police officers, teachers, nurses, fire fighters, corrections officers, etc., as they are all directly affected by qualified immunity protections.

(3) POSA Committee: The composition of the POSA Committee must include more rank-and-file police officers and experts in the law enforcement field. If you're going to regulate law enforcement, up to and including termination, you must understand law enforcement. The same way doctors oversee doctors, lawyers oversee lawyers, teachers oversee teachers, experts in law enforcement should oversee practitioners in law enforcement.

In closing, I remind you that those who protect and serve communities across Massachusetts are some of the most sophisticated and educated law enforcement officials in the nation. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2820 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Thank you,

Kelly De Castro

22 Weyham Road

Weymouth, MA 02191

Kellykeefe25@yahoo.com

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPhone

<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__overview.mail.yahoo.com_-3F.src-3DiOS&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk

13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=7gnr-BwidWpN3sbWvEirTBKDdRUf9hsS4fAkxr4jquc&s=MnvS-BzrYRox0dfOR9Wiv4Wxk40K_jukWwGipw9KIb8&e=>

From: Denise Gunn <denisegunn13@hotmail.com> on behalf of Denise Gunn <denisegunn@remax.net>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:23 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Cc: Garballey, Sean - Rep. (HOU); Jehlen, Patricia (SEN)

Subject: S.2820 Opposition

?As a concerned wife, mother, mother-in-law and friend in Massachusetts trying to stay safe with the COVID-19 pandemic and as your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the recently passed S.2820. I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment of a standards and accreditation committee, which includes increased transparency and reporting, as well as strong actions focused on the promotion of diversity and restrictions on excessive force. These goals are attainable and are needed now.

I am, however, concerned at the expansion of this legislation, targeting fundamental protections such as due process and qualified immunity. This bill in its present form is troubling in many ways and will make an already dangerous and difficult job even more dangerous for the men and women in law enforcement who serve our communities every day with honor and courage. Below are just a few areas, among many others, that concern me and warrant your rejection of these components of this bill:

(1)?Due Process for all police officers: Fair and equitable process under the law demands the same rights of appeal afforded to all citizens and fellow public servants. Due process should not be viewed as an arduous impediment, but favored as a bedrock principle of fundamental fairness, procedure and accountability.

(2)?Qualified Immunity: Qualified Immunity does not protect problem police officers. Qualified Immunity is extended to all public employees who act reasonably and in compliance with the rules and regulations of their respective departments, not just police officers. Qualified Immunity protects all public employees, as well as their municipalities, from frivolous lawsuits. This bill removes important liability protections essential for all public servants. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open officers, and other public employees to personal liabilities, causing significant financial burdens. This will impede future recruitment in all public fields: police officers, teachers, nurses, fire fighters, corrections officers, etc., as they are all directly affected by qualified immunity protections.

(3)?POSA Committee: The composition of the POSA Committee must include more rank-and-file police officers and experts in the law enforcement field. If you're going to regulate law enforcement, up to and including termination, you must understand law enforcement. The same way doctors oversee doctors, lawyers oversee lawyers, teachers oversee teachers, experts in law enforcement should oversee practitioners in law enforcement.

In closing, I remind you that those who protect and serve communities across Massachusetts are some of the most sophisticated and educated law enforcement officials in the nation. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2820 so as to treat our men and women, mothers and fathers, husbands and wives, sisters and brothers in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Thank you for this consideration ...

Respectfully,
Denise Gunn
48 Whitney Road
Medford, MA 02155

From: Kelly <kloynd9@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:23 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform

To whom it may concern,

As a Massachusetts resident who has family members who are in policing, nursing and emergency medicine, I do agree that police reform is needed. I feel that the current police reform bill gets one thing wrong which will make the public at large and first responders much less safe. Qualified immunity must not be taken away from any first responder. Bad police officers that break the law are not ultimately protected by qualified immunity if they knowingly break the law. That should continue to be the case. Removing qualified immunity from police officers & first responders that do their job professionally and to the best of their ability, must continue to be protected at least until they have had an opportunity to have their day in court. This is what the constitution allows for any private citizen and this right should certainly not be taken away from any first responder! Doing this will change policing as we know it. Every city and town will lose quality police officers and first responders (this is happening already), as they will no longer feel protected for doing their job correctly. It will give more power to criminals as they will be able to sue police officers and first responders if something doesn't go quite right. None of us are perfect and mistakes will be made, but even more so if they are second guessing every move they make! Not only will good police officers and first responders leave employment but future hires will be far less qualified choices of hire. Please do not let this happen. We have already seen a crazy amount of violence in major cities like New York City. Defunding the police and removing qualified immunity will lead to more of this and make the public far less safe.

Passing this bill as is will have long term effects that will ultimately cost the Commonwealth of Massachusetts far too many innocent lives.

Thank you,
Kelly Loynd

Sent from my iPhone
From: Laura cowie-haskell <lcowiehaskell@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:22 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: I do not support S.2820

Dear members of House leadership;

S.2820 does almost nothing to prevent state violence against Black people or stop the flow of Black people into jails and prisons.

I believe S.2820 will cause more harm than good by increasing spending on law enforcement through training and training commissions, expanding the power of law enforcement officials to oversee law enforcement agencies, and making no fundamental changes to the function and operation of policing in the Commonwealth. Real change requires that we shrink the power and responsibilities of law enforcement and shift resources from policing into most-impacted communities. The definition of law enforcement must include corrections officers who also enact racist violence on our community members.

If the Massachusetts legislature were serious about protecting Black lives and addressing systemic racism, this bill would eliminate cornerstones of racist policing including implementing a ban without exceptions on pretextual traffic stops and street stops and frisks. The legislature should decriminalize driving offenses which are a major gateway into the criminal legal system for Black and Brown people and poor and working class people. Rather than limiting legislation to moderate reforms and data collection, the legislature should shut down fusion centers, erase gang databases, and permanently ban facial surveillance by all state agencies including the RMV. I also support student-led efforts to remove police from schools.

The way forward is to shrink the role and powers of police, fund Black and Brown communities, and defund the systems of harm and punishment which have failed to bring people of color safety and wellbeing. S.2820 does not help us get there.

Thank you,

Laura Cowie-Haskell, Boston, MA

From: Madison Rivard <madisonrivard@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:17 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony in Support of Police Accountability -- Use of Force Standards, Qualified Immunity Reform, and Prohibitions on Face Surveillance

The Honorable Rep. Aaron Michlewitz
Chair, House Committee on Ways and Means

The Honorable Rep. Claire D. Cronin
Chair, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Dear Chairs Michlewitz and Cronin,

I am in strong support of the many provisions in S.2820 designed to increase police accountability. In particular, I urge you to:

Adopt strict limits on police use of force,

End qualified immunity, because it shields police from accountability and denies victims of police violence their day in court, and

Prohibit government use of face surveillance technology, which threatens core civil liberties and racial justice.

We have seen that these measures are necessary to decrease police brutality, which is a major public health and social justice crisis.

George Floyd's murder by Minneapolis police brought hundreds of thousands of people into the streets all around the country to demand fundamental changes to policing and concrete steps to address systemic racism. This historic moment is not about one police killing or about one police department. Massachusetts is not immune. Indeed, Bill Barr's Department of Justice recently reported that a unit of the Springfield Police Department routinely uses brutal, excessive violence against residents of that city. We must address police violence and abuses, stop the disparate policing of and brutality against communities of color and Black people in particular, and hold police accountable for civil rights violations. These changes are essential for the health and safety of our communities here in the Commonwealth.

Massachusetts must establish strong standards limiting excessive force by police. When police interact with civilians, they should only use force when it is absolutely necessary, after attempting to de-escalate, when all other options have been exhausted. Police must use force that is proportional to the situation, and the minimum amount required to accomplish a lawful purpose. And several tactics commonly associated with death or serious injury, including the use of chokeholds, tear gas, rubber bullets, and no-knock warrants should be outlawed entirely.

Of critical and urgent importance: Massachusetts must abolish the dangerous doctrine of qualified immunity because it shields police from being held accountable to their victims. Limits on use of force are meaningless unless they are enforceable. Yet today, qualified immunity protects police even when they blatantly and seriously violate people's

civil rights, including by excessive use of force resulting in permanent injury or even death. It denies victims of police violence their day in court. Ending or reforming qualified immunity is the most important police accountability measure in S2820. Maintaining Qualified Immunity ensures that Black Lives Don't Matter. We urge you to end immunity in order to end impunity.

Finally, we urge the House to prevent the expansion of police powers and budgets by prohibiting government entities, including police, from using face surveillance technologies. Specifically, we ask that you include H.1538 in your omnibus bill. Face surveillance technologies have serious racial bias flaws built into their systems. There are increasing numbers of cases in which Black people are wrongfully arrested due to errors with these technologies (as well as sloppy police work). We should not allow police in Massachusetts to use technology that supercharges racial bias and expands police powers to surveil everyone, every day and everywhere we go.

Now is the time to divest funding from police and invest in communities. Police do not prevent crime. Investing in education, social support, the built environment and

There is broad consensus that we must act swiftly and boldly to address police violence, strengthen accountability, and advance racial justice. We urge you to pass the strongest possible legislation without delay, and to ensure that it is signed into law this session.

Sincerely,

Madison K. Rivard, MPH, NREMT

From: Emily Johnson Peterson <emilyj12@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:16 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony opposing S.2820

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the recently passed S.2820. I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment of a standards and accreditation committee, which includes increased transparency and reporting, as well as strong actions focused on the promotion of diversity and restrictions on excessive force. These goals are attainable and are needed now.

I am, however, concerned at the expansion of this legislation, targeting fundamental protections such as due process and qualified immunity. This bill in its present form is troubling in many ways and will make an already dangerous and difficult job even more dangerous for the men and women in law enforcement who serve our communities every day with honor and courage. Below are just a few areas, among many others, that concern me and warrant your rejection of these components of this bill:

(1)?Due Process for all police officers: Fair and equitable process under the law demands the same rights of appeal afforded to all citizens and fellow public servants. Due process should not be viewed as an arduous

impediment, but favored as a bedrock principle of fundamental fairness, procedure and accountability.

(2)?Qualified Immunity: Qualified Immunity does not protect problem police officers. Qualified Immunity is extended to all public employees who act reasonably and in compliance with the rules and regulations of their respective departments, not just police officers. Qualified Immunity protects all public employees, as well as their municipalities, from frivolously lawsuits. This bill removes important liability protections essential for all public servants. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open officers, and other public employees to personal liabilities, causing significant financial burdens. This will impede future recruitment in all public fields: police officers, teachers, nurses, fire fighters, corrections officers, etc., as they are all directly affected by qualified immunity protections.

(3)?POSA Committee: The composition of the POSA Committee must include more rank-and-file police officers and experts in the law enforcement field. If you're going to regulate law enforcement, up to and including termination, you must understand law enforcement. The same way doctors oversee doctors, lawyers oversee lawyers, teachers oversee teachers, experts in law enforcement should oversee practitioners in law enforcement.

In closing, I remind you that those who protect and serve communities across Massachusetts are some of the most sophisticated and educated law enforcement officials in the nation. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2820 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Emily Peterson
67 Coachman Ln
West Barnstable, MA 02668

From: Galina Nizhnikov <teshena40@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:15 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: qualified immunity

keep qualified immunity for MA police officers intact.

From: Andrew Mason <andy40169@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:16 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2820 Concerns

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the recently passed S.2820. I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment of a standards and accreditation committee, which includes increased transparency and reporting, as well as strong actions focused on the promotion of diversity and restrictions on excessive force. These goals are attainable and are needed now.

I am, however, concerned at the expansion of this legislation, targeting fundamental protections such as due process and qualified immunity. This bill in its present form is troubling in many ways and will make an already dangerous and difficult job even more dangerous for the men and women in law enforcement who serve our communities every day with honor and courage. Below are just a few areas, among many others, that concern me and warrant your rejection of these components of this bill:

(1) Due Process for all police officers: Fair and equitable process under the law demands the same rights of appeal afforded to all citizens and fellow public servants. Due process should not be viewed as an arduous impediment, but favored as a bedrock principle of fundamental fairness, procedure and accountability.

(2) Qualified Immunity: Qualified Immunity does not protect problem police officers. Qualified Immunity is extended to all public employees who act reasonably and in compliance with the rules and regulations of their respective departments, not just police officers. Qualified Immunity protects all public employees, as well as their municipalities, from frivolously lawsuits. This bill removes important liability protections essential for all public servants. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open officers, and other public employees to personal liabilities, causing significant financial burdens. This will impede future recruitment in all public fields: police officers, teachers, nurses, fire fighters, corrections officers, etc., as they are all directly affected by qualified immunity protections.

(3) POSA Committee: The composition of the POSA Committee must include more rank-and-file police officers and experts in the law enforcement field. If you're going to regulate law enforcement, up to and including termination, you must understand law enforcement. The same way doctors oversee doctors, lawyers oversee lawyers, teachers oversee teachers, experts in law enforcement should oversee practitioners in law enforcement.

In closing, I remind you that those who protect and serve communities across Massachusetts are some of the most sophisticated and educated law enforcement officials in the nation. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2820 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Thank you,

Andrew Mason

47 Fair Acres Drive, Hanover MA

From: patti donovan <donovanpatti@hotmail.com>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:15 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Fw: Opposition to Parts of Bill S.2820

Testimony.HWMJudiciary@mahouse.gov

Susan.Gifford@mahouse.gov <mailto: Susan.Gifford@mahouse.gov>

Good Evening,

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the recently passed S.2820. I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment of a standards and accreditation committee, which includes increased transparency and reporting, as well as strong actions focused on the promotion of diversity and restrictions on excessive force. These goals are attainable and are needed now.

I am, however, concerned at the expansion of this legislation, targeting fundamental protections such as due process and qualified immunity. This bill in its present form is troubling in many ways and will make an already dangerous and difficult job even more dangerous for the men and women in law enforcement who serve our communities every day with honor and courage. Below are just a few areas, among many others, that concern me and warrant your rejection of these components of this bill:

(1)?Due Process for all police officers: Fair and equitable process under the law demands the same rights of appeal afforded to all citizens and fellow public servants. Due process should not be viewed as an arduous impediment, but favored as a bedrock principle of fundamental fairness, procedure and accountability.

(2)?Qualified Immunity: Qualified Immunity does not protect problem police officers. Qualified Immunity is extended to all public employees who act reasonably and in compliance with the rules and regulations of their respective departments, not just police officers. Qualified Immunity protects all public employees, as well as their municipalities, from frivolously lawsuits. This bill removes important liability protections essential for all public servants. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open officers, and other public employees to personal liabilities, causing significant financial burdens. This will impede future recruitment in all public fields: police officers, teachers, nurses, fire fighters, corrections officers, etc., as they are all directly affected by qualified immunity protections.

(3)?POSA Committee: The composition of the POSA Committee must include more rank-and-file police officers and experts in the law enforcement field. If you're going to regulate law enforcement, up to and including termination, you must understand law enforcement. The same way doctors oversee doctors, lawyers oversee lawyers, teachers oversee teachers, experts in law enforcement should oversee practitioners in law enforcement.

In closing, I remind you that those who protect and serve communities across Massachusetts are some of the most sophisticated and educated law

enforcement officials in the nation. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2820 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Thank you,

Patricia Donovan

32 Longwood Ave. Onset, East Wareham, MA

781-254-9747

From: Paul Shoaf Kozak <pkozak04@jcu.edu>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:12 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Madaro, Adrian - Rep. (HOU); Gingras, Steven (HOU); Rivas, Gloribel (HOU)
Subject: S.2800

Hello,

I am writing in support of the Reform-Shift-Build Act (S.2800). I am an East Boston resident who has serious concerns with the current state of policing, especially considering the negative consequences of qualified immunity such as continued use of excessive force, primarily used on people of color, and a rise in distrust of police due to these un-checked actions.

Please take immediate action to address abuse of power by law enforcement.

Your concerned constituent,

Paul Shoaf Kozak
313 East Eagle St.
Boston, MA 02128

From: Kelsey Schroder <kgmcniel@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:16 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: support for S.2820 An Act to Reform Police Standards

I strongly support many provisions of the Senate bill and it is imperative that the House include these provisions in their version of the bill:
- The same limits to qualified immunity that the Senate included. This is vitally important to protect the constitutional rights of Massachusetts residents.

- Amendment 80, which gives superintendents and school committees the ability to authorize a school resource officer, rather than the current unfunded mandate for every district to have SROs. Districts should have local control over their own budgets and policies.
- Amendment 108, which prevents schools from sharing personal information about students into local, state, and federal databases.
- Amendment 65, which bans tear gas, a chemical weapon banned in warfare.

--

Kelsey Schroder
Medford, MA
From: Katie Brogna <ktbrogna@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:09 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Qualified immunity

Dear House of Representatives,

My name is Katie Chambers and I live at 54 Plymouth Road, Wakefield, MA. As your constituent, I write to you today to express my staunch opposition to S.2820, a piece of hastily-thrown-together legislation that will hamper law enforcement efforts across the Commonwealth. It robs police officers of the same Constitutional Rights extended to citizens across the nation. It is misguided and wrong.

Like most of my neighbors, I am dismayed at the scarcity of respect and protections extended to police officers in your proposed reforms. While there is always room for improvement in policing, the proposed legislation has far too many flaws. Of the many concerns, three, in particular, stand out and demand immediate attention, modification and/or correction. Those issues are:

(1) Due Process for all police officers: Fair and equitable process under the law. The appeal processes afforded to police officers have been in place for generations. They deserve to maintain the right to appeal given to all of our public servants.

(2) Qualified Immunity: Qualified Immunity does not protect problem police officers. Qualified Immunity is extended to all public employees who act reasonably and in compliance with the rules and regulations of their respective departments, not just police officers. Qualified Immunity protects all public employees, as well as their municipalities, from frivolously unrealistic lawsuits.

(3) POSA Committee: The composition of the POSA Committee must include rank-and-file police officers. If you're going to regulate law enforcement, up to and including termination, you must understand law enforcement. The same way doctors oversee doctors, lawyers oversee lawyers, teachers oversee teachers, law enforcement should oversee law enforcement.

it should be done with dignity and respect for the men and women who serve the Commonwealth. I ask that you think about the police officer you need to keep your streets safe from violence, and don't dismantle proven community policing practices. I would also ask you to think about the Correction Officer alone in a cell block, surrounded by up to one hundred inmates, not knowing when violence could erupt. I'm asking for your support and ensuring that whatever reform is passed that you do it responsibly. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Lou Hernandez

Sent from my iPhone
From: David Kendall <davidpkendall@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:01 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2800

Good morning,

I'm writing to express support of S.2800, and specifically HD.5128 (an act relative to saving black lives) and HB.3277 (and act to secure civil rights, which would end qualified immunity). These are all things that should just be done, both for black lives, and for everybody else as well. Our police need to be re-imagined. We need to take a deep breath and look at where we are and how we got here. Do we really need to be this violent all the time? Do we want to be standing on this cliff, where the next step is into the abyss of a police/security state? I say no. Pass these measures.

Thank you,
David Kendall
16 Orchard HL,
Harvard, MA 01451

From: nanram <nanram@beld.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:01 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives:

I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership.

Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement

authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP.

To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated.% 0A SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated.

Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status.

Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers.

I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation.

Sincerely,

From: Marques Crosby <marques.crosby@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:00 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Pass SB.2800, Reform, Shift, Build Act

Dear Chairman Aaron Michlewitz & Co-chair Rep. Claire Cronin:

My name is Marques Crosby. I am a resident of Medway and a member of Medway Marches. I am writing this virtual testimony to urge you to pass SB.2800 the Reform, Shift, Build Act in its entirety. It is the minimum and the bill must leave the legislature in its entirety.

I support this bill because I am tired of seeing excessive force being used, black lives being lost, and no accountability or training being given. This bill bans chokeholds, promotes de-escalation tactics, certifies police officers, prohibits the use of facial recognition, limits qualified immunity for police, and redirects money from policing to community investment. I urge you to ensure that all aspects of this bill are intact. We are in a historical moment and this bill ensures that we in Massachusetts meet the demand of this movement.

Thank you for your consideration of your request to give SB.2800 a favorable report.

Sincerely,

Marques Crosby
5 Virginia Rd, Medway, MA 02053

--

Marques A. Crosby

860.681.8260

marques.crosby@gmail.com

www.marquescrosby.com <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.marquescrosby.com&d=DwMFaQ&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk

13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=1FI644yVn3fIGwuB1ERKNcuXF2Jjqja6tIqyi7ie0U&s=pCn5K4BI_cYbOSaKiil6as4hu7DJUDnE9reySXC-lOg&e=>
From: Cassie Catherine Q <cass-q@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:00 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Pieces to add to community testimony

My name is Cassie Quinlan, and I like to add comments to debate on the issues raised in the Senate bill S.2800

I apologise for rough nature of these remarks, I struggle to select and explain the key pieces that I know so well.

I know the topic from my soul, so many aspects come from my own personal experiences, as a solo immigrant, staying solo, but working, living and learning in different worlds: right in the Boston area.

I listened to much of the Senate debate, and yet note that much needs addition to the reforms and expectation of a separate bureau to evaluate police. I can contribute useful insight in 3 major aspects:

1. De-Escalation - If you want to learn skills in de-escalation, don't ask a big man with a gun who did not need them. Ask a small woman who traveled solo yet was able to learn to take charge in diverse situations, who learned them to survive. How to enter, engage, notice on site resources and communication, as well as community and other human services input, to manage risks with expectations of least harm to community members.

2. Completing Assignments: Unlike other human service agencies, Police role is to get the job done - achieve calm before leaving the scene. Ask someone in healthcare who was required to persuade, not medicate or strongarm - disruptive clients to comply with next step procedures - this focus, of cooperatively moving people or individuals to next step in defined process - is part of requirements needed to handle a task filled with resistance, belligerence, fear, etc. During protest demonstrations on Sunday, Police forces did a brilliant job, working with local helpers, holding a low profile, yet stepping up, then stepping back: in formation, they addressed emerging risk areas, then stepped back again, into the background. Those tactics were effective, and the protester guides helped on the other end, to limit incidents against the police. What police did wrong: they had No - End Plan. Wrapping up an engagement is a task on its own and as we saw, makes all the difference in how the whole event is later remembered on the media - judged by disruptions allowed to grow, after the day's protest was almost over.

3. Cultural Training - Implicit Bias training is limited from the start by its name: containing a polite liberal education terminology that is not realistic to officers working on streets in the real world: for many in the USA and police force, bias is not "implicit" - it is open, in their own communities, seen as normal - and explicit. Meaningful discussion is hampered without training for many white policemen, older, or younger, Irish or Polish descent, or other - to understand, come to terms with, get to know, and work with African American culture and other Black

cultures. This is not an easy task in a larger culture where again, there is a liberal bias about even mentioning culture - but meaning and details are lost and irrelevant in generalizations. Tom Kochman is one person who wrote about different styles of communication in Black and White. Movement, voice, history, expectations - a culture clash emerges when Catholic trained police officers, who are trained in a culture that relies on respect shown by calm and quiet - meet up with a culture that encourages all persons present to speak up and exchange information.

I am an individually trained throughout my life, to learn from, be rescued by, be inspired by, cultures other than my own. And as a Canadian resident immigrant living 50+ years in the USA, I navigated various worlds alone, starting in business management, but then finding more meaning and effectiveness in the work I did as a volunteer, in mental hospitals in the evenings. When I looked to change jobs by working entry level - I stumbled on Therapeutic Communities - drug free residential programs known around the world for effective work with recovering addicts. I participated in this program, started and run by ex prisoners, who knew they needed to change their lifestyles, if they were going to exit from and survive the drug life.

After a year in that program, I chose a new career, School Bus driving, which led me to work directly with teens, and in Boston's Black Neighborhoods as a school bus driver, during Boston Desegregation. Finding myself in the middle of a whole culture previously invisible to me, but with amazing talents for informal inclusion and self organizing - I kept learning directly from people and experiences in trainings in this culture - while also returning to graduate school, to study Intercultural Relations - a study of world and of cultural processes - which helped bring the various pieces together into a whole - which we miss so much, by parceling out training to be given by separate experts - while the Police - in order to be effective as Caring intervention people - need to bring with them as human beings: the whole. They can benefit from bringing or summoning Peace Officers with them, but the Police themselves need to be peaceful. Managing crowds works best when guides can actually know and like the people they lead.

My learning path was uniquely influenced by my offer to take full responsibility for my youngest brother, whose disabilities of Brain Injury made it very difficult for him to transition from care at home - to learning to survive, avoid risk, de-escalate, learn to learn - from others in any adult world. Because he is bigger than I, I had to strategize to figure out how to keep helping him, even after I learned that he was often not able to de-escalate quickly, and he is much bigger and heavier than I. I learned over time, from my own experimentation (only to meet him in public or on the phone for years) - learned what specific things he was afraid that he could not do, and I helped him start, learn skills that he could do if taught slowly (like how to ride the T) -and I also made sure to bring him to professional programs organized for disabled individuals. It was there that I learned that to them, my effort was irrelevant, and that their staff changed repeatedly- so they made countless mistakes in diagnosing him, always starting him back from the beginning and relying only on his choices - which he did not now how to make, since his experience was so limited.

Decades of working through the glitches, to help my brother use professional services, while I trained him how to avoid disruptive episodes and seizures - in community settings. This whole experience taught me that seeing interventions through to the end, is what makes the difference. Incomplete interventions just leave a reputation for failure, so that medical people intervene.

Interface with medical systems was my ongoing professional work - but I chose to work in Direct Care, with elders in their homes. Trained by my experiences with my brother, to find the success by follow through to the end of any intervention, hold on until next steps are clear, set up, tried out, and in place, don't just excuse failure by writing "patient was non-compliant".

My informal roles have led me to hold a working class distance from professional identity: for professionalism is not life. It needs to be supplemented by the wisdoms of working class people - African American special talents, Immigrant talents, and Irish and different white group talents - named, recognized, included - even alongside of an 80% focus on professional structures that endure. Until now, our larger culture, because of distances and because of the tendency to not name cultures - has been using an economic or political lens only. Thus our larger system persists, with its major division between working class people and college educated ones. The only description we are allowed talk about is the one that says that it is either or, that education is the "advanced" state, or there are working class alternatives.

I think both approaches to live are essential, and with a formula of maybe 75-80% professional - with working class leaders alongside - a population has a working formula, to include transition planning, cross class wisdom sharing, cross cultural and cross race explicit wisdom sharing and conversation as well.

I live in Concord MA at this time, so glad about these important conversations brought to us by the hard working policemen, left far too long with the whole task of policing a society - where people have not learned to talk with each other about cultural differences plain to see. Society and work training keeps focusing where the money is, in workplaces, but it is the country which does not know how to converse, and the current belligerence is the result of a country where we have emphasized free speech, but nobody sees the community value of listening, when every issue is only seen as political.

Cassie Quinlan (978)430-5780 cass-q@msn.com

From: Paul Birri <pebirri1@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 11:57 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform

July 17, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Paul Birri and I live in Shrewsbury, MA. I am a Correction Officer at the Souza Baranowski Correction Center. As a constituent, I am writing to express my opposition to Senate Bill 2820. This legislation is detrimental to police and correction officers, who are committed to the safety of the people of the Commonwealth. In 2019 the Criminal Justice System went through reform. That reform took several years to develop. The haste in which this bill was passed is disconcerting. Please allow me the opportunity to explain how this bill lacks any consideration for the very men and women who serve the public.

Qualified Immunity: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who violate the law or an individual's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits making it necessary for officers to acquire additional insurance and jamming the justice system. This will cost the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

Less than Lethal Tools: These tools were developed in an effort to minimize injuries to subjects and Officers alike. They also create an option other than deadly force. The removal of an officer's ability to utilize pepper spray, impact devices and K9 would leave no other option than to jump from, verbal commands to physical force tactics and/or use of firearms. De-escalation tactics are trained and utilized overwhelmingly in the vast majority of law enforcement and Correction Officer encounters, but if these tools are removed, the amount of injuries and deaths would undoubtedly rise.

Civilian Oversight: While we are held to a higher standard than others in the community, to have an oversight committee comprised of people who have never worn the uniform, including an ex convicted felon, is biased and irresponsible. When this oversight board hears testimony where are the officer's rights under our collective bargaining agreement? Where is the right to due process? What is the appeal process? These things have never been heard or explained. The need for responsible and qualified individuals, on any committee, should be paramount to a fair and righteous outcome.

Please stop and think about this knee-jerk reaction to reform police and corrections in such haste. Our officers are some of the best and well-trained officers anywhere. Although, we are not opposed to improvement, it should be done with dignity and respect for the men and women who serve the Commonwealth. I ask that you think about the police officer you need to keep your streets safe from violence, and don't dismantle proven community policing practices. Also to please consider the Correction Officer alone in a cell block, locked in with nearly one hundred inmates, not knowing when the next violent assault may occur. I'm asking for your

support in ensuring that whatever reform is passed, that it be done responsibly. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Paul Birri

From: Samantha Lord <samantha.f.lord@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 11:56 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2800

To Whom it May Concern:

I object to Section 24, 10A. In order to have more competent police officers who make the right decisions in difficult situations, one would want to attract the most intellectual candidates. Reading the laws set forth in this bill, it appears that the cadets would have to meet the same academic requirements as an academy provides, while circumventing any stress conditioning. If this is true, you will end up with officers less likely to make the right decisions under stress. If the goal of this bill is to create a police force that responds to pressure rationally, using de-escalation techniques, you will not get this by lessening training or bypassing stress conditioning. If you want qualified and intelligent police, what you should be requiring is a college degree and a difficult academy.

SECTION 64 (e). Body cameras should be made available to police officers as soon as possible. With the implementation of any of the laws in Bill S. 2820, body cameras should be made available to those requesting them for our citizens' and officers' personal safety and as assurance of lawfulness and truth. 2022 is a long time to wait.

Chapter 147A, Section 2 (e). In recent memory, there have been numerous instances where a vehicle was used as the sole weapon of attack on people, both nationally and globally. "Use of the vehicle itself" should constitute imminent harm. That line should be stricken from the bill.

I object to Section 223 (d) as the document does not make clear if this "searchable database" will include the officer's name (as opposed to 223 (e) which states it will "identify each officer by a confidential and anonymous number"). As you should be aware, in the small towns in which many MA residents live, everyone already knows where the police officers and Troopers live. If you are to include names, it will not matter whether you include an address or not, for the officer's address will be known. In the current, tumultuous climate, this information could certainly be used for harassment purposes, leaving family members vulnerable.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Samantha Lord

413-539-7690

From: Capobianco, Valentino (SEN) <Valentino.Capobianco@masenate.gov>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 11:57 AM

To: Amato, Matthew (SEN); Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Re: S2800 Testimony

The format looks good on my end.

Tino

Get Outlook for iOS <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__aka.ms_o0ukef&d=DwMFAG&c=1DF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAFCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGIinjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=roaq1GD1DpePT5a1l8DhZ85Rf0P29EdCsg1Gup5JtNg&s=IZpVUHGN_xnb5F5HmY-3-ZYPuPvXJUsMYSS-5iHMGoY&e=>>

From: Amato, Matthew (SEN) <Matthew.Amato@masenate.gov>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 11:53:36 AM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU) <Testimony.HWMJudiciary@mahouse.gov>

Cc: Capobianco, Valentino (SEN) <Valentino.Capobianco@masenate.gov>

Subject: S2800 Testimony

Good Afternoon,

I hope this email finds you well!

Here is Senator Feeney's testimony for S2800.

Best,

Matthew Amato

Director of Budget and Policy

Office of State Senator Paul R. Feeney

(Office) 617-722-1222 Ext. 1237

(Cell) 781-521-0622

From: Haley Roth <har965@mail.harvard.edu>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 11:52 AM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Pass SB.2800, Reform, Shift, Build Act

Dear Chairman Aaron Michlewitz & Co-chair Rep. Claire Cronin:

My name is Haley Roth. I am a resident of Cambridge, MA and a member of March like a Mother: for Black Lives. I am writing this virtual testimony to urge you to pass SB.2800 the Reform, Shift, Build Act in its entirety. It is the minimum and the bill must leave the legislature in its entirety.

I am distressed by the inequitable treatment and measures taken by police toward people of color, Black people, those who suffer from mental

illness, and am enraged that the state has not supplied proper non-violent trainings.

This bill bans chokeholds, promotes de-escalation tactics, certifies police officers, prohibits the use of facial recognition, limits qualified immunity for police, and redirects money from policing to community investment.

I urge you to ensure that all aspects of this bill are intact. We are in a historical moment and this bill ensures that we in Massachusetts meet the demand of this movement.

Thank you for your consideration of your request to give SB.2800 a favorable report.

Sincerely,

Haley Roth

42 Sargent Street,

Cambridge, MA 02140

From: Jack Taylor <treadwell22@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 11:52 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2820

?

? As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the recently passed S.2820. I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment of a standards and accreditation committee, which includes increased transparency and reporting, as well as strong actions focused on the promotion of diversity and restrictions on excessive force. These goals are attainable and are needed now.

I am, however, concerned at the expansion of this legislation, targeting fundamental protections such as due process and qualified immunity. This bill in its present form is troubling in many ways and will make an already dangerous and difficult job even more dangerous for the men and women in law enforcement who serve our communities every day with honor and courage. Below are just a few areas, among many others, that concern me and warrant your rejection of these components of this bill:

(1)?Due Process for all police officers: Fair and equitable process under the law demands the same rights of appeal afforded to all citizens and fellow public servants. Due process should not be viewed as an arduous

impediment, but favored as a bedrock principle of fundamental fairness, procedure and accountability.

(2)?Qualified Immunity: Qualified Immunity does not protect problem police officers. Qualified Immunity is extended to all public employees who act reasonably and in compliance with the rules and regulations of their respective departments, not just police officers. Qualified Immunity protects all public employees, as well as their municipalities, from frivolously lawsuits. This bill removes important liability protections essential for all public servants. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open officers, and other public employees to personal liabilities, causing significant financial burdens. This will impede future recruitment in all public fields: police officers, teachers, nurses, fire fighters, corrections officers, etc., as they are all directly affected by qualified immunity protections.

(3)?POSA Committee: The composition of the POSA Committee must include more rank-and-file police officers and experts in the law enforcement field. If you're going to regulate law enforcement, up to and including termination, you must understand law enforcement. The same way doctors oversee doctors, lawyers oversee lawyers, teachers oversee teachers, experts in law enforcement should oversee practitioners in law enforcement.

In closing, I remind you that those who protect and serve communities across Massachusetts are some of the most sophisticated and educated law enforcement officials in the nation. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2820 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Thank you,

John Taylor

40 Elmwood Dr

Taunton

Sent from my iPhone

From: Emily Romm <eromm55@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 11:50 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: An Act to reform police standards and shift resources to build a more equitable, fair and just commonwealth that values Black lives and communities of color

Dear representatives,
Please vote NO on the question of reducing qualified immunity for police. The police need confidence to act quickly in dangerous circumstances while they risk their own lives protecting public safety.
Please vote NO!
Emily Romm
617-784-1958

From: nuahsd@charter.net
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 11:49 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2880

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the recently passed S.2820. I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment of a standards and accreditation committee, which includes increased transparency and reporting, as well as strong actions focused on the promotion of diversity and restrictions on excessive force. These goals are attainable and are needed now.

I am, however, concerned at the expansion of this legislation, targeting fundamental protections such as due process and qualified immunity. This bill in its present form is troubling in many ways and will make an already dangerous and difficult job even more dangerous for the men and women in law enforcement who serve our communities every day with honor and courage. Below are just a few areas, among many others, that concern me and warrant your rejection of these components of this bill:

(1)?Due Process for all police officers: Fair and equitable process under the law demands the same rights of appeal afforded to all citizens and fellow public servants. Due process should not be viewed as an arduous impediment, but favored as a bedrock principle of fundamental fairness, procedure and accountability.

(2)?Qualified Immunity: Qualified Immunity does not protect problem police officers. Qualified Immunity is extended to all public employees who act reasonably and in compliance with the rules and regulations of their respective departments, not just police officers. Qualified Immunity protects all public employees, as well as their municipalities, from frivolously lawsuits. This bill removes important liability protections essential for all public servants. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open officers, and other public employees to personal liabilities, causing significant financial burdens. This will impede future recruitment in all public fields: police officers, teachers, nurses, fire fighters, corrections officers, etc., as they are all directly affected by qualified immunity protections.

(3)?POSA Committee: The composition of the POSA Committee must include more rank-and-file police officers and experts in the law enforcement field. If you're going to regulate law enforcement, up to and including termination, you must understand law enforcement. The same way doctors oversee doctors, lawyers oversee lawyers, teachers oversee teachers, experts in law enforcement should oversee practitioners in law enforcement.

In closing, I remind you that those who protect and serve communities across Massachusetts are some of the most sophisticated and educated law enforcement officials in the nation. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2820 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Thank you,

Shaun Cole

14 Valley View Dr. Hampden, MA

From: mcb74eo2@comcast.net

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 11:48 AM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Reject Senate Policing bill SB 2820

Dear Members of the Massachusetts House of Representatives: I am writing to ask you to reject the Policing Bill, SB 2820. It endangers public safety, removes important protections for police, and creates a commission to study and make recommendations regarding policing with a lopsided membership. Section 49 alters our education laws to prohibit school officials from reporting immigration or citizenship status to any law enforcement authority or GANG MEMBERSHIP. To think that school authorities would be prohibited from telling the police that a student might be a member of MS-13 or any other dangerous gang is extremely dangerous. Section 49 should be eliminated. SB 2820 endangers our police by dramatically watering down "qualified immunity" in Section 10. This provision should be eliminated. Section 52 should also be eliminated as it hinders an officer's ability to protect our roadways as well as him- or herself by not allowing them to ask someone who they have stopped about their immigration or citizenship status. Section 63 creates a fifteen-member commission to make recommendations on policing. But, only 3 of the 15 are associated with policing. It should have more equal representation of law enforcement officers. I oppose SB 2820, and at a minimum, it should specifically eliminate any provisions similar to sections 10, 49, 52, and amend Section 63 to have more police representation. Sincerely,

From: David Janvier <janvier1980@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 11:46 AM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Juvenile Justice Data, Raise the Age, and Expungement

Dear Chair Cronin, Chair Michlewitz, Vice-Chair Day, Vice-Chair Garlick and House members of the Judiciary and the House Ways and Means Committees,

Thank you for your commitment to racial justice and to the bright futures of young people in our

Commonwealth.

As a resident of the commonwealth, I urge you to support Juvenile Justice Data, Raise the Age, and Expungement.

1. Require transparency in juvenile justice decisions by race and ethnicity (as filed by Rep. Tyler in H.2141)

2. End the automatic prosecution of teenagers as adults (as filed by Rep. O'Day in H.3420)

3. Expand expungement eligibility (as filed by Reps. Decker and Khan in H.1386 and as passed in S.2820 §§59-61)

Thank you for defending and protecting the students of Massachusetts. I look forward to hearing back from you about how you voted on this bill.

Best,

David