Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:27 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: ryno; Jones, Bradley - Rep. (HOU); Michlewitz, Aaron - Rep. (HWM)
Subject: Police Reform Bill

Dear MA State Representatives,

I am writing to you today as the wife of a career well educated Law Enforcement Officer who has served the public for 33 years as a dedicated member of the Boston Police serving many ranks.

To say I am saddened and angry by the severe scrutiny and quite frankly lack of support for Massachusetts Law Enforcement Officers is an understatement. Over the last several months my family has witnessed MA Police Officers being pelleted with bottles of urine and other waste, police cars being lit on fire, and vulgarities being screamed at them by strangers who know nothing about the person who wears the uniform. All the while the Officers are holding the line not wearing any riot gear and exercising great patience. These Officers are able do this because it's how they were trained.

In our house, we don't hear many stories about what happens at work because the Dad of two great kids and my husband usual leaves his job it at the front door when he enters our home. Every work day I've watched him put on his uniform and before he walks out the door he gives me and the kids a hug and I love you. Once the door closes, I often imagine who is he going to protect, help and what tragic situation will he witness today. I never doubt that he will respond to the call and give nothing but his very best. Because you see one thing about my husband and his colleagues is they have been trained so well to handle any situation and most important respect anyone they encounter. The majority of men and women who wear that badge understand the importance of the oath they took. They treat every citizen equal and fair.

I completely understand the outrage from the tragedy that occurred in Minneapolis but we are not that state. We are Massachusetts! Our Police Officers are the very best of the best. If you look at the Boston Police, we have the first black Police Commissioner in the history of the City. He is a great well respected leader who pushes his department to be better everyday. Their Community Policing model is admired by many. The BPD has great established relationships with Community Leaders and residents. Most parts of the City heavily depend on the police to be patrolling their areas so they can put their heads on the pillow knowing their families are safe. The positive impact that BPD Officers have with kids throughout the City is amazing. I've seen it first hand through the many non profit groups I volunteer at. Shop with a Cop, BPD National Night Out, Cook Outs, Ice Cream Truck, and sometimes just a patrol car stopping in the neighborhood to share a hello and a small conversation with the kids. These are some of the things departments are doing to create that trust with their Communities. Now in a blink of eye after many years of hard work that trust has been lost. Primarily because of the media and the lack of support for the MA Police Departments.

There is no doubt MA Police Departments can always find way to improve themselves and do better. In order to achieve this, you must allow them a seat at the table for them to be able to listen, learn and share their experiences as well. Conflict is never resolved and nothing is accomplished by lack of communication.

Like I stated at the beginning of my testimony when my husband leaves for work, says his goodbyes and the door closes him and I know both know it might be for the last time. We both know that unspoken truth that if something happens our family will always be protected financially. We both know that when he has to answer that call to put himself between a domestic partner trying to murder his/her spouse with a knife, or someone on the street pointing a gun at innocent people and/or my husband, or a terrorist holding a bomb attempting to blow up a marathon...we both know that if my husband has to shoot his gun or use the take down techniques he learned by the tremendous amount training he's received...we both know he and our family will be protected from liability from the municipality in which he is employed. Let me tell you if these Officers now have to pause and question their instincts their lives and the lives of those they protect will be in a far more dangerous situation.

I am asking you today to please protect the brave men and women of Law Enforcement by not stripping them of their qualified immunity. This is not answer. I am also asking for you the MA Representatives to stand up and support all sides. For some reason most political leaders are afraid to say hey, you know what...overall LEO's in this state are doing a pretty good job.

As a kid who grew up in Charlestown, I am actually stunned that we have reached this point. I grew up, like many kids in Boston, involved with many youth programs which led me to interact with other kids for all over the city. It was awesome! Most became my friends. We shared our background and stories about the many struggles we had faced. We all understood one another a lot better and respected each other's opinions. This was 32 years ago. I've carried that teenage experience, as I'm sure many others kids did, my entire life. It is my belief that the MA community relationships has only improved since then. I'm not sure how we got to where we are today expressing such distain for Law Enforcement in the Commonwealth. Sure we've had ups and downs along the way but I've always felt we were a step ahead the rest of the Country.

Thank you for the taking the time to read my testimony. I completely understand the taunting task you have before you and I truly hope a fair outcome will prevail.

Take Care,
Kimberly Mahoney

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Justin du coeur <jducoeur@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:26 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Regarding the Reform, Shift + Build Act

I would like to express my support for this bill, S.2820, and urge the State House to pass it largely in its current form.

Police reform is necessary at all levels -- even us middle-class, middle-aged white voters can see that by this point. No, the situation in MA isn't as horrifying as it is in some places, but that's a terribly low bar: we can, and should, do much better.

There is a lot in the Senate bill that moves in the right directions: an independent review board, tightening the use-of-force standards, downplaying the use of police in schools. Perhaps above all, limiting qualified immunity like this should be a matter of common sense, and it is appalling that that isn't *already* in state law.

This needs to happen, and it needs to happen now. I urge the House to avoid the temptation to water the bill down, and also to avoid nitpicking it to death in the name of improvements. While I believe that we can do yet more going forward, it's important to begin making smart, measured progress.

Please support this bill, and get it passed in this legislative session.

Sincerely,
Mark Waks
617-718-1800
Somerville, MA
From: Nancy Bettinger <nancybettinger@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:26 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Meschino, Joan - Rep. (HOU); Murphy, James - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: Racial Justice Legislation

Dear Chairs Cronin and Michlewitz and Members of the Ways and Means and Judiciary Committees,

The League of Women Voters advocates against systemic racism in the justice system and supports preventing excessive force and brutality by law enforcement.

We urge you to support legislation that includes the protections proposed by the following bills:

HD.5128, An Act Relative to Saving Black Lives and Transforming Public Safety, filed by State Representative Liz Miranda, which bans chokeholds, no knock warrants, tear gas, and hiring abusive officers; creates a duty to intervene and to de-escalate and requires maintaining public records of officer misconduct.

H.3277 An Act to Secure Civil Rights through the Courts of the Commonwealth, filed by State Representative Michael Day, which ends the practice of qualified immunity, making it possible for police officers to be personally liable if they are found to have violated a person’s civil rights.

It is time at last to ensure that all citizens of the Commonwealth benefit from basic health, safety and civil rights protections.

Sincerely,
Nancy Bettinger
Hingham League of Women Voters Legislative Envoy

From: Crista <crista0217@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:25 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Acceptance of Written Testimony Only

Dear Senator Julian Cyr,

My name is Jane Lesanto and I live at 609 Great Neck Road South, Mashpee, MA. As your constituent, I write to you today to express 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.

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. Let me remind you that in 2015 President Obama recognized the Boston Police Department as one of the best in the nation at community policing. 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.

Sincerely,

Jane Lesanto

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=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=Lxl4XeQ6_iiCXvw8IuvWDYoJgvpP5sYPJTO4XI537ZE&s=93DvL_V3hNIK_KzriiEei71-PdhDdP0-C08trErbZcE&e=>

From: Leah McGowan <mcgowanleah@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:25 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill for Police Reform S2820

To whom it may concern,

Thank you for drafting Bill S2820. I want to make sure you are aware that constituents are proud to live in Massachusetts when Police Reform bills like S2820 are being crafted in response to Black Lives Matter protests and public outcry. I support this bill and hope that we will actually get to see reform in the streets. I also hope that the money spent on policing Black people can be redistributed to actually support and uplift these communities and families.

I thank you for your work to make our country a safer, more respectable place to call home. We have hundreds of years of oppressive laws and law enforcement actions to reverse and heal from. I am glad we are taking a step in the right direction.

Leah McGowan
20 Beal St
Canton MA 02021

(413) 522-0899
From: Stacey & Jay Cappello <jnscappello@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:25 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2820

Good Evening
My name is Stacey Cappello and I live at 57 Bellevue rd in Braintree. I write to you today with regards to S.2820. This is a bill that has the attention of many in our Commonwealth. Most particularly, it has the attention of Police/Law Enforcement officers, those that love them and those that support them.
I write to you as the wife of an active Weymouth Police Dectective As the wife of a Police Dectective in today's world things are different. Like all police wives, I watch my husband leave and hope and pray that he comes

home safely every day. My last words to him every time he leaves are “be careful”. In our world this is “normal” but not everyone lives in the same world we do, not all wives need to say "be careful" when their loved one leaves for work.
I also write to you as a member of a larger family - the Blue Family. This week, Wednesday July 15 to be specific, my Blue Family and I remembered one of our own, Sergeant Michael Chesna. On July 15, 2018 this husband, father, son, brother and uncle who just also happened to be a Police Officer was murdered. I will never forget sitting on our back deck having coffee when my husband got the initial call about Mike.I will never forget him running upstairs to get dressed to go to work and help wherever he could. I will never forget where I was when he called me to tell me the news that Mike had died. I will never forget attending Mike’s wake and funeral with my husband, my Blue Family and the Chesna Family. Sitting in St. Mary of the Sacred Heart Church in Hanover with my fellow police wives is something none of us will never forget. A police wake and funeral are things NONE of us ever want to attend again.
As I noted above, S.2820 has caught our attention. There are pieces of S.2820 that are acceptable and appropriate when we think of a bill with a goal of constructive Police/Law Enforcement reform.
Like many, I support enhanced training and appropriate certification standards that apply to individual officers. I also support accreditation of police departments. Certification and accreditation both serve as a commitment to excellence in training and promote each individual’s and department’s maintenance of the highest professional standards. Certification and accreditation also serve to enhance public confidence. Public confidence, and I might offer respect, is critical to police officers being able to do their job on a daily basis. I also support the ban of the use of excessive force by police officers as well as the proposal that every individual officer has the duty to intervene if they witness excessive force. These parts of S.2820 all make sense when we focus on the idea that this bill is about constructive police/law enforcement reform.

S.2820 has also caught our attention because there are pieces of it that do not allow for the fair and unbiased treatment of Police Officers. Most importantly, the removal of Qualified Immunity for Police Officers is unfair and potentially dangerous. Qualified Immunity, as I understand it, does not excuse criminal conduct. It is, instead, a legal protection offered to all public employees and serves as a protection against losing one’s home or life savings in a civil suit. As many people know, Police Officers need to make in the moment decisions every day when they put on their uniform. If they don’t make those decisions quickly enough they face the very real chance of death or injury. Police Officers CANNOT do the job they were hired to do safely and effectively if they are worried about liability. They CANNOT do the job they were hired to do safely and effectively if they are worried about losing the home their family lives in. They CANNOT do the job they were hired to do safely and effectively if they are worried about how they will support their loved ones. Is there a chance that Sergeant Michael Chesna chose not to use his weapon on the morning of July 15, 2018 because he was worried that such use would have been viewed as use of excessive force? Was he worried that if he used his weapon he could potentially lose his family’s home? The answers to those questions we will never know. It does seem reasonable to assume,

however, that had Sergeant Michael Chesna chosen to use his weapon to shoot Emanuel Lopes he would still be here today. He would still be here with his family who miss him every single day. Police Officers need to be able to make quick decisions and act in good faith without fearing that each and every decision they make could lead to a lawsuit against them. Police Officers who are forced to stop, pause and think about potential liability before they act are Police officers whose lives are at risk. The removal of Qualified Immunity should NOT be part of the final police/law enforcement reform package.

As I stated, there are parts of S.2820 that are acceptable and appropriate when we think of a bill with a goal of constructive Police/Law Enforcement reform. The bill as it currently stands before you is NOT acceptable as a total package. If Legislation such as that tied to S.2820 is to be effective, appropriate and just for all citizens of our Commonwealth it takes time along with careful thought and consideration. Reactive and rash decision making do not serve the citizens of our Commonwealth. The early acts in the Senate to rush a vote on this bill and to not study pieces like Qualified Immunity further have been extremely disheartening. I appreciated those Senators who called for more time and for a closer look at the bill in order to produce a product that was fair and just for all citizens of our Commonwealth. I also appreciate the willingness of the House to hear from the citizens of the Commonwealth. Legislation such as S.2820 impacts all citizens so all of those citizens should be allowed to share their thoughts.
In closing, I urge you to take the time that is necessary to make the best decision for ALL citizens of our Commonwealth. We have some of the most well trained Police/Law Enforcement Officers in the country. They need to be able to do the job they were trained to do in a safe and effective way. I urge you to correct S.2820 so as to treat the men and women in Law Enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Sincerely,
Stacey Cappello

57 Bellevue Rd

Braintree,Ma

From: Jerry Cuellar <cuellargerald@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:25 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: PLEASE FOLLOW UP: LACK OF A PUBLIC HEARING CONCERN, Police Reform Bill (S 2800)

?

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a citizen, a taxpayer and a voter of the Commonwealth. I and am writing to express my concern on the lack of a public hearing on the Senate's bill (S 2800) which is a major point of contention for police unions and other critics who felt excluded from the development of the bill. I would ask that police unions and We The People be allowed to have input on the bill as it directly effects police and the safety of our citizens.

I can be reached at 954 245 2206 if you have any questions.

Respectfully,
Gerald Cuellar

Sent from my iPhone
From: Phyllis Ellis <phyllis@naacp-brocktonbranch.org>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:21 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: DeLeo, Robert - Rep. (HOU); Ron.Marlano@housema.gov; Gonzalez, Carlos - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: Testimony

PO Box 1535

Brockton, MA 02302

July 17, 2020

Claire Cronin, House Judiciary Committee

Aaron Michlewiz, Chair, House Ways and Means Committee

Good Morning,

As president of the Brockton Area Branch NAACP, I write in support of a strong policing reform bill. I support the Massachusetts Black and Latino Legislative Caucus position and priorities.

This is not Black vs White. It’s about accountability vs non-accountability. Police should be held accountable for their actions and not be shield. We look to police to protect us, yet some, not all, are becoming the predators. This reform may hinder that.

Phyllis Ellis

President

Brockton Area Branch NAACP

From: Camy Ducasse <cducasse24@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:24 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S.2820

July 17, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Camy Ducass and I live at 1 Marshall Circle Peabody Ma. I work at the Suffolk County Sheriff's Department and am a Correction Officer. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

???????????????? ????????????????: Qualified immunity doesn’t protect officers who break the law or violate someone’s civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

???????? ???????? ??????????? ??????????: The fact that you want to take away an officer’s use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling “Stop” to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

???????????????? ?????????????????: While we are held to a higher standard than others in the community, to have an oversight committee made

of people who have never worn the uniform, including an ex convicted felon is completely unnecessary and irresponsible. When this oversight board hears testimony where are the officer's rights under our collective bargaining agreement? Where are our rights to due process? What is the appeal process? These are things that have never been heard or explained to me. The need for responsible and qualified individuals on any committee should be first and foremost.

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, we are not opposed to getting better 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,
Camy Ducasse

From: Christine Del Favero <cad7@cornell.edu>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:24 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Pass 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 Christine Del Favero with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 18 Dartmouth Place, Boston, MA 02116. 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.

Be well,

Christine Del Favero

--

Christine Del Favero
cad7@cornell.edu
702-743-7902
18 Dartmouth Place,
Unit 2
Boston, MA 02116

From: Wendy Cunniff <wwcunniff@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:23 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony on S 2820

Wendy Cunniff
22 Naples Road
S. Hamilton, MA 01982
wwcunniff@gmail.com

Dear Representatives of the People of Massachusetts,

I am not a member of any special interest group. I want to express my concern as a regular citizen of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Qualified Immunity protects the people of Massachusetts just as much as it protects first responders. Without it we will have our first responders afraid to act because of the threat of being sued. We will have good first responders forced to leave the profession in order to protect their family. As a citizen, I want to be able to call a first responder, knowing without question that if needed an action, such as performing CPR will be performed without hesitation.
There will be people who will target first responders with lawsuits. It will be a nightmare for society. Please pass common sense reform, not knee-jerk reaction reform. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,
Wendy Cunniff
From: Arthur McIver <apmuci@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:23 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2800

To whom it may concern:

I am totally against what you are doing. You are wasting your time and mine. But that seems natural for you.

Once again you have missed the mark. First of all it's not the Police who have the problem(.5% maybe) it's the people breaking the law. They have no respect for themselves or anyone else. If an officer asked you to stop you stop if they ask you a simple question, you answer. Why is this so difficult.

As for the Michael Rodrigues comments: "We took bits and pieces on many different ideas, and we did what we always do in the Senate: we tried to put together the best piece of legislation that we could... It's disappointing that we're not going to do the business that we were elected to do today. We know it's hard. We know it's difficult. It's just going to be as difficult the next day." He "tried to put together the best piece of legislation that we could", but it's not and it is being rushed through the process.

You have to take care of Massachusetts and any issues we might have here. Stop looking at the out of control cities across the country and focus on Massachusetts.

I strongly suggest you add a weekend ride along with Police officers for every politician elected. Let them see first hand how people react to the Police and how they have to make instant life and death decisions. The people breaking the law are the enemy not the Police. Why doesn't Sonia Chang-Diaz name the white people involved in Police shootings? It doesn't fit his narrative.
Most of you political puppets are ruining this great country.
POLICE are a MUST. Give them more money.

Thank you for listening.

Sent from my iPhone
From: Kristina Lauer <kristina_j_lauer@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:23 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform

To: Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Chairperson, House Committee on Ways and Means

Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

My name is Kristina Lauer with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). 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.

Sincerely,

Kristina Lauer

12 Morrison Ave.
Somerville, MA 02144
505-550-8324
From: Pete Skerritt <peter@shilohnv.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:23 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: 'Pete Skerritt'
Subject: police reform bill (S2820)

Hello,

I recall a story from my father (a lifelong Democrat) about how, when the United States Air Force was being formed, he was standing at attention with a line of other Army soldiers, and when they asked for volunteers to move over to the Air Force, the rest of the line took one step back, leaving him and just a few others as the only volunteers. Now I know this was probably just a story from him, but it leads me to the situation that we see here with this new police reform bill. Those of you with courage (seemingly only a handful) were abandoned by those with no backbone, falling to the pressure of the mob, and having no guts to stand against that mob. You should all be ashamed of yourselves… I know I'm ashamed of you.

Everything, every concept, every invention created by man can be improved upon. Nobody argues that the police are perfect, not even close. But they are nevertheless the defenders of society when that society needs defending, and that includes the removal of those from society that threaten the lives and property of the innocent. Do what is right for a change.

Thank you,

Peter Skerritt

email: pete@shilohnv.com

phone/text: 775-560-9219

From: Liz McGuire <lizmcguire@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:22 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Re: Urge you to pass S.2820 into law

Correction: I'm writing in favor of S.2820—sorry about the typo in my last email.

On Thu, Jul 16, 2020 at 9:05 PM Liz McGuire <lizmcguire@gmail.com> wrote:

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 teargas, chokeholds, and no-knock raids like the one that killed Breonna Taylor.

Thank you,

Elizabeth A. McGuire

Brighton, MA

From: Alice Santarlasci <arae41@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:22 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, and 52, as well as amend Section 63 to have more police representation.

Sincerely,

Thomas Graziose
Newburyport, MA

Sent from my iPhone
From: Khalid Johnson <khalidjohnson80@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:22 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Khalid J. Johnson and I liveat 55 Wayland St Apt 1 Boston, Ma 02125. I work for the Suffolk County Sheriff Department and am a Deputy Sheriff. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

??????????????????? ????????????????: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

???????? ???????? ??????????? ??????????: The fact that you want to take away an officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling "Stop" to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

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

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, we are not opposed to getting better 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,

Khalid J. Johnson
From: Jennifer Casali <jenn32975@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:22 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.

Sincerely
Jennifer Donahue
of Saugus Massachusetts
jenn32975@hotmail.com

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone
From: Josh <jrucho@charter.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:21 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: 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,

Joshua Rucho

26 Suomi St Paxton

Jrucho@charter.net

Sent from my iPhone
From: Alice Santarlasci <arae41@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:21 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, and 52, as well as amend Section 63 to have more police representation.

Sincerely,

Ali Santarlasci
Newburyport. MA

Sent from my iPhone
From: nickpadellaro@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:20 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reform bill

Good morning,

I am a firefighter in North Andover, MA. I love this work and am grateful every shift I get to serve my town, it's truly a privilege.
I write to you to express my deepest disappointment in our politicians who have supported this outrageous bill. It cannot be over stated how ridiculous this restrictive proposal is. To suggest that public safety professionals should be exposed to legal action for simply performing their jobs, selflessly at that, is not right. The women and men of my local union are nothing short of spectacular in the way they serve our community and the public day after day. This bill takes away all power our unions have fought to uphold to keep our working conditions fair. To have people who are elected to serve the public, many of whom, who have been backed by unions like mine turn around behind closed doors and sneakily pass this crazy bill is staggering. I find this act shameful and am wondering since when sitting at a table to talk things out went out the window?!
We support our police and take this attack on them as an attack on us, which it is.
Any person who has never served in a first responder capacity has no place telling trained professionals how to handle situations that they could never fathom themselves. The professionals and civil servants I know are exactly that, professional, and to remove all hope they have of a fair process if something goes wrong is maddening. Our members will continue to serve our communities and put our lives on the line every day. I hope that this bill is destroyed like it should be.

Respectfully,
Nick Padellaro
978-885-6649From:Matt Cronin <mcronin359@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:20 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2820 Police Reform Bill

As a long-standing Massachusetts resident and taxpayer, I am adamantly opposed to this bill S2820. All profession has bad apples and must be dealt with the full backing from the law. With all the violence that has taken place in Boston and around the country its time to increase police budgets.No, first responders should have a potential lawsuit against them.
Matthew Cronin
Georgetown, MA
Sent from my iPadFrom: Allison Rosenthal <alkrosenthal@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:19 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Bill no. S2820- public testimony

To Whom It May Concern:

I am writing to you in strong opposition to Bill No. S2820. Law Enforcement officers put their lives on the line every time they go to work. They deserve the protections that qualified immunity provide them. I believe now more than ever it is an essential that this protection remain in tact for those honest and hard working individuals tasked to protect ALL of the residents of Massachusetts. I strongly believe that the silent majority of Massachusetts residents feel the same way. Please join me in opposing this bill.

Sincerely,
Allison Rosenthal

From: Aimee Petronglo <a.petronglo@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:19 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: No not push bill no S2820

Dear Chair of the House Committee,

I am writing to you to ask you to not push the S2820 bill through the House. While I understand it is vital that we take a hard look at our country's police force to discover where reform is needed, I feel as though bill S2820 is rushed and poorly thought out.

By taking away qualified immunity from our officers, we are putting them at great risk for being the subjects of legal suite on a daily basis. There are numerous times when officers have to destroy property to rescue a civilian and times when they may need to use force to prevent someone from hurting themselves or another person. This bill will make officers hesitant to do their jobs which in turn will affect the public.

Please reconsider pushing this bill forward. I strongly believe that if we slow down and take some more time a bill can be drawn up that takes into account both officer safety and civilian safety.

Thank you for your time,

Aimee Petronglo, the family member of Law Enforcement

From: Judy Kendall <judyakendall@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:19 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2800 Written Testimony

My name is Judy Kendall and I live at 68 Early Red Circle, Plymouth, MA 02360. I work at Plymouth North High School as a secretary. As a constituent, I write to express my opposition to Senate Bill 2800. 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 at the hastiness that this bill passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

Qualified Immunity: Qualified Immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. The erasure of this would open up the floodgates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional Insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

Less than Lethal Tools: The fact that you want to take away an officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling "Stop" to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. Officers are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools, the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

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

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 officers are not opposed to getting better it should be done with dignity and respect for the men and women who serve the Commonwealth. I ask that you think about the Correction Officer alone in a cell block, surrounded by up to 100 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
Judy Kendall
Sent from my iPad
From: Adam Hakkarainen <adamhakkarainen@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:18 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Re:

Please redact my home address from any publications related to this communication, or public records.
Thank you,

On Fri, Jul 17, 2020 at 8:06 AM Adam Hakkarainen <adamhakkarainen@gmail.com> wrote:

My name is Adam Hakkarainen and I live at 73 North Road in Chesterfield. I have been a police officer for 27 years. As a constituent,

I write to express my opposition to Senate Bill 2820. This legislation is detrimental to police 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. In contrast, I am dismayed in the hastiness that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public. In fact, I believe it does a grave disservice to our citizens by limiting input from the public. We will all have to live with whatever bill becomes law. There are consequences, good and bad to every piece of legislation. Without public comment and input, and the input from our stakeholders, and those whom understand the problems of criminal justice the best, the consequences are unknown and untested. With such important endeavors such as criminal justice reform, we must get it right.

Qualified Immunity: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

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

I am asking you to stop and think about the rush to reform policing in such haste. Our law enforcement officers are some of the best and well-trained officers anywhere. Although we are not opposed to getting better, it should be done with dignity and respect for the men and women who serve the Commonwealth. I ask that you think about the law enforcement officer you need to keep your streets safe from violence, and don't dismantle proven community policing practices. I'm asking for your support and ensuring that whatever reform is passed that you do it responsibly. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Adam Hakkarainen

From: Dan4th Nicholas <dan4th@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:18 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony re S.2820

Good morning!

I am writing to express support for S.2820, the Senate's police reform bill. I urge the House to enact a similar bill as soon as possible, and get it through a conference committee and signed by Governor Baker by the end of July.

I particularly support the Senate bill's approach to the creation of a state-wide certification board and state-wide training standards, limits on use of force, the duty to intervene if an officer witnesses misconduct by another officer, banning racial profiling and mandating the collection of racial data for police stops, civilian approval required for the purchase of military equipment, the prohibition of nondisclosure agreements in police misconduct cases, and allowing the Governor to select a colonel from outside the state police force, as well as all of the provisions requested by the Black and Latino Legislative Caucus.

I support allowing local Superintendents of Schools, not a state mandate, to decide whether police officers (school resource officers) are helpful in their own schools. Municipalities should be able to make this decision for themselves.
I also support the Senate bill's small modifications to qualified immunity for police officers. Under this bill, police officers would continue to have qualified immunity if they act in a reasonable way, and they would continue to be financially indemnified by the tax-payers in their municipalities. Police officers should not, however, be immune to prosecution if they engage in egregious misconduct, even if case law has not previously established that this particular form of misconduct is egregious.

Most importantly, I hope a good police reform bill will be enacted by the end of July. Thank you for giving attention to this important priority, along with all the other important issues the House is addressing.

Danforth Nicholas
781-258-5628
93 Richdale Ave
Cambridge MA 02140

--

Danforth Nicholas
dan4th@gmail.com

From: Emmy Rainwalker <emmyrain@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:17 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2820

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

As a citizen of Massachusetts, I am in favor or S.2820, bringing reform to our criminal justice system.

I am especially in favor of eliminating qualified immunity. As a social worker, I have to purchase liability insurance every year at my own expense in order to maintain my license. So does my husband who is a contractor.

I would like to see the final bill stop qualified immunity and hold police accountable, as the rest of us are, for their actions. I am in favor also of banning no knock raids, tear gas and chokeholds.

Please act swiftly.

Thank you,

Emilia Rainwalker
8 Carruth St.
Dorchester, MA 02124

From: Julie Reece <jareece611@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:17 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Fwd: Mass Senate Police Reform Bill

Dear Mass Senate,

This week, at 4am, the MA senate betrayed Massachusetts law enforcement and put a nail in the coffin of good faith policing. 4 am! When you vote on a piece of controversial legislation without a public hearing at 4am, you display to the citizens that you had an agenda that you wanted to push through, without proper dialogue and debate, a cowardly act.

Just 8 weeks ago, the Mass Senate and politicians in general did not have issues with how law enforcement policed our cities. In fact, some of you were calling local PD’s daily asking help to celebrate birthdays, graduations, and more by driving by your houses blaring their sirens and waving to your children! These are the officers, first responders, who helped and continue to help people afflicted with COVID-19. But now,

because of one murderous cop in Minneapolis, you have painted all officers as villains and calling for new “reforms.” This is highly hypocritical, as it profiles and stereotypes officers because of their job. Most officers give selflessly to their communities every day in ways the public never hears about from the media and politicians.

We see you , cowards who refused to take law enforcement calls to discuss this legislation before the 4am vote and who wouldn’t return emails. We see you, all of you who voted at 4am. We will remember this when you are up for reelection.

This legislation DOES NOT make communities safer. If someone has a heart attack, and an officer uses chest compressions, breaking a rib in the process (which almost always happens), the officer can be sued. If a baby is left in a hot car and an officer smashes a window to save the baby, the car's owner can sue the officer for property destruction. The list goes on and on. Good cops will be sued, fired, and even incarcerated in their efforts to help citizens. They will be afraid to help at all. The consequences are anarchy. This is appalling at every level. Qualified Immunity protects public servants who are doing their job and acting in good faith from litigation. This new legislation must not be passed.
Sincerely,
Julie Reece

From: pjm84 <pjm84@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:17 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform bill

Will the perpetrators show the same restraint while being taken into custody?

This issue requires much more debate.

Sent via the Samsung Galaxy S8, an AT&T 5G Evolution capable smartphone

From: Justin Green <justin.greenaa@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:16 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Objections to S.2820

Representatives Michlewitz and Cronin

Massachusetts House of Representatives

24 Beacon Street

Boston, MA 02133

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Justin Green and I live at 87 County Rd in Huntington, Massachusetts.

I am writing to express my opposition to the current Senate bill S.2800, which was passed in the Massachusetts Senate this week and is being heard by you the Massachusetts House of Representatives for consideration.

My oppositions to this bill are very simple and straight-forward. First, this bill will change the current legal standard of the Qualified Immunity doctrine in Massachusetts state courts. The present standard allows the courts to consider past precedent and established legal authority, and the information the public official possessed at the time of their alleged illegal action when determining whether the doctrine will apply to a public official defendant before a case can go forward.

S.2800 would change the established legal standard to only allow the court to consider what every reasonable defendant would have understood as being illegal at the time of their alleged illegal action before allowing the case to go forward. This shift in legal doctrine would completely ignore the bedrock legal doctrine of stare decisis and legal precedent, and prohibit courts from benefiting from past decisions, both mandatory and persuasive, that would apply to the case at bar.

This will completely erode Qualified Immunity because it places far too much subjectivity into the decision whether to bring forward cause of action against a public employee. A finder of fact will be left to make their decisions in a vacuum, without the benefit of fairness and established legal precedents.

Secondly, I oppose S.2800 because of the changes it makes to the Massachusetts Civil Rights Act or "MCRA." Currently, under the MCRA, a plaintiff's case may only go forward against a public employee for acts that interfere with the exercise and enjoyment of [a citizen's] constitutional rights, as well as rights secured by the constitution or laws of the Commonwealth, where such interference of constitutional or statutory rights were achieved or attempted through threats, intimidation or coercion.

The proposed changes in § 10(b) of S.2800 completely delete the requirements of threats, intimidation and coercion be present in a public employee's alleged violation of the plaintiffs constitutional rights. This will, in effect, open the flood-gates for causes of action to be brought

in Massachusetts state courts under the MCRA under this weakened standard. As you are aware, causes of action that lie under the MCRA are eligible for consideration of awarding attorney's fees if there is a favorable verdict for the plaintiff. What will stop unscrupulous plaintiffs and their attorneys from filing suit under this weakened standard in an attempt to exact a quick settlement that includes attorney's fees? The gatekeeper will be asleep at the wheel, as the finders of fact will have no way to dismiss these frivolous claims before they make their way into court.

Finally, please consider the families, children, spouses and public employees themselves when making your decisions regarding this piece of flawed legislation. Qualified Immunity was established to shield public employees who act in good faith from frivolous and exhortative law suits. The erosions of S.2800 will place hardworking and dedicated public employees in a position where personal liability could apply in situations where it never should. Are their homes, college savings accounts, retirement accounts, and personal assets so under-valued that they should be forfeited to settle damages in these cases? Our public employees, especially our police officers, deserve better.

I implore you to take more time and truly consider the far-reaching implications of this bill. There is no doubt that there are things that need to change in law enforcement, but this is not how they should change. A bill that is filed as a knee-jerk reaction in an attempt to solve a real problem will only create more problems. Discussion, conversation, debate, opposition, and objection are all cornerstones to our democratic process. We must use them, even embrace them, in order to find a solution to police reform that is both meaningful and pragmatic.

Sincerely,

Justin Green

From: Laura Vecchione <lauravecch@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:15 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Pass Police Reform to Include

To: Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Chairperson, House Committee on Ways and Means

Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Hello, my name is Laura Vecchione with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 53 Appleton St. Arlington, MA 02476. 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.

Laura Vecchione

53 Appleton St Unit 4

Arlington, MA 02476

617-461-0525

Voting Address usually Arlington Town Hall unless changed for Covid

--

Laura Vecchione (Veck-ee-oh-nee)
Singer/Songwriter/Private Music Teacher
617-461-0525
www.LauraVmusic.com <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.lauravmusic.com_&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=ntdGdloo-V7pxeImvbe0RV-fI6YAh4YKRE-sKHP2HlA&s=82f7kjvPRx1Xb7zbsj_dBnJjfohIYubJ-LwwCWy-nYM&e=>
www.ConcertsfromtheHeart.com
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.concertsfromtheheart.com_&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=ntdGdloo-V7pxeImvbe0RV-fI6YAh4YKRE-sKHP2HlA&s=0vURBpdYjmckIoEXsekCmoYiGxtIxfg7d7AdtURDhxs&e=>

Stay in touch: Facebook <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.facebook.com_lauravecchionemusic_&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=ntdGdloo-V7pxeImvbe0RV-fI6YAh4YKRE-sKHP2HlA&s=ilUvdwKRJ9RdabuWcJcPWY7PkFVO7zJutAPRlctKn94&e=> Instagram

<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.instagram.com_lauravmusic_&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=ntdGdloo-V7pxeImvbe0RV-fI6YAh4YKRE-sKHP2HlA&s=6jtNj9rpOU3a7CGdW9Zh2eyn-qrahQvt6jcr3_kF9gc&e=> Spotify <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__open.spotify.com_artist_024ha1798aBjLqMW5Wv6cU&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=ntdGdloo-V7pxeImvbe0RV-fI6YAh4YKRE-sKHP2HlA&s=AodcJSUjEoBCwW1YEe6w1nDPvrLIVj2W94mxi2aknKg&e=> Twitter <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__twitter.com_LauraVmusic&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=ntdGdloo-V7pxeImvbe0RV-fI6YAh4YKRE-sKHP2HlA&s=pWp0mNQ7GRm1mzwGMVUo9I4I9Sv9PaWaj9ud1Utt458&e=> YouTube <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.youtube.com_user_lauravecch_videos&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=ntdGdloo-V7pxeImvbe0RV-fI6YAh4YKRE-sKHP2HlA&s=rblY8hlBxpECvkjaJzPUUe4yERv-RxVGYHB4PjTs0CI&e=> Newsletter <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__lauravmusic.us8.list-2Dmanage.com_subscribe-3Fu-3Dd280a08d05c510b8f13eef5ea-26id-3D7d5f636563&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=ntdGdloo-V7pxeImvbe0RV-fI6YAh4YKRE-sKHP2HlA&s=YzwsNeqpsestOGg7UFY7ulKA2IDpfF1wVDpnfHzWxec&e=>
Music Stores: CDBaby <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__store.cdbaby.com_Artist_LauraVecchione&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=ntdGdloo-V7pxeImvbe0RV-fI6YAh4YKRE-sKHP2HlA&s=uVmK8FxXeDt-5v35PKTQxglWS4H4NPtYiFbU8ywgkFU&e=> iTunes <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__itunes.apple.com_us_artist_laura-2Dvecchione_id210704397&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=ntdGdloo-V7pxeImvbe0RV-fI6YAh4YKRE-sKHP2HlA&s=yCuCGmN_-0R298LHCijUee8FibfPHFyWPiaZHQfGhnY&e=>

From: Ann Dickinson <annflynndickinson@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:13 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Qualified Immunity

July 17, 2020

Whom It May Concern:

I'm hoping that the citizens can count on your support to fix the severely flawed legislation labeled S2800.

If qualified immunity is changed from its current definition, the safety of the public will be severely jeopardized.

It is unfair and immoral to change current collective bargaining agreements without negotiations

When you view these considerations along with other problems with the bill, no one will desire to be (or will be able to afford to be) a police officer, firefighter or nurse.

Look around the country and see what's happening. New York City Police Officers are retiring in droves. Minneapolis Police Officers are leaving on medical stress. Atlanta Police Officers stopped answering calls on shifts.

Do you really want inevitable similar events to occur here in the Municipalities of Massachusetts?

If the subject bill passes in its present form, no young person with any sense of self-preservation will enter public service.

When the police are gone, there will be no one to protect innocent civilians of all colors from the evil that the political radical left refuses to acknowledge.

Please consider your actions on this issue extremely carefully. Be completely aware of the unintended consequences. The Citizens of the Commonwealth do not want to live in a society of complete chaos due to the inability of public servants to do their jobs. Your careful review and consideration is critical.

Sincerely

Ann Flynn Dickinson

58 Coolidge Ave

Weymouth, MA 02188

781-706-6743

annflynndickinson@gmail.com

From: Brenda Breed <gbmacbreed@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:14 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Subject: Testimony in support of Senate bill S.2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

I am writing in support of Senate bill S.2820.

Over the years, the ability of our city and town governments to create and manage policing that meets the needs and aspirations of our communities has been dismantled, including by the non-statutory judge-made doctrine of qualified immunity, and the Chapter 150E collective bargaining law and the Joint Labor Management Committee statute that together eliminate local government options for effective police accountability.

This bill provides important legislation that begins to return those rights to our communities. It also creates a much needed system for the training and certification of police officers, and makes other necessary changes to law and policy to improve and enhance the accountability of policing in the Commonwealth. This is landmark legislation that would help transform how law enforcement is practiced in Massachusetts, with a long overdue focus on racial equity in our justice system.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,
Brenda Breed
19 Crescent St.
Medford, MA 02155
781-391-6825

From: Julie Kelly <jkelly@newtonma.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:14 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill S.2800

I'm writing to beg you not to pass that bill. Yes there are always ways to improve things. But there are major problems with that bill.

It was passed at 4am with no public comment. You are destroying all the great police officers in this state. I have never seen the people I work with so down and defeated as right now, and I've worked there 29 years. They feel under attack by everyone. How about we deal with the bad police officers, and LET THE GREAT ONES KNOW HOW MUCH WE APPRECIATE THEM! What are you all going to do when all the good ones have been driven away? This is disgusting.

As a public safety worker myself, 29 years as a 911 dispatcher, you have me scared out of my mind that I'll try to help someone, something goes wrong, I get sued, and lose my home. And I worry for all of my coworkers now. I've spent my entire adult life helping people, and this is how you repay people like myself and all of my coworkers along with all of my coworkers across the city/state.

Please do not pass this current bill. Yes there may need to be some changes but not the way that's written, and not giving the public only two days to respond.

Sincerely,

Julie Kelly
AFSCME Local 3092 President
City of Newton

Sent from my iPhone

When responding, please be aware that the Massachusetts Secretary of State has determined that most email is public record and therefore cannot be kept confidential.
From: d0cness@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:14 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Immunity for public safety employees

To whom it concerns,

As a 20+ year veteran of the Massachusetts Fire Service, I am writing to voice my concern of my state's pursuit of removing immunity for my brothers and sisters currently employed to serve our communities.

In the wake of events perceived by certain individuals of political power as systemic racism, ALL of us are being cast (profiled) as racists. Because of this rush to judgement ALL of us now are at the gravest of threats from working in an environment that already is as dangerous as it is but now causes undue stress and hardship.

The safety net of immunity provides US the protection from baseless lawsuits from opportunists looking to cash in on perceived slights or "civil rights" violations.

To lump 99% of the dedicated, lawful and hardworking men and women in with the 1% of perceived "racists" is unfair and quite frankly offensive. How would you (politicians) feel if this false narrative was unjustly cast upon yourselves?

If immunity is stripped from US I can guarantee there will be a mass exodus of my brothers and sisters from a career that we've performed tirelessly and with honor. We will have no other choice. Can't you see it's already happening in police departments all around this nation?

This new proposal will put the lives of OUR communities at serious risk. Who will the citizens call for an emergency? You are aware that this situation has already occurred in cities all over the country and will continue to do so if WE are threatened with the loss of immunity.

If WE are stripped of immunity then isn't it only logical that YOU should be "lumped in" with the rest of the public servants (US)? It's only fair and "just" to do so.

I will not support this measure and I can safely say that the 99% of US will not either. Do not take a knee over a false narrative. YOU are literally putting YOUR knee on OUR necks!

With Respect,

Ryan Nicolosi FF/EMT
Local 2035

Sent from Xfinity Connect App

From: Engine 4 <engine4@quincyma.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:14 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S 2820

Richard Bryan
PFFM
617 697 2219.

Full qualified immunity needs to be reinstated.

The current language on qualified immunity should be removed from S 2820

Get Outlook for Android <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__aka.ms_ghei36&d=DwMFAg&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=8uu5bA0PeiGw8OQo9jUpLZegAc6Y1RX6u8VADNdSrSI&s=_7bO0ZDC6uEclDemY9uvwqNY1XmHLpc0sXAjdQt8ZmA&e=>
The content of this email is confidential and intended for the designated recipient specified above. If you are not the intended recipient, then you received this message by mistake. Please notify the sender of the mistake by replying to this message and then immediately delete it from your computer. It is strictly forbidden to share any part of this message with any third party, without written consent of the sender.
From: Brian <bsueldo@mail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:13 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Oppose SB 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Brian Sueldo-Guevara and I live at 579 Raymond Rd in Plymouth, MA. I work at MCI-Norfolk and am a Correction Officer I. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

Qualified Immunity: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to aquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system costing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

Less Than Lethal Tools: The fact that you want to take away an Officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from yelling "Stop", to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

Civilian Oversight: While we are held to a higher standard than others in the community, to have an oversight committee made of people who have never worn the uniform, including an ex convicted felon is completely unnecessary and irresponsible. When this oversight board hears testimony where are the officer's rights under our collective bargaining agreement? Where are our rights to due process? What is the appeal process? These are things that have never been heard or explained to me. The need for responsible and qualified individuals on any committee should be first and foremost.
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, while we are not opposed to getting better, 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 as that you 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,
Brian Sueldo-Guevara

Sent from my iPhone
From: Bavosi, Anthony <ABavosi@bellinghamma.org>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:13 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony

To Whom It May Concern,
Below is the testimony of a coworker that I would like taken into consideration.
He asked that I send it over on his behalf. As a fellow police officer and his union president I feel his voice should be heard. As should the voices of my brothers and sisters throughout the state and country for that matter.

I am writing to you as a concerned police officer and a concerned resident of the Commonwealth. I was told a number of things about the bill but wanted to read it for myself and draw my own conclusions.

I did not finish reading it.

I immediately started asking questions. There will be a commission overseeing law enforcement that is based on race rather than their knowledge on the subject matter? Isn't that going against what we're working towards? Not even any law enforcement representatives on the commission? Are the commissions and task forces for everything else not made up of, or at least have a few subject matter experts? And that's just the first one mentioned. There are a number of commissions/committees to be created with this bill. So we're going to cut police funding and put the money back into the community and at the same time spend millions and millions on these (many unnecessary) commissions and committees?

I quickly realized that the authors of this bill did little to no research nor did they confer with the law enforcement community. There are aspects of this bill that are already in place. They seem to have a lack of understanding of how things currently work and why certain things are in place. It was clear with what is proposed in regard to qualified immunity. There are decent ideas, but funding hasn't been there for them to happen yet, at least not in every town and city, and with this bill more funding is being taken away. People want better trained officers but when budget cuts are needed, police training is one of the first to be cut.

I'm not much of a conspiracy theorist, but I'm not quite sure what to think. There are 3 possibilities:

1. Are the authors and supporters of this bill anti-police and this is their roundabout way to defund/abolish the police? Seems that way. Higher standards for officers? This bill could ruin good officers' careers, lives, their families' lives even when they did nothing wrong. With the very real potential of losing your job or being charged with a crime and going to jail for doing what you have been directed to do by law, laws that were written in the same manner, who would want to stay in this profession? Who would want to get into it? Not the people they want.
2. Are the authors and supporters of this bill In line with the anarchists? Seems that way. This bill has the potential to have financially devastating ramifications, particularly to less wealthy

towns...first. I don't want to see that happen to my town, or any other town or city for that matter. Add #1 to that. Towns and cities going bankrupt and lack of police...right in line.
3. Or, the most likely option, are the authors and supporters of this bill basing this bill off of a tragedy that no police Officer in the Commonwealth condones? Something that took place in a city, in another state, halfway across the country, where a lot of things are different than they are here, without doing any research on those differences or the effects the bill will have, without communicating or working with law enforcement, just to placate the mobs and say "look what we did, see how much we care" in the typical knee-jerk reaction that is all too common today?

I'm trying to as respectful as possible while being as honest and straight forward as possible. However, it makes it very difficult when I see this garbage (S.2820) being presented by our elected officials.

Massachusetts law enforcement is pretty highly regarded around the country. Forcing such a poorly thought out bill for the sake of "doing something" is a horrible decision at best. How quickly we forget all of the issues that came up with the juvenile law reform. The law enforcement community generally agrees that there are changes that could be made. We are more than willing to work with our community members and legislators on improving things and resolving issues, we just need to be invited to the table.

Respectfully,

Brandon Perella

From: Michael Luth <mluth@townofgroton.org>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:13 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

The Honorable

Sheila Harrington

First Middlesex District

Mass. House of Representatives

24 Beacon Street, Room 237

Boston, MA 02133

Dear Representative Harrington,

I would like to thank you for meeting with some of the police chiefs from your district.

In consideration of debate for a Police Reform addressed by the House of Representatives we

would urge you not to change or remove the qualified immunity protection. We ask that you apply language from Amendment #51 to the Senate Bill S.2800 that would have stricken the POSAC section of the Bill S.2800 and replace it with the Governor's language filed in his original POSAC bill.

We are concerned and opposed to efforts to change the qualified immunity protections for police officers. Qualified immunity is a foundational protection for the policing profession and any modification to this legal standard will have a devasting impact on the ability of the Police to fulfill their public safety mission.

Qualified immunity provides police officers with protection from civil lawsuits, so long as their conduct does not violate clearly established law or constitutional rights of which a reasonable officer would have known. Further, qualified immunity does not prevent individuals from recovering damages from police officers who knowingly violate an individual's constitutional rights. Qualified immunity is an essential part of policing and American jurisprudence. It allows police officers to respond to incidents without pause, make split-second decisions, and rely on the current state of the law in making those decisions. This protection is essential because it ensures officers that good faith actions, based on their understanding of the law at the time of the action, will not later be found to be unconstitutional.

Some of the benefits to the language from the Governor's Bill are:

- Included input from Law Enforcement and Black and Latino caucus’,

- Creates balanced and objective process for certification and de-certification of police officers,

- Requires POSAC membership 1/2 racially diverse,

- Certifies every officer in Commonwealth,

- Makes Law Enforcement accountable for their conduct

Some of the shortcomings of S.2800:

- Widespread undefined authority: unlimited subpoena power without oversight and authority to conduct investigations,

- Language does not provide process or standard of proof for investigations, could step into DA and police internal investigations,

- Creates an arbitrary process, subpoenas can be issued by the Chair alone or just 3 members,

- There is no standard to the basis for investigation

The Use of Force language moves away from the US Supreme Court case, Graham v. Connor, which established that the amount of force used by police had to be Objectively Reasonable is being changed to Necessary. Also, the Reasonable Officer standard is being replaced with Reasonable Person standard. The Senate bill is leaving the "reasonable officer" standard and replacing it with "reasonable person".

"The reasonableness of a particular use of force must be judged from the perspective of a reasonable officer rather than with the 20/20 vision of hindsight". Graham v. Connor

The new language changes the amount of force to "Necessary" from "Objectively Reasonable".

Necessary is subjective (who makes that determination?)

Objectively Reasonable was established under the 4th Amendment decided by USC, Graham v. Connor,

* "Allows for the fact that police officers are often forced to make split-second judgements – in circumstances that are tense, uncertain, and rapidly evolving – about the amount of force that is necessary in a particular situation."
* An officer's evil intentions will not make a Fourth Amendment violation out of an objectively reasonable use of force; nor will an officer's good intentions make an objectively reasonable use of force constitutional. See Scott v United States, supra at 138 citing United States v. Robinson 44 U.S. 18 (1973)

These language changes have very serious implications as to how officers perform their duties and how they will be judged in a court of law.

This is very important legislation and we need to get it right and not rush something out just to do something. We appreciate you considering the

above points and use of the information when formulating the House of Representatives Police Reform Bill.

Respectfully,

Chief Michael F. Luth, Groton
Chief Fred Alden, Ashby

Chief David Scott, Pepperell
Chief James W. Dow, Dunstable

Chief William A. Murray, Ayer
Chief James P. Sartell, Townsend

Michael F. Luth

Chief of Police

Groton Police Department

99Pleasant Street, Groton, MA 01450

(978) 448-5555

(978) 448-5603 (fax)

From: Kristina Harrison <kristina.e.bradford@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:13 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Public Testimony Emails

Dear Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Chairperson, House Committee on Ways and Means

and Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Hello, my name is Kristina Harrison with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 39 Willis Ave Medford. 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.

Kristina Harrison

Kristina.e.Bradford@gmail.com

978.384.8178

39 Willis Ave, Medford, MA 02155

From: Allison Cooley <nosillamc0604@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:12 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Public Testimony - PASS POLICE REFORM

To: Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Chairperson, House Committee on Ways and Means

Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Hello, my name is Allison Cooley with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 95 Edgemere Road, West Roxbury, MA. 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.

Allison Cooley

nosillamc0604@gmail.com

857-707-0059

95 Edgemere Rd, West Roxbury, MA 02132

From: NC <clocknoah@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:12 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: 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.

Thank you,

Noah Clock

235 Carver st

Granby Ma 01033

Clocknoah@yahoo.com

From: Robert Fish Jr <fishjrrobert@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:12 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Robert Fish Jr and I live at 101 Walker St Newtonville, MA 02460. I work at Suffolk County House of Corrections and am a Deputy Sheriff. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

??????????????????? ????????????????: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

???????? ???????? ??????????? ??????????: The fact that you want to take away an officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling "Stop" to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

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

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, we are not opposed to getting better 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,
Robert Fish Jr

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Lilliane Szwaja <lszwaja@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:12 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,

Lilliane Szwaja
Swansea, Ma. 02777
From: JOHN <JOHNSOUZA41@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:11 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform Bill

Dear Representatives,

I am writing this email to you in an appeal to stop the mass police reform bill as it stands. Instead, I am asking that you suspend vote on this bill until the public can be heard at an actual open forum instead of only being allowed to send emails in an extremely limited time frame that will mot likely be highly disregarded.

This bill is a transparent attempt by lawmakers to gain votes preying on public emotions. Sentor Tran stated the bill was "ill conceived and politically driven" and "The bill's main goal and objective is to attack and discredit law enforcement". I and all of the law enforcement officers I have spoken with could not agree more with Sentor Tran's statement and

assessment on this horendous bill. Senator Tran also stated "Democracy is about working together and getting things done right. This bill should be driven by collaboration and not politics". I could not agree more and ask that you suspend vote on this bill and meet with law enforcement officials, including minority police officials, who could be heard at an actual forum where we can work out details to make a bill that is fare, works for everyone, and will keep police and innocent people safe opposed to this horrendous bill that will endanger the lives not only of police officers but of innocent people.

When Covid-19 began, lawn enforcement was praised along with health care workers for being on the front lines and still keeping communities safe during a dangerous world wide pandemic. This bill's interpretation may also include firefighters and health care workers with law enforcement to frivolous lawsuits based on a reaction to a despicable incident in Minneapolis, that no one condones. Lawmakers are now trying to pass a bill encompassing all lawn enforcement as bad based on those awfulpolice officer's actions. We will be open to frivolous lawsuits that will cost the tax payers ridiculous amounts of money and will further clog our courts with these frivolous lawsuits.

Taking away qualified immunity from law enforcement will make officers hesitate which will result in catastrophic consequences not only to law enforcement officers, but also to the innocent people they are sworn to protect. Please do not hesitate or second guess themselves while acting as situations unravel in the blink of an eye.

Police officers have to arrive on scene, assess a situation, determine what is the safest and best course of action to take, and then act all in the blink of an eye. The average person takes 400 milliseconds to blink. There are 1000 milliseconds in a second making it less than half a second to arrive, determine what's going on, make the best decision possible in chaos, and then act while the rest of the world had a lifetime to second guess the actions of an officer and unfairly question the officer's motives.

We have seen what defunding the police has done in Seattle, New York City, along with other cities where chaos has ruled supreme, endangering the lives of innocent people often resulting in catastrophic injuries and the death of innocent people including innocent children.

Our society regards multi millionaire celebrities and professional athletes in the highest of regards. Several, but not all professional athletes have gang affiliations where they funnel money from their multi million dollar contracts to these highly dangerous and highly violent gangs. Many athletes condone and are sponsored by Nike who pays children of indigent countries, extremely low wages in sweatshops to make their products that are endorsed by professional athletes in our country. Again, these athletes are adored and praised while law enforcement works for a minimal fraction of professional athletes salaries.

If you speak to any police officer, they will most likely tell you that policing is not about money or becoming wealthy financially, but is a calling not only to serve and protect but also serving for the better good of our communities putting our lives on the line every day to protect those who cannot protect themselves. Those of us that are lucky enough to make it home at the end of our shift, when we lay our heads down at night, we see dead people, mutilated people, innocent victims violated and taken advantage of, and evil that is every single community in our country. We wonder if we did enough, second guess and pray we did the

right thing, and are thankful we came home physically safe if we are lucky to do so, but knowing the mental aspects of a days work will linger with us forever. We wake up, get ourselves ready physically and mentally, press our uniforms, kiss our loved ones goodbye as they and we know we may never see each other again, and we go to work to do it all over again.

I would respectfully ask that you suspend this bill and meet with actual law enforcement officers and agencies, to hear us and work with us in a democratic fashion to make a bill that will keep officers and our communities safe for the better good of of everyone. Thank you.

John Souza
FOP
(978) 869-7468From: James Johnson <johnson0707@charter.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:10 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Public Safety

My name is Jim Johnson and I write to you to express my support for our many first responders who put their lives on the line for the Commonwealth every single day. As the House and Senate consider legislation revolving around public safety, and in particular police reform, 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 – legal safeguards that have been established over decades and refined by the some of the greatest legal minds our country has known. Due process should not be viewed as an arduous impediment, but favored as a bedrock principle of fundamental fairness, procedure and accountability. Qualified immunity is the baseline for all government officials and critical to the efficient and enthusiastic performance of their duties. Qualified immunity is not a complete shield against liability – egregious acts are afforded no protection under the qualified immunity doctrine. Further, qualified immunity is civil in nature and provides no protection in a criminal prosecution. The United States Supreme Court and the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts through numerous cases have continued to uphold the value and necessity of qualified immunity. To remove or modify without deliberative thought and careful examination of consequence, both intended and unintended, is dangerous.

Due Process and Qualified Immunity are well settled in the law and sound public policy dictates that the Legislature not disturb these standards – certainly not in this bill so abruptly and certainly not without a vigorous debate both in the Legislature and in the court of public opinion.

We must remain focused on passing legislation that includes a standards and training system to certify officers, establish clear guidelines on the use of force by police across all Massachusetts departments, to include a duty to intervene, and put in place mechanisms for the promotion of diversity. This does not detract or reject other reforms, but rather

prioritizes those that can be accomplished before the end of this legislative session on July 31st.

Please join me in demanding nothing less than sound, well-reasoned and forward-thinking legislation.

Thank you for your consideration.
Jim Johnson (registered voter)

Sent from my iPhone
From: Taryn O'Hearn Andrea <tarynohearn@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:10 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: In support of the Senate police reform bill, S.2800

Hello,
I am in support of the Senate police reform bill, S. 2800. I urge you to support the inclusion of the following measures:

HD.5128, An Act Relative to Saving Black Lives and Transforming Public Safety (State Representative Liz Miranda <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.facebook.com_voteliz_-3F-5F-5Ftn-5F-5F-3D-2DUK-2DR-26eid-3DARAoqrvxbqxcHkbaGFFDal2duSLy5lzQwskyvWjSckN0ysQRjD-5FhYuVo9hUS8qQ7GsXpQxRtDfuqyFxu-26fref-3Dmentions-26-5F-5Fxts-5F-5F-5B0-5D-3D68.ARCpDWxSSsBCAr4mlQWUG89eamUATJiOejOVVzTb-5Fh5TYPOtPwTkxZ2JtqfZoMTFI-2D1fSGgJE-5FAdM69hnlW0GxpWGCmB-2DDeQIkK4gMQFDv9KdbZTqybbTQab81GKdWQqCJ16NpVz0rWrm5Tat7OE-2Dj1U99acZZdP8YctIDWcI-2DQfxYjvYfn5aO-5F-2DtZqgE1N7OCvfaYTnFPi6-26-5F-5Fcft-5F-5F-5B0-5D-3DAZXDvPJ2ViV9rcnde4JjRUVF2UwDyDEzXIkgrX6-2D-2D0ZH-2DtjNJyfcN3xSuBBbyxR7gKp-2DSPXKS5ee1r7WxCowQ1Iaenuedwg6JyzZzK87-5FEaisOs9X16jy9l9qjLVUGCbztmcjfdv1VwKqDEmUk9sx-2Ds5Rtvy3-5FQQatTcdla-5FMjUnxeliNgEryqECk-5F5lQ4HkbTs&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=EB7jzzYh_GIu5tEv5e3IGWs2MK_sJQIGRQxW3wIun2Q&s=-p-pamWaNwGy87ElMZkCvsncEVszGgD5LbP1YW86Tn0&e=>) bans chokeholds, no knock warrants, tear gas, and hiring abusive officers; creates a duty to intervene and to de-escalate and requires maintaining public records of officer misconduct.
HB.3277 An Act to Secure Civil Rights through the Courts of the Commonwealth (State Representative Michael Day) which ends the practice of qualified immunity, making it possible for police officers to be personally liable if they are found to have violated a person’s civil rights.

Thank you,
Taryn Andrea
508-364-0971
Plymouth, MA

From: Feraco, Thomas A. <FeracoTA@worcesterma.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:09 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Law Enforcement Bill

To all my state representatives the senate bill that was passed was anti labor legislation. It removes our rights to due process, collective bargaining & inserts a board that has no training, experience or background in law enforcement.
Please look into this further.
Thank you Tom FeracoFrom: Parker Tobon <parkerwtobon@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:09 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Madaro, Adrian - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: Concert about the Reform Shift Build Act.

Hello,

I am 16 and am getting ready to register with a political party. I am leaning towards the Democrat party but am not seeing the issues I care about being addressed in a meaningful way.

Please keep the Senate's qualified immunity reforms, ban facial surveillance, and actually ban chokeholds/tear gas/no-knock raids/other abusive tactics? Please give me a party to believe in.

Parker Tobón
East Boston, MA

From: Donna Forand <donnaforand@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:09 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2800

I would like an opportunity to be heard today.

I believe police need more funding. We have the very best trained officers in this state.

Let’s continue to support them. Let us be heard.

Being the daughter of a police officer, deputy sheriff, and a daughter presently in training all of you have no idea what we as children have been through over the years. We’ve been enduring our parents not home for holidays, parents not at the dinner table for the holiday dinner, we’ve been enduring our parents not at our school appointments, we’ve been enduring parents running out the door to fill-in a day when they were going to host a birthday party for us, we’ve been enduring a lot. We were raised with parents who had to make those unexpected calls at the door of parents to let them know that their children wouldn’t be coming home. Or witness a suicide.

I ask you have you ever done that, have you ever put your life on the line, have you ever stood up and protected a politician, have you ever stood guard outside when the governor is inside speaking, have you ever ridden beside the governor in a car to protect him, have you ever stood outside of school, have you protected a school, if you've done none of those things then you need to listen and you need to let us as children or employees in these ranks speak. Not giving us the right to speak is not fair.

Thank you I do not support this bill entirely. We need special funding to police not defunding. We need to protect their rights. You are protected, what about EMS, Nurses Doctors you take our protection away that's not right.

Thank you,
Donna Forand
7744543392
Donnaforand@gmail.com
--

Kindly,
Donna-Marie Halunen-Forand
From: Tom Bakey <bughillbilly@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:08 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2820

Representatives Michlewitz and Cronin:

Thank you for the opportunity to be heard on S2820, the police reform bill.

I am a lieutenant with the State Police and am going into my twenty-seventh year of service, all of which I have served in Western Massachusetts. Over those twenty-seven years I have largely been assigned to uniform patrol or detectives attached to the Hampden and Hampshire/Franklin District Attorney's Offices.

Every shift I work I attempt to render the highest standard of professionalism, to the utmost of my abilities and capabilities, for the benefit of every resident and guest of the Commonwealth. I have never been accused of excessive use of force. I have never been accused of bias against a minority group, religion, orientation, etc. When someone- anyone- asks for my help, I do my best to assist them whether it be providing them directions, medical assistance, or attempting to bring them justice and resolution if they claim to be the victims of a crime. And when I am investigating someone accused of a crime, I do my best to approach the investigation objectively and guide my actions by the facts discovered, without any consideration to whatever social, ethnic, or other group to which they may belong.

I do not think I am an exception; not with the State Police and not with the local police officers with whom I have had the privilege of working. The animosity and, quite frankly, hatred, displayed against Massachusetts police officers these past few weeks has been upsetting, not least because I find it is so utterly unjustified. We are not Minneapolis Police. We are not Atlanta Police. In my twenty-seven years I'm not aware of the Northampton Police Department ever having shot anyone and I had never heard of a choke hold being employed by police officers at all until the Eric Gardner incident in New York. Regardless, I was present in Northampton last month where dozens of protesters were shouting profanity and insults at us and demanding our jobs. This was followed by the Northampton Police having their budget cut by ten percent. Last week I was in line at Pita Pockets in Northampton before my shift and was called a 'pig' by another customer. There is a vocal mindset among some members of our communities that reminds me of the mobs from the French Revolution and I am extremely concerned that it might be influencing legislation affecting policing in Massachusetts.

State Police training and policy repeatedly prohibits profiling and discrimination and has done so for years.

The State Police does not and never has employed choke holds and I'm not aware of any other department in Massachusetts that does.

The State Police has been providing traffic citation data for years. And, from all I have read, the data continues to show that race, gender, etc is not a factor when troopers stop cars.

The State Police has excellent firearms and other use of force training and discipline and, I have come to realize as I learn of other departments throughout the nation, has remarkably few officer involved shooting incidents. From the Worcester area west to the New York state line, I can at this moment recount three instances of troopers discharging their firearms at people over the past several years: five or six years ago when the suspect wanted for murdering Auburn Officer Tarantino ambushed troopers with a firearm; earlier this year in West Springfield when a wanted felon burst from a residence firing at officers; and a few weeks ago in the Shelburne area when a trooper attempting to deploy tire deflation on a fleeing vehicle had that vehicle driven at him. And we deal with armed people barricaded and/or engaged in criminal activity on a regular basis. As a member of the State Police Crisis Negotiation Unit for many years, often paired up with members of the State Police Special Tactics and OPerations Team at armed barricade call outs, I can assure you of this. No one hears about all the armed, violent people taken into custody safely on a regular basis by the State Police and local police agencies.

You need only recall back to the hunt for the Tsarnaev brothers in the Boston area to be reminded why, sometimes, police officers need armored

cars and patrol rifles and other 'military' gear and training in order to safeguard the Commonwealth. Sandyhook, CT, Jersey City, NJ, San Bernardino, CA, are a few more examples among too many in this country.

I have no problem with oversight of the State Police. I have no problem with the State Police being asked to continually review policies and training to keep them in step with the wishes of the community to respect and defend the lives and property of all members and guests of the Commonwealth. But I urge you to take a measured, careful approach with S2800 and to not kick the legs out from under your police officers doing their best to keep our communities safe.

I have read Senator Hinds' explanation of the history and purpose of the bill and what he believes it will and will not accomplish. I have also watched Senator Brownsbergers' Zoom presentation of the bill to his constituents. Overall, I find this proposed bill fairly well balanced and the expectations and requirements it puts on police officers understandable and reasonable (with many already effectively in place with most of the agencies I am familiar). My greatest concern is how the proposed POSAC and the 'tweaking' of qualified immunity will in reality affect the day to day work of officers. Despite your best intentions, these two portions of the bill will result in increased hindsight analysis of the reactions and decisions of police officers during charged, volatile situations and, almost certainly, increased litigation.

Thank you for hearing me out and considering what I have to say.

-- Tom Bakey
PO Box 458, Ashfield, MA 01330
(413) 320-9975

From: Linda Preston <ljpreston7@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:08 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Vote NO 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: John Miceli <miceli.john@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:07 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S.2800

It is with great sadness that I write this letter to you. In my 70 years, I have never written a letter to the House or any political organization asking for consideration for a Bill/Law. Unfortunately, with our state and country being torn apart from within I must know not just my feelings but the feelings of the thousands who have remained silent while all this turmoil has played out over the last couple of months.

The efforts of a very vocal and sometimes violent movement are looking to dismantle our local police departments and force their socialist views on all of us. My grandparents came to this country to escape the violence that we are now seeing on our streets because we were a country of law and order. More recently, I don't have to look further than my daughter in law who came here from El Salvadore to escape the violence there. She sums it up best by saying "I love this country, people don't understand how bad it can get if you don't have the police to protect you." PLEASE, don't condemn all the police for the sins of a few. A great majority of the police work hard to keep you and me safe and are as mad as the protesters that one of their own would take away someone's rights and life.

I am asking that the House delay any vote on Bill S.2800 for at least six months so we can all take a hard look at the impact of the bill and truly see what the impact would be to our society. This Bill as any major decision in our life must not be passed hastily without proper thought and input from ALL.

PLEASE, consider a six month delay to allow proper discussion by all on this bill.

Sincerely,
John Miceli
192 Mill Street
Burlington, MA 01803
miceli.john@gmail.com

From: jerkbait@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:07 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill S2820

Dear Chair Aaron Michlewitz and Chair Claire Cronin,

I ask that you support amendments 114,116,126,134,129, and137 to the Senate Bill S2820. The amendments deal with due process and fair representation on the board as well as uniform accreditation standards. I support enhanced training and appropriate certification standards and policies that promote fair and unbiased treatment of all citizens, INCLUDING POLICE OFFICERS. The original version of the bill undercuts collective bargaining rights and due process. These amendments are an attempt to improve the bill in these areas. They do not lessen the training protocols and standards or general accountability for law enforcement as originally proposed. Thank you for your time and consideration.

These are the important points that I would really like to highlight and bring to everyone's attention:

1. The senate version will seriously undermine public safety. The false narrative that QI prevents the public from suing Pos and holding them accountable which dominated the senate debate masked provisions in the bill which will have a serious impact on critical public safety issues. Not only will the unintended and unnecessary changes to QI hamstring police offices in the course of their duties due t the fact that they will be subjected to numerous frivolous nuisance suits for any of their actions but hidden in the bill are various provisions which will protect drug dealers, human traffickers, gang activity in minority neighborhood schools ,organized retail theft and terrorists.

2. The process employed by the senate of using an omnibus bill with numerous, diverse and complicated policy issues coupled with limited public and professional participation was undemocratic, flawed and totally non transparent. The original version of the bill was over 70 pages, had hundreds of changes to public safety sections of the general laws and sound public policy sections ,it was sent to the floor with no hearing and less than a couple of days for the members to digest/caucus and receive public comment thus creating a process which was a sham.

3. Police support uniform statewide training standards and policies as well as an appropriate regulatory board which is fair and unbiased. The senate created a board that is dominated by groups who have stated anti law enforcement biases and preconceived punitive motives toward police. The board as proposed is unlike any other of the 160 professional regulatory boards in the Commonwealth that the Black and Latino Caucus and its individual members as well as the Governor repeatedly and publicly stated should be used as the example of the model o be use. Its composition is fundamentally incapable of providing regulatory due process. Furthermore, the proposed members are completely devoid of sufficient experience in law enforcement to create training policies and standards unlike members of the other 160 professional boards.

4. Qualified Immunity is unnecessary if the Legislature adopts uniform statewide standards and bans unlawful use of force techniques which all police personnel unequivocally support. Once we have uniform standards and policies and the statutory banning of use of force techniques both the officers and the individual citizens will know what is reasonable and have a clear picture of what conduct is a violation of a citizen's rights and that conduct cannot be protected by QI. This will also limit the potential explosion of civil suits against other public employee groups Thus reducing costs that would otherwise go through the roof and potentially have a devastating impact on municipal and agency budgets. Police officers are already subjected to suits and suits that are successful when their conduct warrants it. There is no legitimate need to change the law particularly when we get uniform standards

Sincerely,

Matthew McCabe
22 Hollywood Drive
Charlton, MA 01507

774-230-0919

From: Diana <naomimoon@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:07 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform legislation

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

Hello, my name is Diana H Perretta with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 275 Main St., Apt. 401, Watertown, MA 02472. 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.

Diana H Perretta
dnhrstn@yahoo.com
781-290-8596
275 Main St., Watertown, MA 02472

??????
From: Adam Hakkarainen <adamhakkarainen@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:07 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

My name is Adam Hakkarainen and I live at 73 North Road in Chesterfield. I have been a police officer for 27 years. As a constituent, I write to

express my opposition to Senate Bill 2820. This legislation is detrimental to police 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. In contrast, I am dismayed in the hastiness that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public. In fact, I believe it does a grave disservice to our citizens by limiting input from the public. We will all have to live with whatever bill becomes law. There are consequences, good and bad to every piece of legislation. Without public comment and input, and the input from our stakeholders, and those whom understand the problems of criminal justice the best, the consequences are unknown and untested. With such important endeavors such as criminal justice reform, we must get it right.

Qualified Immunity: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

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

I am asking you to stop and think about the rush to reform policing in such haste. Our law enforcement officers are some of the best and well-trained officers anywhere. Although we are not opposed to getting better, it should be done with dignity and respect for the men and women who serve the Commonwealth. I ask that you think about the law enforcement officer you need to keep your streets safe from violence, and don't dismantle proven community policing practices. I'm asking for your support and ensuring that whatever reform is passed that you do it responsibly. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Adam Hakkarainen

From: Lisa R. Benson <lisarbenson@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:06 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Please Pass a strong version of S2820!

I am writing to ask you to please pass a strong version of S2820. I have lived in Waltham for the past 5 years and am raising my family here. We

are a white family living in a diverse Multi-racial community. As a mother I appreciate help and safety that local police departments provide the community. For example, I recently heard a loud noise on my block and a Waltham police officer came out immediately to investigate upon my phone call. However, for far too long, there has been legislation passed that has changed policing so that it is much more aggressive, more detrimental to our communities, and completely inequitable. As my daughter is growing up, I fear for the lives of her black friends and no one should have to feel this way. Supporting this bill does not mean that I think police officers are bad people. It means the system and structures in place are inequitable and they need to change. Now.

I'm writing to ask you to please support prohibiting violent police tactics -- this includes ANY choke holds that could come close to injuring a person! These have no place in our community, especially since implicit bias exists; racism exists. We, as white people, are all racist because we are part of a racist system. It doesn't mean we are bad people. It means that it is OUR JOB to strive to be antiracist and to find all the ways in which we can consistently fight racism day to day to create a more just and equal society. That includes not harming or killing community members, especially when a disproportionate number of individuals stopped by police are people of color.

I also ask that you impose meaningful restrictions on qualified immunity. Police officers need to be held accountable for their actions. Maybe if police officers are held accountable, more police officers will make a greater effort to strive to be antiracist and the amount of tragic deaths, injuries, and violence at the hands of police officers will be diminished. As a member of the diverse Waltham community, I am on my own journey of becoming antiracist and I strongly believe that if I do not fight to be antiracist (through educating myself about race, racism, whiteness, and my personal biases, decolonizing my curriculum, using culturally responsive teaching methods, analyzing and changing racist policies in my district, etc), I am not doing what’s right. Police officers should be learning how to be antiracist in their profession as well - in their preparation would be best!

Finally, please support a BAN on the use of dangerous and discriminatory facial recognition technology. This technology is not valid and has been proven to make policing even more racist than it already is.

I am a mom, a wife, and a resident of Waltham. I know many of my neighbors support these same ideas. You are in a unique position to fight for antiracist policies - I am doing my part by sharing my opinions with you, but I cannot vote to change the law. Please do your job and fight for anti-racist polices; fight for our community.

Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Lisa Benson

From: Jessica Parlon <jparlon@me.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:06 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Statement against S2820 as presented

To: The Chair of the House Committee on Ways and Means, Rep. Aaron Michlewitz, in cooperation with Rep. Claire Cronin, Chair of the Joint Committee on the Judiciary

I am writing to state I am against S2820 as presented.

The senate version of this bill as written will seriously undermine public safety by limiting police officer’s ability to do their jobs while simultaneously allowing provisions to protect criminals. Furthermore, the process employed by the Senate to push this through with such haste without public hearing or input of any kind was extremely undemocratic and nontransparent.

Police across the commonwealth support uniform training standards and policies and have been requesting more training for years

The Senate version of a regulatory board is unacceptable as it strips officers of the due process rights and does away with protections currently set forth in collective bargaining agreements and civil service law. The Senate created a board that is dominated by anti-police groups who have a long-detailed record of biases against law enforcement and preconceived punitive motives toward police. A bill that does not include the same procedural justice safeguards members of the communities we serve demand and enjoy will not be supported.

The proposed makeup of the oversight board is one sided and biased against law enforcement. It is unlike any of the 160 other regulatory boards across the Commonwealth and as constructed incapable if being fair and impartial.

What the Senate has tried to do is pass a knee jerk reaction to an incident which occurred half a country away that everyone agrees was egregious.

Massachusetts police officers are among the highest educated and trained in the country.

This bill directly attacks qualified immunity and due process. Qualified immunity does not protect bad officers, it protects good officers from civil lawsuits. We should want our officers to be able to act to protect our communities without fear of being sued at every turn, otherwise why would they put themselves at risk? A large majority of law enforcement officers do the right thing and are good officers, yet there is a real push to end qualified immunity to open good officers up to frivolous lawsuits because of the actions of a few who, by their own actions, would not be covered by qualified immunity anyway. It just doesn’t make any sense why we are endangering the livelihood of many for the actions of a few.

Changes to qualified immunity would be unnecessary if the legislature adopted a uniform statewide standard and bans unlawful use of force techniques which all police personnel unequivocally support.

If the senate bill is passed in its current form, the costs to municipalities and the State will skyrocket from frivolous lawsuits and potentially having a devastating impact on budgets statewide.

Again, I reiterate that you consider voting against S2820 as presented.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jessica Parlon

43 Bird Street

Quincy, MA

From: Sue Cunningham <suebee1710@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:06 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: Jim <jimatsoc@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:06 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,

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sean McKiernan <smckiernan819@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:04 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2820

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,

Sean P. McKiernan

Worcester

smckiernan819@holdenma.gov

From: Pauline <paulineoleary@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:04 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2820 Against

I am AGAINST Bill S2820 to reform police standards.
Please do not pass this bill.

Pauline Oleary
Constituent
617-694-9716

Sent from my iPad
From: Susan <poisonsuemac9@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:04 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill S2820

Dear Chair Aaron Michlewitz and Chair Claire Cronin,

I ask that you support amendments 114,116,126,134,129, and137 to the Senate Bill S2820. The amendments deal with due process and fair representation on the board as well as uniform accreditation standards. I support enhanced training and appropriate certification standards and policies that promote fair and unbiased treatment of all citizens, INCLUDING POLICE OFFICERS. The original version of the bill undercuts collective bargaining rights and due process. These amendments are an attempt to improve the bill in these areas. They do not lessen the training protocols and standards or general accountability for law enforcement as originally proposed. Thank you for your time and consideration.

These are the important points that I would really like to highlight and bring to everyone's attention:

1. The senate version will seriously undermine public safety. The false narrative that QI prevents the public from suing Pos and holding them accountable which dominated the senate debate masked provisions in the bill which will have a serious impact on critical public safety issues. Not only will the unintended and unnecessary changes to QI hamstring police offices in the course of their duties due t the fact that they will be subjected to numerous frivolous nuisance suits for any of their actions but hidden in the bill are various provisions which will protect drug dealers, human traffickers, gang activity in minority neighborhood schools ,organized retail theft and terrorists.

2. The process employed by the senate of using an omnibus bill with numerous, diverse and complicated policy issues coupled with limited public and professional participation was undemocratic, flawed and totally non transparent. The original version of the bill was over 70 pages, had hundreds of changes to public safety sections of the general laws and sound public policy sections ,it was sent to the floor with no hearing and less than a couple of days for the members to digest/caucus and receive public comment thus creating a process which was a sham.

3. Police support uniform statewide training standards and policies as well as an appropriate regulatory board which is fair and unbiased. The senate created a board that is dominated by groups who have stated anti law enforcement biases and preconceived punitive motives toward police.

The board as proposed is unlike any other of the 160 professional regulatory boards in the Commonwealth that the Black and Latino Caucus and its individual members as well as the Governor repeatedly and publicly stated should be used as the example of the model o be use. Its composition is fundamentally incapable of providing regulatory due process. Furthermore, the proposed members are completely devoid of sufficient experience in law enforcement to create training policies and standards unlike members of the other 160 professional boards.

4. Qualified Immunity is unnecessary if the Legislature adopts uniform statewide standards and bans unlawful use of force techniques which all police personnel unequivocally support. Once we have uniform standards and policies and the statutory banning of use of force techniques both the officers and the individual citizens will know what is reasonable and have a clear picture of what conduct is a violation of a citizen's rights and that conduct cannot be protected by QI. This will also limit the potential explosion of civil suits against other public employee groups Thus reducing costs that would otherwise go through the roof and potentially have a devastating impact on municipal and agency budgets. Police officers are already subjected to suits and suits that are successful when their conduct warrants it. There is no legitimate need to change the law particularly when we get uniform standards

Sincerely,

Susan Pulcini
Resident
137 Spring Lane
Canton, MA 02021
781-883-5859
From: James D. Payne <jdpayne@norwoodma.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:04 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S2820

Too whom it may concern,

I have been a police officer since 2006 and have worked in the State of New Hampshire and the Commonwealth of Massachusetts as police officer. I am currently employed as a Sergeant with the Norwood Police Department. I am born and raised in Massachusetts and I attended Westfield State University (College when I was there) in order to receive my Bachelor's Degree in Criminal Justice. I am a second generation officer as my father before me was employed with the Norwood Police Department as well as my step-mother. In order to pursue the career that I had envisioned since childhood I needed to leave Massachusetts and join the Derry, NH Police Department due to budget/hiring shortage in Massachusetts at the time. However, I was afforded the opportunity to return to Massachusetts and I gladly accepted.

I am deeply concerned at the pace and speed that Bill S2820 is attempting to be passed. I am also very concerned as to some of the contents of the bill. I ask that you all please take into consideration the men and women

that thanklessly protect the citizens of Massachusetts without hesitation each and every day. I also ask that the bill be reviewed and studied as others are and with an appropriate time frame. Please do not just pass this bill as a result of emotion, please utilize logic and strategy while reviewing the bill.

I am the patrol sergeant for the 4pm-12am shift at the Norwood Police Department and I supervise several of the departments younger officers. The training that the men and women of the Norwood Police Department is phenomenal and it is shown in the work and the care and compassion that each officer displays towards their profession and the citizens they serve. I would be lying if I said that the officers are not concerned with this bill and the possible outcome and repercussions of it. The morale of the officers as well as morale of officers across the Commonwealth unfortunately is at an all time low. No good Officer, or person for that matter, condones or even comes close to seeing the actions by the horrendous human being in the George Floyd case as appropriate or justified. We are all disgusted by the actions.

I have concerns with the bill S2820 as many officers do, however I do agree with some of the issues that the bill addresses.

I am in agreement that it would be beneficial for the Commonwealth of Massachusetts to adopted universal standards and training for the entire state. As many states already do this it would ensure across the state that officers are receiving the correct and appropriate training.

However, I am concerned with the issue of adjusting/changing the qualified immunity of an officer. Qualified immunity does not protect bad officers nor do I want it to. It works to protect an officer that acts in good faith and as a result of their actions/enforcement an individual attempts to hold them civilly liable. It DOES NOT protect officers that act outside the confines of the law...nor should it.

Also of concern is the establishment of a disciplinary review board to review potential police misconduct. The idea of the board is not my concern and any good cop agrees with it. The requested make up of the board is my concern. At this time the bill suggests that the board be made of a majority of civilians that have no experience in law enforcement and the law enforcement professionals are the minority in of the board. As with other review boards, such as the bar association reviews and medical review boards the boards consist of attorneys and medical professionals. Why I ask then are police officers careers possibly in review by a majority of people that have no idea about the law enforcement profession?

Another concern is the issue that officers that conduct a stop and frisk even during a consensual manner must be required to issue a receipt. First off the term “stop and frisk” indicates that randomly an individual is stopped and automatically frisked for no reason by an officer. This practice is forbidden in Massachusetts and as many other officers I know not at all practiced. Many times this occurs because officers are called to the area for suspicious activity and an individual, described by a calling party, matches the description and the involvement of a weapon is either described or made known to the officer based on indicators. The

fact that an officer must issue a receipt for instances like this is absurd and in fact places an officer safety and life at risk.

I am proud to serve the Town of Norwood in my capacity of a Sergeant and I will continue to do so. However, I am concerned with the speed that this bill is attempted to be passed and implore you to please properly review, conduct research, and accept some of the suggestions from the law enforcement field in adopting this bill.

Respectfully submitted,

Sergeant James Payne Jr
Norwood Police Department

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Brian Gerardi <bgerardi1433@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:04 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform bill

Good morning,
I am writing this email to voice my opposition and displeasure with the recently passed police reform bill in the senate. I am a current law enforcement officer with 16 years experience and I find this bill to be extremely anti labor/anti union. Further it tramples on collective bargaining rights. I plead with you to examine these parts of the bill before passing it. I truly believe there can be policing reforms without throwing out these rights we have fought hard for and give us the protection we need to do our jobs effectively. Thank you for you time.

Respectfully
Brian Gerardi
Shrewsbury, MA and Worcester PD (proudly)

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: jlqqk2003@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:04 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: 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.

Thank you,

Joshua Look

3 Lancaster Ln

Bourne, Ma 02532

Josh.look@comcast.net

From: Aimee Binette <islandgirl810@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:04 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Fwd: Police legislation

Subject: Police legislation

?I am the wife of a police officer who has served our city with dignity and an oath that he serve his community and the citizens in it. For 26 yrs . During his career I have been in awe of how he and his fellow officers can see humanity at its worst on the calls he has had to respond to. And still see good in this world. Let me ask you a question Have any of you ever sat down and listened To any officer say what they have to endure on a regular basis. Or even in their career. It is not pretty they see ugliness so often. And right now it is horrific what is happen to law enforcement by our elected officials.

As a wife of a police officer let me tell you what it is like for the family of these officers. I kiss my husband goodbye before he leaves for work not knowing if I will get a call that he is injured or has been killed . I am on edge until he is safely at home. An FYI I have gotten 5 calls that he was injured and was at hospital !!! One incident he had to be out of work for a year!!! He has been spit on not knowing if the criminal had a disease that could be transmitted thus bringing it home to us! He has seen so much hate and death caused by criminals!!! It is amazing he still sees the human race as good.. and he does he does not group all people in one category he sees the individual. He has helped so many that were on a path to destruction find a way out of it by taking a chance on the person. He uses every tool he can to assist a person if they need help.

I can only imagine how it feels to him to put on a uniform to protect and serve, something he has been proud to do only to see a false police narrative play out all over. It is disgusting to watch this legislation that is proposed!! Shame on you for trying To slide this pass. With no real talk on issues. It is a sad day that you are making a respectful job(duty) as a police officer into a disrespected profession.

I told my husband if this bill is passed to look into retirement because it will be a cold day in hell before a criminal has more rights then he does. And I have no faith in a fair panel of anyone to decide my husbands fate in his job. When the rhetoric is so anti police it is shameful.

If you want to be productive then how about looking into ways to assist law enforcement and support them and not tear them down for protecting us. There truly is a thin line between peace and anarchy and we are seeing it played out in communities that have already belittled and dismissed law enforcement.

Can we please be better than that.

Sincerely

Aimee Binette

Sent from my iPhone

From: Samara Gross man <novelunknown@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:04 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony

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

My name is Samara Grossman I am a resident of Boston 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 want to live in MA assured that my neighbors and myself are not going to be intimidated, hurt or killed by police. I want to live in my community assured that we have the funds to promote health, enjoyment, employment for everyone, not just the most privileged. Redirecting funds from police will assist in this. I was shocked when I learned the proportion of funds channeled to police.

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

Samara Grossman

28 Forbes St

Boston MA 02139

Sent from my iPhone
From: Cathy W <cathylwaldman@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:03 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Cathy Waldman
Subject: Please pass police reform

Hello, my name is Cathy Waldman with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 13 Old Colony Lane, Arlington,

Massachusetts. 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.

Cathy L. Waldman

cathylwaldman@gmail.com

617-595-0540

13 Old Colony Ln, Arlington, MA 02476

From: Tracy Williams <tm13084@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:03 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); tracy williams; Ehrlich, Lori - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: Fw: S.2820 Swampscott

Dear Representative Ehrlich,

As your constituent from Swampscott, 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.

My son is a MSP Officer and we are very concerned about these Bills being passed with expediency. The Police in Massachusetts have done nothing wrong, and are being punished for what others, and another State did, very unfair.

Thank you,

Tracy Kennedy
3 Galloupes Terrace
Swampscott, MA 01907
tm13084@yahoo.com
781-771-4433 C

From: Amaral, Rick <RAmaral@JORDANS.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:03 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: In reference to Passed 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.

Thank you,

Ricky Amaral

663 Wareham St unit 7

Middleboro MA

From: Joanie Weaver <weaver.joanie@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:03 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Support for Bill S.2800

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

I'm writing in to voice my support for S.2820, to bring badly needed reform to our criminal justice system.

I also wanted to advocate my support for these additional measures that the final bill should include:

* language about raising the age on the juvenile justice system so that young people ages 18-20 can be moved out of the adult justice system and into the more developmentally appropriate juvenile system
* eliminate qualified immunity (to hold public employees accountable for illegal and unconstitutional offenses)
* introduce strong standards for decertifying problem officers
* completely ban tear gas, chokeholds, and no knock raids like the one that killed Breonna Taylor

Joan Weaver
59 Elm St
Somerville, MA
From: Ariel Schwartz <ariel.schwartz31@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:02 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform

To: Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Chairperson, House Committee on Ways and Means

Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Hello, my name is Ariel Schwartz with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 20 Tufts St, Arlington, MA. 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.

Ariel Schwartz

ariel.schwartz31@gmail.com

From: Kaye Ingalsbe <kayeingalsbe@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:03 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S2820

Hello,

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,

Kaye Ingalsbe

21 Smallwood Street <x-apple-data-detectors://1/0>

Indian Orchard, MA 01151 <x-apple-data-detectors://1/0>

Kayeingalsbe@gmail.com

From: Erica Vozzella <egvozzella@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:03 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform bill

I am writing this email because as a resident of Massachusetts, I am strongly against the passing of the police reform bill as it is currently written. This bill will greatly affect how police respond to calls due to qualified immunity possibly being taken away. How an officer is able to do their job will ultimately affect the residents of Massachusetts. I hope that you will consider not passing this bill which will only hurt us the people.
From: Ed Brunton <eddiebrunton@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:02 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,

Edward Brunton

21 Smallwood St Springfield, Ma

eddiebrunton@gmail.com

From: Pierce VanDunk <vandunkp@bu.edu>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:01 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Correctional Chaplain in Favor of the Reform, Shift, Build Act

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

My name is Pastor Pierce VanDunk, and I am the Religious Services Coordinator at the Middlesex House of Correction in Billerica, MA (I speak only for myself, not on behalf of the Sheriff's Office).

I am in favor of S.2820, and I encourage you to pass this bill into law swiftly. It will be beneficial to our communities to implement things like banning chokeholds and limiting teargas use, the duty to intervene, and expanding training for deescalation and racial justice.

I also agree with limiting qualified immunity to NOT include officers who break the law or operate completely outside of their training.

I DISAGREE, though, with those who call for banning qualified immunity entirely. In my experience in correctional chaplaincy, there are inmates (and I presume people in the community as well) who intentionally cause problems and provoke officers in an attempt to create a situation where they can file and win lawsuits--some falsify information and twist details to try and win money. In situations like these, law officers who follow the law and their training (but may have the details twisted against them in court) should not have their assets and families at risk. If there is not already, the bill should have a provision that clearly addresses the issue of people trying to create a situation where they can sue, requiring courts to pay special attention to the possibility that the claimant is disingenuous.

Thank you,
Pastor Pierce VanDunk
Chaplain, Middlesex HOC
Antioch Community Church, Waltham
Resident, Lowell
From: Cara Hart <cara.hart5@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:02 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Written Testimony

Dear Senator Julian Cyr,

My name is Cara Giuca and I live at 3 Delancy Drive, Plymouth,MA. As your constituent, I write to you today to express 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.

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. Let me remind you that in 2015 President Obama recognized the Boston Police Department as one of the best in the nation at community policing. 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.

Sincerely,

Cara Giuca

From: Alexandra Sweet <alexandra.b.sweet@gmail.com>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:02 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Lovely, Joan B. (SEN)
Subject: Support for Law Enforcement

Good morning,

As your loyal constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the recently passed S.2820. I implore you to take a moment and consider these following notes.

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.

My husband has been a Massachusetts State Trooper for almost 15 years now. This is something that has significant meaning to me and our family.

Thank you,

Alexandra Sweet

55 Endicott St, Danvers, MA 01923 <x-apple-data-detectors://1/1>

978.473.3962

Sent from my iPhone
From: Noelle Stork <noelle1015@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:01 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: A Mother's Cry Against the Current Proposed Changes to S2820

Good morning,

My name is Noelle Stork. I have been an employee of the Commonwealth of MA for the last 12+ years. Prior to that, I worked with the Middleboro Police Department as an Administrative Assistance. My husband is a Detective

Lieutenant with the Middleboro Police Department. He is also a Veteran of the United States of America. Our family had dedicated years of service to our local communities, the Commonwealth of MA, and the United States as a whole. We are in desperate need of your support. I thank you in advance for reading and considering my message here.

The proposed changes to S2820 are going to suppress police, and other professions, from doing their jobs. It is going to make ALL people less safe. As you know, qualified Immunity does not apply if you knowingly break the law. It protects public servants that act in good faith while doing their jobs. Why in the world would we take that away? MA has had one unarmed Police death in the last 5 years. One - and not that it matters, but that man was white. This legislature is not going to fix anything in MA. In fact, it is going to make things much worse. It will result in a lot of professions hesitating to do their job.

I am the mother of three little girls. They are ages 6, 3, and 1. How will I ever explain to them that we have lost our home because of a frivolous lawsuit against their Daddy? How will I ever explain to them that Daddy isn't coming home because he hesitated to protect himself? (Michael Chesna) How will my husband ever look us in the eye knowing he hesitated to help someone on the job due to fear?

Please don't leave us in the dust. The proposed changes to S2820 will do just that. Please protect our family the way my husband has been protecting others for the last 18+ years of his life.

Respectfully,

Noelle Stork
Marion, MA
(774) 263-0659
From: Kathy Laskowski <kathy.laskowski@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:00 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Support of S.2820

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

I'm writing in favor of S.2820 to bring needed reform to our criminal justice system. I urge you to work 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.

Qualified Immunity for police officers is directly linked to the unaccountability that allowed slaveholders to murder black men with

impunity. In Frederick Douglass's 1892 autobiography "The Life and Times of Frederick Douglass", he described the situation thusly:

"While I heard of numerous murders committed by slaveholders on the Eastern Shore of Maryland, I never knew a solitary instance where a slaveholder was either hung or imprisoned for having murdered a slave. The usual pretext for such crimes was that the slave had offered resistance. Should a slave, when assaulted, but raise his hand in self-defense, the white assaulting party was fully justified by southern law and southern public opinion in shooting the slave down, and for this there was no redress."

Substitute "slaveholder" with "police officer" and "slave" with "black man". This issue of white, authoritarian dominion over Blacks runs deep in the collective unconscious of our society. It's time for us to do better. In light of the numerous murders of black men that the nation has witnessed with our own eyes at the hands of the police, there MUST be accountability. We cannot sit idly by and allow this unchecked violence against Blacks to continue.

Thank you for your consideration,
Kathleen Laskowski
25 Tuckernuck Avenue
PO Box 156
Oak Bluffs, MA 02557
610-389-1405

From: William Enright <wenright@napd.us>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:49 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2820 Testimony

Hello my name is William Enright,

I am a police officer for the town of North Andover, Massachusetts. I have been working as a police Officer for 5 years , been though 2 academies (MLETA and the NECC Police Academy), and obtained hundreds of hours of training on a variety of aspects to policing. I have worked patrol and am now the School Resource Officer at North Andover High School. After reading the purposed bill I feel that aspects of the bill will effectively destroy municipal policing, cost millions of dollars to local governments and innocent individuals in civil law suits, and cause mass retirement from the field with very little incentive to draw high quality candidates. This will not only hurt police officers but in turn crime will rise and low income areas which tend to be majorly minority in Massachusetts will be hit the hardest effectively hurting the demographic of people this bill is designed to protect.

Section 10 (qualified immunity) need to be removed. Qualified immunity does not protect police that have operated outside the law, policy and procedure, or outside the scope of their training. Many myths about qualified immunity have been floating around and if the legislation would take the time to look at statistics qualified immunity has never been an

issue and has been an involving concept which protects people who have a duty to act from frivolous law suits. The language proposed to replace the already well working system is general, left open to individual interpretation , and will take a decade of case law to even have a guideline for how it can work. If section 10 is not removed from the bill you will see a civil suit happy culture which are currently targeting police flood the court system with allegations and accusations which will not only effect police officers but their innocent families, children and community. SECTION 10 is a HUGE problem and needs to be removed. Qualified Immunity has no recorded issues in Massachusetts and police officers that are breaking the law or do anything that is considered a violation of people's rights are currently liable civilly, it does not protect bad police that do bad things.

The bill also wants to institute a board that reviews police officers and decides if they can be re certified as they go though their career. This board must consist of members that have an expertise on MPTC training, law enforcement policies and procedures, and a back round in law enforcement and criminal law. All other professions that have review boards allow only experts in the field. Putting people that don't understand policing in Massachusetts at an expert level on a review board with such declared powers and influence will bring misinformed and bias guided discussions. Also the language in the bill appears to supersede unions collective bargaining agreements and essentially over power civil service. Parts of the proposed appeals process and the sharing or testimony from all process is currently written horribly and I would consider is in violation of an individuals rights to fair due process.

Insert language that we use in criminal court for this bill. Reasonable suspicion, Probable cause, beyond a reasonable doubt, (Gram vs Connor) . At certainty will an officer face civil and and criminal allegations. Nothing Is discussed.

Insert mandatory statistic keeping to the FBI data base on use of force.

Look at Massachusetts and all the accredited departments. That is the gold standard here we are doing things above and beyond what is even asked when it comes to training but how I'll this be funded. Add a section on the program that will generate this funding or mandate the state to put forth the money to get these trainings.

Thank you

All email messages and attached content sent from and to this email account are public records unless qualified as an exemption under the Massachusetts Public Records Law
<http://www.sec.state.ma.us/pre/preidx.htm> .

Visit us online at www.northandoverma.gov
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.northandoverma.gov&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=1HlH5KHjw5E1WS6NMVHJRpAsYH5KxsYz6sxzMhp_lNk&s=P6ytHqkg3Uib1vJvXDPHSaD-7DdBIZFAqzy7v7rjTHM&e=> .

From: luke stevens <lukestevens@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:00 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform Public Testimony

To: Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Chairperson, House Committee on Ways and Means

Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Hello, my name is Luke Stevens with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 82 Partridge St, Boston. 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.

Luke Stevens

lukestevens@gmail.com

617.637.0835

82 Partridge St, West Roxbury, MA 02132

From: Mary Bennett <marybennett118@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:00 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,

Mary Bennett

From: Carly Burdick <carlynburdick@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:54 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Pass a Strong Police Accountability Bill with Key Provisions from S.2820

Dear Chairs HWM & Judiciary,

I urge you to pass legislation that establishes real oversight and accountability for police.

Our law enforcement system is rife with systemic racism that manifests in poignant police murders of unarmed black people, brutality and excessive use of force, unlawful arrests, and unnecessary police contact. The House of Representatives and Senate should ultimately pass a bill that ends qualified immunity in most instances, reduces and oversees police use of force, removes police from schools, expands juvenile expungement, and establishes funds to improve re-entry from incarceration.

The shielding of law enforcement from accountability for violating people's rights through qualified immunity is unacceptable and

irresponsible. Police should be held to professionalism standards that limit misconduct similar to doctors or lawyers, who cannot commit malpractice with impunity. Additionally, we need to stop surveilling juveniles with police in schools, collect data, and let young people expunge records related to mistakes they made as a child. If we invest in communities of color and hold police accountable for their misuse of power, then we will have safer communities, less crime, and more respect for the justice system.

This is an urgent matter. Please pass a bill that includes at a minimum the provisions of the senate bill.

Sincerely,

Carly Burdick
215 Ash St Apt 4
Waltham, MA 02453
carlynburdick@gmail.com

From: Laura Foner <laura.foner@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:00 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Please support the passage of SB.2800 - public testimony

Dear Chairman Aaron Michlewitz and Co- Chair Rep. Claire Cronin:
My name is Laura Foner and I am a resident of Boston. I am submitting this virtual testimony to urge you to pass SB.2800 the Reform, Shift, Build Act in its entirety. It is th minimum and the bill must pass both houses of the MA State Legislature in its entirely.

It is past time for us to create a version of public safety for our Commonwealth which truly protects communities and prevents police abuses. This bill bans chokeholds, promotes de-escalation tactics, certifies police officers, limits qualified immunity for police to help ensure accountability, and redirects money from policing to community investment.

I urge you to ensure that all aspects of this bill are intact. This is an important historical moment that calls for bold action. We in Massachusetts can set an example of how to meet the demands of this moment.

Thank you for your consideration. Please give SB.2800 a favorable report.

Sincerely,
Laura Foner
24 Kingsboro Park
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130

From: Samantha Kain-Call <skaincall@yahoo.com>

Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 8:00 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: 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.

Thank you,

Samantha Kain-Call
42 Dell St Turners Falls Ma
Skaincall@yahoo.com
From: Alexandra Sweet <alexandra.b.sweet@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:59 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Speliotis, Theodore - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: Support for Law Enforcement

Good morning,

As your loyal constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the recently passed S.2820. I implore you to take a moment and consider these following notes.

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.

My husband has been a Massachusetts State Trooper for almost 15 years now. This is something that has significant meaning to me and our family.

Thank you,

Alexandra Sweet

55 Endicott St, Danvers, MA 01923

978.473.3962

Sent from my iPhone
From: Sarah Eknaian <sarah.eknaian@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:59 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Written Testimony SB2800

Good morning,

My name is Sarah Eknaian. I am a Massachusetts resident and a social worker in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts. I am reaching out to you in regards to SB2800.

In the wake of the tragic murder of George Floyd, our country is facing ugly truths about how racism and discrimination are embedded in us and in systems in place. It is an uncomfortable place to be in, when we face the fact that we aren't as progresive as we thought we were or how systemic oppression lingers in our society. This has been an extremely challenging time for me. I work for the Newton Police Department as a jail diversion clinician. I love my job. It is my passion and I look forward to going to work every day. My job entails co-responding with police to calls for service involving mental health crises. As a crisis clinician, I am deployed with the police as a part of compassionate justice. I work closely with the police to ensure that the residents have the most appropriate and safe outcomes on a call. I follow up with individuals that may need mental health or substance use help based on referrals by the police. My office isn't just a desk, it's a cruiser with a police officer. This job is perfect for me. I want to help and better others. Massachusetts is at the forefront of what 21st century policing should look like with embedded and trained mental health clinicians in their departments to work alongside police on calls for service.

With all this being said, it has been especially challenging seeing the policing profession demonized by the actions of some. I can't speak for the actions of every police department in the country and there is no excuse for the accounts of police brutality that continues to occur in our nation. That being said, I have been able to get to know various police officers throughout the state. Good police officers do still exist. Any officer that has allowed me to sit next to them in their cruiser or asked for my assistance on a call has been a representation of progressive policing. It is these officers, who I hear today that are downtrodden, discouraged, and feel hopeless in the face of reform, which will greatly affect how they do their jobs. It has been so difficult hearing good, proactive police officers say they regret ever becoming police officers.

While I can't say that I disagree with the entire proposed bill, what concerns me is the potential negative effects on school resource officers and qualified immunity. From the departments I work in and especially the department I work in presently, there are police officers that have a heart for the students they serve. They want to ensure kids get the best life they possibly can and want to work with them. Qualified immunity is a way to protect police from frivolous lawsuits when they are trying to do their job. I've been hearing from police that if qualified immunity is gone, they will be open to civil lawsuits if they accidentally break someone's ribs while trying to administer CPR. Does this mean police will stop performing life saving measures on calls? I've been on calls where police have had to perform these lifesaving measures and have been able to save lives. I've seen the look on family's faces as their loved one comes back to life, saving them the grief and heartache of having to lose a loved one when they could live. The thought of our police, firefighters, and EMTs not being able to save a life because of a civil suit is baffling and unacceptable.

As a social worker, it is part of my responsibility to stand up for others. I have been trying to figure out my voice when I feel I am in the middle. Black lives matter. I need to uphold the rights of black communities and work against a racist system. At the same time, the mental health of my officers is suffering greatly and I feel a responsibility to stand up for them too. I've had the pleasure of working in police departments in Massachusetts that are progressively and can be a model to policing nationwide. Part of this email is my story and I wanted to share it. I would gladly share any story or encounter I've had during my career. I hope to continue this line of work for years to come. Please consider my experience and please re-think this proposed bill. Please don't penalize hard-working men and women that stand for something larger than themselves.

Thank you for your time.

Respectfully,

Sarah Eknaian
From: Josh Dankoff <jadankoff@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:59 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony in favor of SB.2800, Reform, Shift, Build Act with important amendments

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

Please see below the message I sent to my representative this morning. I submit this as testimony in favor of SB.2800, with these important amendments.

Thank you.

Joshua Dankoff
12 Holbrook St
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130

---------- Forwarded message ---------
From: Josh Dankoff <jadankoff@gmail.com>
Date: Fri, Jul 17, 2020 at 7:56 AM
Subject: Pass SB.2800, Reform, Shift, Build Act with important amendments
To: <nika.elugardo@mahouse.gov>

Dear Rep. Elugardo,

My name is Joshua Dankoff, and I am a resident of Boston and a constituent of yours. Thank you for committing to confront racial injustice in our communities. I am writing asking you to urge the Speaker to include the below youth-focused policies in the House race equity bill. These proposals will address racial disparities in our justice system and hold law enforcement accountable when interacting with young people in our communities and in our schools:

* Require transparency and accountability by reporting race/ethnicity data at each major decision point of the juvenile justice system, as filed by Rep. Tyler (H.2141). Require law enforcement and other juvenile justice agencies to report data on young people at major decision points with the juvenile justice system to improve the state's policy and planning. For too long, we have waited for transparency <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.cfjj.org_just-2Dthe-2Dfacts&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=xtPLQgyI__m-VK2u2b-PtdQtXTp82dQTu3UqNS0vPrM&s=p95L9gs4rtFy0tqRNpaHDPAegjOvxYheenJFtDPghKo&e=> on how our legal system responds to children and youth by collecting and reporting race and ethnicity data <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.cfjj.org_data-2Dcollection&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=xtPLQgyI__m-VK2u2b-PtdQtXTp82dQTu3UqNS0vPrM&s=STIvoVnJKgqZuNEwWeYj7QRhRxs4REEoOy7l-oX7kaU&e=> to allow us to see disparities where they occur and to identify policies or practices to reduce these disparities. FACT SHEET <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.cfjj.org_s_FACT-2DSHEET-2DData-2DCollection.pdf&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=xtPLQgyI__m-VK2u2b-PtdQtXTp82dQTu3UqNS0vPrM&s=ygqzxTZ85ucgKwYNSgtdeObDGsh-4l1AGVnALWhxmcQ&e=>

* End the automatic prosecution of older teens as adults, as filed by Rep. O'Day and Rep. Khan (H.3420): Massachusetts' youth of color bear the harshest brunt of our legal system with their over-representation in the adult criminal justice system. By raising the age at which a teenager can be automatically tried as an adult, we can hold young people accountable in a more developmentally appropriate setting, giving them a better chance to succeed and turn away from offending and reduce the harms of legal system involvement all while reducing crime in our communities. FACT SHEET <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.cfjj.org_s_FACT-2DSHEET-2DRtA21-2Dwith-2Dsponsors.pdf&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=xtPLQgyI__m-VK2u2b-PtdQtXTp82dQTu3UqNS0vPrM&s=NPfqpzsBogHOlk6eBQBu9_EKobXs8pQ70t7N_G6O1iU&e=>

* Expand eligibility for expungement to rectify the collateral consequences of the over-policing and criminalization of communities of color, as filed by Rep. Decker and Rep. Khan (H1386) and as passed in S.2800: There is overwhelming evidence <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.washingtonpost.com_graphics_2020_opinions_systemic-2Dracism-

2Dpolice-2Devidence-2Dcriminal-2Djustice-2Dsystem_-23School&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=xtPLQgyI__m-VK2u2b-PtdQtXTp82dQTu3UqNS0vPrM&s=UkycEavMSrmMMQf22uQggEZ-1QZI5DZ08O65T_uB3HU&e=> that racial disparities against Black individuals at every stage of the legal system - from policing and profiling, court proceedings to sentencing and every stage in between. Expungement is an important tool to rectify the over-policing and disparate treatment of people of color be expanding. The current law limits does not distinguish if a case ended in a conviction or a dismissal. We ask that eligibility is modified so that (1) all non-convictions are eligible for expungement; (2) change the limitation on the number of cases on a record, to length of time since last conviction (3 years for misdemeanors and years for felonies); and (3) limit the list of offenses ineligible for expungement to only those resulting a felony conviction. FACT SHEET <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.expungema.org_s_FACT-2DSHEET-2DExpungement-2Dv2-2Dwith-2DSponsors.pdf&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=xtPLQgyI__m-VK2u2b-PtdQtXTp82dQTu3UqNS0vPrM&s=4GIc19QMsnZ2qwGA0T9qhifLjHdN5v-WlAsRAeJLUs0&e=>

* End the surveillance and profiling of students in schools as amended in S.2800 Section 49 by prohibiting school police from sharing student information they gather through their interactions with students with the Boston Regional Intelligence Center (BRIC) and the Commonwealth Fusion Centers that are accessed by local, state and federal law enforcement. FACT SHEET <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__docs.google.com_document_d_1YmlnfAJUax0GO3Qo05Ch4IUiBYbVb2q1fUC1v4WF0EM_edit-3Fusp-3Dsharing&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=xtPLQgyI__m-VK2u2b-PtdQtXTp82dQTu3UqNS0vPrM&s=E0DHvU5SSfE9gBwbWcHFrOmfhTakvNkQFrxJWYfQr80&e=>

* Prohibit law enforcement restraints of minor children in a prone or hog-tie position and require that de-escalation techniques are developmentally appropriate and require that law enforcement consider calling parents/guardians to de-escalate a situation with a child. Some of these provisions passed in S.2800 amendment 41.

* National and local studies have overwhelmingly shown that Black and Latinx students are significantly more likely to be suspended, expelled, and arrested in school than their white peers. Repeal the state mandate that every school district be assigned at least one school resource officer; require school committee approval by public vote for assigning SROs; require that law enforcement officers be stationed in a police station and on-call for schools, rather than being stationed on school property; and mandate that school districts and police departments comply with the reporting requirements of school-based arrests to qualify to have an SRO. These provisions passed in S.2800 amendments 25 and 80.

This is such an important bill as it 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.

Thank you and I look forward to hearing back from about your position on these priorities.

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

Sincerely,

Joshua Dankoff
12 Holbrook St
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130

--

Joshua Dankoff
jadankoff@gmail.com
@joshdankoff <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__twitter.com_joshdankoff&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=xtPLQgyI__m-VK2u2b-PtdQtXTp82dQTu3UqNS0vPrM&s=DUt867fctZBF0-kWNkmky8d15_cezSJT8IHo9h-Ub9c&e=>
+1.617.396.1889

+1.312.608.8871

From: Michael Kenney <MGKenney@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:59 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony

Whom it may concern,

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,

Michael Kenney
28 Cooper Ln
MGKenney@comcast.net
From: Sean Hussey <hussey976@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:59 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: No on 2800

My name is Sean Hussey and I am a Police Officer with the Malden Police Department. I ask that you do not support bill S.2800.

This bill will eliminate collective bargaining for police officers. This is detrimental to our ability to negotiate a fair contract with municipalities. As a member of our union executive board, I have worked hard to represent the men and women of the Malden Police Patrolmen's Association in seeking fair contracts with the city. This bill would put us at the mercy of the city and ultimately lead to unfair working conditions.

This bill also removes due process for police officers. This would result in officers being handled unfairly. No other profession in the world is as publicly and harshly judged after the fact than police work. Everyone makes immediate judgements on police incidents with little to no information. Due process ensures officers get a fair chance to

defend their actions. This process does not protect bad officers but does protect good ones.

Most importantly, this bill would eliminate qualified immunity for police officers. I truly believe this will be a huge mistake. This absolutely WILL lead to frivolous lawsuits brought against police officers personally. Political activists will be chomping at the bit to sue officers personally at absolutely no cost to them but at an out of pocket expense to officers and their families. I have a family to support and the way I support it is by going to work every day to protect the life and property of the citizens of Malden. I would love to continue to do that for the rest of my career. If this bill passes and eliminates qualified immunity, the job no longer becomes financially feasible. I can not expose my family to the financial burdens that will come along with performing my basic job functions.

Police departments have been struggling more and more each year to find quality candidates. I can only imagine this is going to force even more desirable candidates into other fields. Once the good, professional officers are gone, who is going to be left to handle the true criminal element that does exist in society? Less qualified, bottom of the barrel candidates are going to lead to more problems. Less qualified officers are going to make bigger mistakes.

While watching the senate hearings, it was mentioned several times that they needed to make what happened to George Floyd illegal here in Massachusetts. What happened to George Floyd is illegal in Massachusetts and every other state in the country. Just like all lawmakers are not held accountable when one lawmaker commits a crime, I would hope you would not hold law enforcement accountable for the criminal behavior of one officer.

I ask that you support the great men and women in Massachusetts that go to work every day to protect perfect strangers and have done so for years. Please look at facts here in Massachusetts and do not overreact to the actions of one officer in Minnesota. Please consider the true long lasting impacts of this bill down the road once the public pressure relents. We already seeing the results of officers afraid to do their job. Violent crime is already starting to rise. Please keep this in mind as you consider this bill.

Thank you,
Sean Hussey
781-520-1195From:joseph clark <jmclark0491@icloud.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:59 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform bill. I don’t want our lawmakers to react to mob rule. George Floyd death was horrible. I don’t know anyone defending it. The out of control mob actions turned a protest into a sad reason to turn against police and our way of life. Some c...

Sent from my iPhone

From: Steve Schnapp <schnappintosh@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:57 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony on Senate Bill 2820

Dear Rep. Cronin and Rep. Michlewitz,

I am writing with great urgency to express support for S.2820, the Senate's police reform bill. It is critical that the House enact a similar bill as soon as possible, and then get it through a conference committee, and on Governor Baker's desk, by the end of July.

I also want to call attention to the Senate bill's approach to:
• the creation of a state-wide certification board and state-wide training standards,
• limits on the use of force,
• the duty to intervene if an officer witnesses misconduct by another officer,
• a ban on racial profiling and mandating the collection of racial data for police stops,
• requiring civilian approval for the purchase of military equipment,
• the prohibition of nondisclosure agreements in police misconduct cases,
• allowing the Governor to select a colonel from outside the state police force, and
• all of the provisions requested by the Black and Latino Legislative Caucus.

I am also in favor of allowing local Superintendents of Schools, not a state mandate, to decide whether police officers (school resource officers) are helpful in their own schools. This is exactly what we in Medford are in the process of doing and all municipalities should be able to make this decision for themselves.

I also support the Senate bill's small modifications to qualified immunity for police officers. Under this bill, police officers would continue to have qualified immunity if they act in a reasonable way, and they would continue to be financially indemnified by the tax-payers in their municipalities. Police officers should not, however, be immune to prosecution if they engage in egregious misconduct, even if case law has not previously established that this particular form of misconduct is egregious.

Again, it is most importantly that a good police reform bill be enacted by the end of July. Thank you for your attention to this important priority.

Steve Schnapp
36 Hillside Ave.
Medford, MA 02155
617-999-0433 (cell)
From: Jeff <jconnolly17@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:57 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: S.2820

?

?
?
?
? Dear Representative Cutler,

My name is Jeffrey Connolly and I live in your district at 30 Driftwood Drive, Duxbury and I am a huge fan of those who protect and serve our community. As you consider legislation that affects police officers and their safety, and thus the safety of our entire community, please understand that protection and preservation of due process and qualified immunity are non-negotiable and must be defended. Failure to protect both will undoubtedly put all public employees in harm's way while drastically and negatively impacting public safety for us all.

WHY DUE PROCESS MATTERS- Any legislation must allow fair and equitable due process under the Law. Currently, when an officer is disciplined, he/she is entitled to due process and an appeal process with the employer. A new outside board (like the POSA Committee) should allow this process to complete before instituting a review. This will not only maintain fairness, but will allow the new Committee to have a full record and make determinations after a thorough and neutral process has been undertaken. Other public employees such as teachers go through a similar process; police officers deserve the same respect and rights.

WHY QUALIFIED IMMUNITY MATTERS - Qualified immunity does NOT protect bad officers who knowingly violate the rights of members of the community. It’s worth saying again. It does not protect bad cops. Instead, it protects good officers who play by and follow the rules. The doctrine allows lawsuits to proceed if a government official (not just a police officer) had fair notice that his or her conduct was unlawful, but acted anyway. The standard is objective reasonableness. By abolishing or changing qualified immunity as it exists today, police officers will not know what is lawful or not. This creates hesitancy and uncertainty in how they perform their duties. This is UNSAFE for all communities.

In closing, we are NOT Minneapolis. So, changing due process or qualified immunity in Massachusetts, which would affect police officers only in Massachusetts, would only serve to punish the men and women in blue for something that happened 1000 miles away. Instead of penalizing and scapegoating, we should be celebrating and promoting the fact that our police officers, some of the best in the nation, are impressive examples of how policing should be done.

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Connolly

Sent from my iPhone

From: Sara Kinnas <sara.kinnas@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:57 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Gobi, Anne (SEN); Ferguson, Kimberly - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: S.2820 Police Reform Bill

Good morning --

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 the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Thank you,

Sara Kinnas

33 Vista Circle

Rutland, MA 01543

Sara.Kinnas@gmail.com

From: Alice Dean <alice0552@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:57 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate S2820

Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

Dear Chair Aaron Michlewitz and Chair Claire Cronin,

I ask that you support amendments 114,116,126,134,129, and137 to the Senate Bill S2820. The amendments deal with due process and fair representation on the board as well as uniform accreditation standards. I support enhanced training and appropriate certification standards and policies that promote fair and unbiased treatment of all citizens, INCLUDING POLICE OFFICERS. The original version of the bill undercuts collective bargaining rights and due process. These amendments are an attempt to improve the bill in these areas. They do not lessen the training protocols and standards or general accountability for law enforcement as originally proposed. Thank you for your time and consideration.

These are the important points that I would really like to highlight and bring to everyone’s attention:

1. The senate version will seriously undermine public safety. The false narrative that QI prevents the public from suing Pos and holding them accountable which dominated the senate debate masked provisions in the bill which will have a serious impact on critical public safety

issues. Not only will the unintended and unnecessary changes to QI hamstring police offices in the course of their duties due t the fact that they will be subjected to numerous frivolous nuisance suits for any of their actions but hidden in the bill are various provisions which will protect drug dealers, human traffickers, gang activity in minority neighborhood schools ,organized retail theft and terrorists.

2. The process employed by the senate of using an omnibus bill with numerous, diverse and complicated policy issues coupled with limited public and professional participation was undemocratic, flawed and totally non transparent. The original version of the bill was over 70 pages, had hundreds of changes to public safety sections of the general laws and sound public policy sections ,it was sent to the floor with no hearing and less than a couple of days for the members to digest/caucus and receive public comment thus creating a process which was a sham.

3. Police support uniform statewide training standards and policies as well as an appropriate regulatory board which is fair and unbiased. The senate created a board that is dominated by groups who have stated anti law enforcement biases and preconceived punitive motives toward police. The board as proposed is unlike any other of the 160 professional regulatory boards in the Commonwealth that the Black and Latino Caucus and its individual members as well as the Governor repeatedly and publicly stated should be used as the example of the model o be use. Its composition is fundamentally incapable of providing regulatory due process. Furthermore, the proposed members are completely devoid of sufficient experience in law enforcement to create training policies and standards unlike members of the other 160 professional boards.

4. Qualified Immunity is unnecessary if the Legislature adopts uniform statewide standards and bans unlawful use of force techniques which all police personnel unequivocally support. Once we have uniform standards and policies and the statutory banning of use of force techniques both the officers and the individual citizens will know what is reasonable and have a clear picture of what conduct is a violation of a citizen’s rights and that conduct cannot be protected by QI. This will also limit the potential explosion of civil suits against other public employee groups Thus reducing costs that would otherwise go through the roof and potentially have a devastating impact on municipal and agency budgets. Police officers are already subjected to suits and suits that are successful when their conduct warrants it. There is no legitimate need to change the law particularly when we get uniform standards

Sincerely,

Alice M Dean

Resident
17 Wildewood Drive
Canton, Ma 02021

781-562-1147

From: CATHLEEN CLARK <cathleen.clark@me.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:57 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: 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.

Thank you,

Cathleen Clark
36 Bowdoin Street, Winthrop, MA 02152

Cathleen.clark@me.com

From: Beverly Williams <mizbevy@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:56 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Submitted yesterday-no receipt you received it

To:

House Ways and Means Judiciary Committee

Chair Clair Cronin and Rep Aaron

From: Beverly Williams

103 Ocean Street, <x-apple-data-detectors://1/1>

Dorchester MA 02124 <x-apple-data-detectors://1/1>

617 438-4595 <tel:617%20438-4595>

Dear Committee Members

I am a life-long resident of Boston, wife, mother of two adult black sons, a retired educator from the Boston Public Schools and currently co chair of The Greater Boston Interfaith Organization.

My lived experiences in Boston, especially Roxbury and Dorchester, has given me front seat observation and first hand knowledge of what goes on in my community regarding policing. I will NEVER EVER forget what happened during the Charles Stuart episodes when he shot his pregnant wife in the stomach and alleged a black man did it. White detectives came out in unprecedented numbers and destroyed a black community in hunt of this black man. Stuart killed himself when the truth came out he was the guilty one, but the spirit and trust of the black community was also killed.

Even today, we have the same type of aggressive behavior in places across MA. The scathing reports and citation from the Department of Justice around the gross misconduct of the Springfield Police Dept.'s Narcotics Bureau sheds light on this.

I don't want to get caught up in "every police officer is not a bad cop"; I am reasonable enough to know that. I don't want your attention to be

distracted from the fact that much work is needed around police reform in terms of:

· Standards/training and accountability. Certification/decertification of police is necessary in any police reform package.

· Creating racial equity through civil service access reform is long overdue.

· Clear Statutory limits on police use of force.

· Qualified Immunity reform (even today people are calling to reopen "D.J." Henry case because he never got justice. He was one of our own MA residents and cases like that have even happened here in our state although the killing by police happened in NY. And was protected by QI.

· Commission for ongoing work around dismantling structural racism and racist procedures and policies.

Any police omnibus bill should have those 5 things in it, but it would be a disgrace to the black community if you stopped there. Senate Bill S2820 is a good bill worthy of guiding you to put out a strong police reform bill.

My community has been shortchanged for many years. There is too much policing, and too many blacks involved with the criminal "justice" system. It is now time to reduce risks and invest in the most vulnerable communities. Senate Bill 2820 includes the Justice Reinvestment Workforce Development Fund that put resources into the community and would make competitive grants to drive economic opportunities in communities most impacted.
I hope there is enough imagination and will in the house to make meaningful police reform based on these suggestions.

-Beverly Williams

Success is somewhere in the struggle
Follow Twitter @mizbevywilliams
From: Mike Connolly <820junior@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:56 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2820

I am a constituent from Marshfield and also a 25 year veteran with Boston Police Department. I've been a Crime Scene Investigator for the past 20 years and you can only imagine what I have seen. From a mother who all but decapitated her two young you children, body parts and three bodies at the Marathon Bombing (my twin boys played basketball with Martin Richard at St. Ann's in Dorchester)or the body of a poor young woman who was taken by force from outside her Southie apartment, brutally raped and stabbed over 80 times and left in the woods in Hyde Park. Physically and

Psychologically I have been put through the ringer. Please know I am not complaining or looking for sympathy as I know someone has to do this work and it is work that I love to do as well as to teach others to do. I am one of many, when the call comes in for a found body, unresponsive infant or bombing at the marathon, we go, no questions asked.
Please remember my colleagues and me as you look at S2820.
I would like to weigh in on the bill that is currently in the House, S. 2820. As it stands, the Senate dropped the ball by keeping police wide open for frivolous law suits by eliminating qualified immunity. As you know, unlike absolute immunity which is something you all are given and enjoy, qualified immunity is given to police officers who do their job the right way. Not rogue officers or cops who break the law. Because of that, I urge you not to pass this bill, but if you must, I ask you to keep qualified immunity.
Another ball dropped by the Senate was something that is rightfully given to all citizens of the commonwealth and this great country, and that is due process. Essentially, by eliminating due process in their bill, the Senate has deemed all police officers second class citizens. That's is outrageous, bogus and downright wrong. Please do not pass this bill, but if you must keep all due process in and please do not deem us second class citizens. In a time when the bad guy is the good guy and the good guy is the bad guy, we need your help.
I pray that you have the courage to be a beacon in a time of darkness and be the anti-panderer and keep these two important aspects in this bill if you must pass it.
Please do no be anti police, please do not open all cops in the commonwealth to frivolous law suits, please be a leader and hear the voices of your constituents and do the right thing.
Thank you ALL for your service.
Respectfully,
Mike Connolly
Prince Rogers Way
Marshfield
617-429-3668

Sent from my iPhone
From: crista nardone <cristanardone17@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:56 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Acceptance of Written Testimony Only

Dear Senator Julian Cyr,

My name is Crista Nardone and I live at 28 Prince Path, Sandwich MA. As your constituent, I write to you today to express 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.

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. Let me remind you that in 2015 President Obama recognized the Boston Police Department as one of the best in the nation at community policing. 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.

Sincerely,

Crista Nardone
From: Danni P <bruren33@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:55 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

July 16, 2020
Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,
My name is Danielle Perez and I live at 672 Boston St Lynn MA. I work at MCI Concord and am a Corrections Officer. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.
?????????????????? ????????????????: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified

Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.
???????? ???????? ??????????? ??????????: The fact that you want to take away an officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling "Stop" to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.
??????????????? ?????????????????: While we are held to a higher standard than others in the community, to have an oversight committee made of people who have never worn the uniform, including an ex convicted felon is completely unnecessary and irresponsible. When this oversight board hears testimony where are the officer's rights under our collective bargaining agreement? Where are our rights to due process? What is the appeal process? These are things that have never been heard or explained to me. The need for responsible and qualified individuals on any committee should be first and foremost.
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, we are not opposed to getting better 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,
Danielle Perez
From: richard gomberg <richardgomberg@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:46 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform bill

To: Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Chairperson, House Committee on Ways and Means

Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Hello, my name is Richard Gomberg with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 290 Islington Road, Auburndale. 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.

Richard Gomberg

Richardgomberg@gmail.com

(617) 796-8804

290 Islington Road

Auburndale, MA 02466

From: demartinijoe <demartinijoe@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:41 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Joseph Demartini and I live at 29 Sheridan Drive, Apartment #9 in Shrewsbury. I work at the Division of Staff Development with the Massachusetts Department of Correction and am a Correction Officer I. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

???????????????? ????????????????: Qualified immunity doesn’t protect officers who break the law or violate someone’s civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

???????? ???????? ??????????? ??????????: The fact that you want to take away an officer’s use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling “Stop” to hands on tactics and/or

using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

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

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, we are not opposed to getting better 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,
Joseph Demartini

From: Christina Scali <christina.aloisi@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:39 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: SR 2800

To whom this may concern,

My name is Christina Scali and I live in Lynnfield. I am the wife of Massachusetts State Trooper and a concerned citizen. I am also a registered nurse in the state of Massachusetts. I am deeply concerned that provisions in this bill will make law enforcement officers afraid to do their job, resulting in an increase in crime around the Commonwealth. If you look at major cities like New York and Chicago, crime has significantly increased and police are afraid to do their job sufficiently as a result of the current climate. Police officers are highly trained in Massachusetts. It is unfair that the actions of one Minneapolis police officer has paved the way for lawless criminals to rebel against hard working and honest officers here in the Commonwealth.

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,

Christina Scali
49 Locksley Road, Lynnfield, MA
6173651881
Sent from my iPhoneFrom: James Whitacre <james.c.whitacre@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:36 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Thank you and insights

Bismillah ArRahman ArRaheem,

Dear MA House of Representatives, Staff, and Supporters,

Thank you for opening the conversation to the public on the issue of policing reform. My name is Jack Whitacre and I am a National Science

Foundation PhD Fellow at the University of Massachusetts Boston. After spending two years researching community policing with DARPA, in partnership with police officers around the country, I feel that an evidence-based approach would benefit our conversation. I ask that we continue to draw upon case studies from reformed departments around the country to weigh and evaluate best practices for Boston.

In a recent Boston Globe article, some stakeholders worried that police reform would 'flood the courts'. Stepping outside of my research and academic lens into philosophy, I'll merely suggest that if justice doesn't take place in the courts, where else will it take place? In the streets? The best way to keep the country unified, in my humble opinion, and to preserve the rule of law is to use evidence based decision making, such as the work of Dr. Gary Klein and Dr. Helen Klein's research below. Thank you for your time and service. I admire your positions as servant leaders.

Source: Klein, Gary, et al. "Police and military as good strangers." Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology 88.2 (2015): 231-250.

Jack Whitacre
BA, Kenyon College
Masters of Law and Diplomacy, The Fletcher School of Law and Diplomacy, Tufts University
National Science Foundation, PhD Fellow, The University of Massachusetts Boston

Cell: 1 (207) 712-6076

From: Rostkowski Family <rostkowski@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:34 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Tarr, Bruce E. (SEN)
Subject: POLICE REFORM BILL S2820 - Concerns with qualified immunity within this bill to be considered

To Whom It May Concern:;

My name is Lori Rostkowski and I live in Rockport MA. I write to you to express my support for our many first responders who put their lives on the line for the Commonwealth every single day. As the House and Senate consider legislation revolving around public safety, and in particular police reform, 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 – legal safeguards that have been established over decades and refined by the some of the greatest legal minds our country has known.

Due process should not be viewed as an arduous impediment, but favored as a bedrock principle of fundamental fairness, procedure and accountability. Qualified immunity is the baseline for all government officials and critical to the efficient and enthusiastic performance of their duties. Qualified immunity is not a complete shield against liability – egregious acts are afforded no protection under the qualified immunity doctrine. Further, qualified immunity is civil in nature and provides no protection in a criminal prosecution. The United States Supreme Court and the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts through numerous cases have continued to uphold the value and necessity of qualified immunity. To remove or modify without deliberative thought and careful examination of consequence, both intended and unintended, is dangerous.

Due Process and Qualified Immunity are well settled in the law and sound public policy dictates that the Legislature not disturb these standards – certainly not in this bill so abruptly and certainly not without a vigorous debate both in the Legislature and in the court of public opinion.

We must remain focused on passing legislation that includes a standards and training system to certify officers, establish clear guidelines on the use of force by police across all Massachusetts departments, to include a duty to intervene, and put in place mechanisms for the promotion of diversity. This does not detract or reject other reforms, but rather prioritizes those that can be accomplished before the end of this legislative session on July 31st.

Please join me in demanding nothing less than sound, well-reasoned and forward-thinking legislation.

Thank you for your consideration,

Lori Rostkowski

14 Seagull Street, Rockport, MA 01966
rostkowski@verizon.net

From: Sarah Lyden <slyden@norwoodma.gov>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:32 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: My testimony

To whom this may concern,

I am writing this to you not only as a proud resident of the Commonwealth of Massachusetts but an even prouder Sergeant of the Norwood Police Department. I want to attempt to be short and sweet with my testimony. Good luck to us all.

I have been a police officer for the Town of Norwood for almost 17 years. I got into law enforcement same like many of us do; my grandfather was a police officer for 30 years. However, I also took my Civil Service test after 9/11. I distinctly remember that day as all of us do and I remember realizing that I wanted to do more for my country, my community. Like most officers, we signed on to help. To be part of something greater than ourselves. There is evil on all levels and in all professions, races, genders and socioeconomic realms. What happened to George Floyd was murder. It's an abomination and I am embarrassed that Chauvin and others wore a badge and claimed the title of Police Officer but, they were the minority of our profession. 99% of us put the badge on for the right reasons and honor our families, communities and departments by helping people and fighting injustices.

I have seen a lot of changes in law enforcement in the last 17 years, some for good and some for bad. I am not against police reform on some level. I am however against this bill and what transpired with the Senate. If we want to better this state and make it equitable for all people, all races then, we as members of the law enforcement community should've been brought to the table to be part of the change not just the victims of it. I strongly believe that if this state keeps moving forward with what was snuck by the other morning, than all that has happened is the weakening of a state and giving power over to the very people that were protecting us all from.

Please table this bill and allow time for the stakeholders to get together and make a bill that suits, protects and enables all people the capability to make a stronger safer Commonwealth of Massachusetts. Do not allow this bill to go through as is. Please. I beg you as a police officer and a citizen of this Commonwealth. Lets slow our roll and do this right. We don't have to be the first over this line of police reform we need cross that finish line with the best product. This bill is not it. What is put through has such a great impact that we need to make sure it's done right the first time . The good citizens of this state will be the ones who suffer if this passes.

Thank you for your time. I hope you do what's right.
Thank you Sergeant Sarah C Lyden

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Nick H <nmhoar@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:29 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2800 testimony

Dear House Judiciary Committee

I, Officer Nicholas M. Hoar, am a Police Officer with the Fall River Police Department and I am contacting you to to give my testimony in regard to the Police Reform Bill. As a proud Police Officer and Asian American Minority it sickens me to see our government bending to the will of non-fact-holding criminals who will take advantage of this anti-police

rhetoric. I am a 5th generation Police Officer in one of the longest serving families in Massachusetts Law Enforcement. I whole heartedly believe that the passing of this bill will put the citizens of the Commonwealth in more danger. The shameless shaemouses that defend the criminal element in a court of law will use this bill to let them walk free without reprimand but punish the Police Officers who swore to uphold the law. I've seen it first hand. Here in the City of Fall River gun violence is at an all time high and those that are involved will never serve the minimum mandatory sentence of 18 months in jail for illegal firearms charges. It just doesn't happen.

As a Army Veteran, citizen of the Commonwealth, father, husband, a Volunteer with the Fall River Young Marines, a mentor, and a civil servant is ask that you look at the bigger picture and into the future and imagine how this decision now will effect the safety and well-being of future generations.

I write to you today to express my staunch opposition to S.2800, 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. How can I protect and serve the victims of crimes if I fear that my actions could ruin my life by giving a criminal the right to sue me for stopping them. I don't go to work everyday to be someone's pinching bag just as much as I don't want to used

defensive tactics. I wish that anyone that needs to be arrest complies without violence.

(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, and law enforcement should oversee 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. Let me remind you that in 2015 President Obama recognized the Boston Police Department as one of the best in the nation at community policing. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2800 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Sincerely,

Officer Nicholas M. Hoar/A708
Fall River Police Department
Nhoar@frpd.org
508.642.8151

From: CHERYL INGALLS <ciwestfield@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:28 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform Bill

I am writing to express my negative opinion of the proposed police reform bill.

As it is written currently, it is going to be detrimental to any LEO, police force, and largely to the community at large.

I support the police; I understand that a few bad apples get in and need to be removed. And I believe the justice system as a whole needs to be looked at. But this bill needs to be rewritten and reconsidered.

As an aside, the middle of the night passage, together with the inability for a public hearing, was sneaky at best.

This is a poor bill and will tie the hands of all of the good, upstanding police officers out there. And will stop any potential applicant to think twice about applying to serve his/her community.

Thank you.

Cheryl Ingalls
Ludlow,Ma.

...Cheryl Ingalls

From: PaulNadeau <buck7pt@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:25 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,

Sent from my iPhone
From: Barbara Stahler-Sholk <watercolorbarb3@sbcglobal.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:25 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Please pass police reform!

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

Hello, my name is Barbara Stahler-Sholk and I'm with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 1205 Centre Street, Unit 315, West Roxbury, Mass. 02132-7749. 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.

Barbara D. Stahler-Sholk
watercolorbarb3@sbcglobal.net
(617) 325-1419
1205 Centre St. Unit 315
West Roxbury, MA 02132-7749

From: Kevin Reen <ktreen62@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:20 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reform

The Massachusetts Senate hastily passed a bill on police reform without doing their due diligence, having hearings and educating themselves to what the serious consequences will be to their actions.

Under Senate Bill 2800 (2820 final version), the elected officials have effectively tied the hands of not only the police but all public officials. This bill removed qualified immunity from all public employees (except themselves of course).

What does that mean? That means that even if myself or my brothers and sisters in blue and red act in good faith under rule/color of law we will now be responsible and open to civil lawsuits. This also opens the municipalities we work for up to frivolous lawsuits for anything, costing you the taxpayers even more.

An example of this is we respond to a medical call where you have a loved one who requires CPR, we arrive on scene do everything we can within the scope of our training and department policies for your loved one but they unfortunately don't make it, we are now open to civil lawsuits for damages.

This is just one major issue with this hastily drafted and passed bill.

It is also important to know that the elected officials who sold us a bill of good and promises of things they would do or stand behind are nothing but wimps who succum to the bullying of higher ranking elected officials to ensure they keep their positions on appointed committees. I know this is probably no great shock to some but this is the stuff that needs to get out to the masses!!

People are calling for police reform for systemic racism and other injustices that occur. Well reform needs to and should start from the top. If our elected officials are so influenced by bullying and pressure from higher ranking elected officials them maybe the reform needs to start with our elected officials and work its way down. Our representatives, at least in the State senate don't give a crap about the people who they serve and the people who voted them into those positions. What they also don't realize is how easily it is for them to loose the support of their constituents and be voted out next election.

Kevin Reen

--

Kevin Sent from Gmail Mobile
From: Chris Goodhind <chrismaz14@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:03 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2820

Dear Representatives,

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 people in law enforcement who serve our communities every day. 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 and unease in performing the duties we ask of them. 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 to bring change to policing, without removing the protections that make doing the job possible.

Thank you,

Chris Goodhind

Hawley, MA

Chrismaz14@yahoo.com

From: Laurel Cooley <cooley.laurel1@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:03 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform Legislation

To: Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Chairperson, House Committee on Ways and Means

Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Hello, my name is Laurel Cooley with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 520 Katahdin Drive in Lexington, MA. 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.

Laurel Cooley

cooley.laurel1@gmail.com

781.835.5777

520 Katahdin Drive, Lexington, MA 02421

From: Drew McArthur <drewmcarthur1@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 5:01 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Honan, Kevin - Rep. (HOU); DeLeo, Robert - Rep. (HOU); Haddad, Patricia - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: S2800

Hi, I'm Drew McArthur, a constituent of Kevin Honan, living at 7 Sparhawk St (#2), Brighton, MA 02135. My phone number is 5085429811, please don't hesitate to reach out to me!

I support the bill & the need for vast, wide-reaching, impactful police reform. We need to fundamentally restructure how policing works in this city, state, and country. Currently, police are given, and consistently abuse obscene amounts of power. We need to disarm the police & get them to stop escalating civilian encounters. Thank you for putting this

initiative in place, and for hearing the voices of your constituency in the process.

"Donations"

The state-wide database is certainly a good start. However, line 58 of the PDF, in Section 1, the new section 72.H, is very concerning.

"The commission may accept and solicit funds, including any gifts, donations, grants or bequests or any federal funds for any of the purposes of this section. The commission shall receive settlement funds payable to the commonwealth related to matters involving racial discrimination or other bias toward African Americans; provided, however, that the commission shall not receive more than $2,000,000 in settlement funds in any single fiscal year or cumulatively more than $2,500,000 in settlement funds in any period of 5 fiscal years. Funds received under this subsection shall be deposited in a separate account with the state treasurer, received by the treasurer on behalf of the commonwealth and expended by the commission in accordance with law."

Why would the commission need to solicit funds? This seems to very plainly greenlight bribes to the commission, which we cannot have for obvious reasons.

Above all, the biggest issue facing the people is the influence of money in politics. Currently, capital completely controls congress (see here: represent.us/theproblem <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__represent.us_theproblem&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=vw0WXX5J1xd-H7bNOSTF4ZJjYqPrZANveHBLckrypOc&s=iGrIHYysoTljoa6Eb1EpOOZXAFmN43mVB8J91sYbKAY&e=>). In order to restore power to the people, we must limit the influence wealth has on our government. That means removing or strongly restricting the donations in Section 72.H.

Dismantling Authoritarianism

The police do not prevent crime, they respond to it. We spend ridiculous amounts on the police, and all we've gained is the highest incarcerated population in the world. All that police spending does is put people behind bars; it doesn't prevent the crimes from occuring. Sure, intimidation works to a degree, but only until the victim is desperate enough.

We can put our money and effort towards programs that will solve the root of the issue (inequality and material deprivation), or we can waste it,

shoveling paper money onto the flames, abuse of power and discriminatory policing only fanning the flames. Almost every crime committed could have been prevented by providing necessities or other assistance, instead of feeding them intimidation and force, escalating the encounter.

The police are inherently authoritarian in nature. They respond to that type of desperation that leads to crime with force and retaliation. The more force, the more desperate people need to act out, and the more people can be left to struggle before they do. We should be listening to the people, not oppressing them with violence to be able to ignore their needs.

Don't listen to police unions, they only fight for themselves and would support every rotten cop before they conceded anything to the public. Don't take campaign donations from police organizations. Tax the rich to fund an actual social safety net, then we can move towards prison abolition.

Incarceration strips a person of their rights, of their humanity. We cannot stand for that. We must move past that. Incarceration also serves as a loophole for slavery in the 13th amendment. MA needs to file a resolution to close that loophole, if not federally then at the state level.

Specific Requests

As for the rest of this bill, every suggestion I have boils down to giving the people more power to hold their own against an authoritarian state.

1. Perform audits of police complaint submitting processes. Investigative journalists have explored this and oftentimes the process is difficult or impossible. https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=vnJ5f1JMKns <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.youtube.com_watch-3Fv-3DvnJ5f1JMKns&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=vw0WXX5J1xd-H7bNOSTF4ZJjYqPrZANveHBLckrypOc&s=PTpsZtJd33iel_mEC1o19EKvAAGgLBTaGIwHvaanlN0&e=>

2. for all data being made available, it should be made available to the public both on a clean, accessible & widely available website, but also to an API, so the public might programmatically design tools that use official govt data.

3. A lot of the racial profiling that happens is due to the socioeconomic status of people being profiled. Lifting citizens out of poverty will reduce that disparity.

4. Expunge the records of anyone convicted of marijuana offenses. Cannabis was obviously made illegal under racial pretense, and is incorrectly scheduled to be weaponized by the prison industrial complex, our modern day slavery. And despite the legality of cannabis and middle class white businessowners profiting massively, we still have people of color incarcerated & forced into slave labor. We MUST expunge those records.

5. To reiterate, we cannot allow the police commission to be bribed.

6. Eliminate completely no-knock warrants, qualified immunity, and school resource officers (put in place to stop school shooters, but they've only been arresting Black children).

An excellent resource for more testimony exists on State Senator Will Brownsberger's wordpress site, and the comments below.

https://willbrownsberger.com/reform-shift-build/
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__willbrownsberger.com_reform-2Dshift-2Dbuild_&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=vw0WXX5J1xd-H7bNOSTF4ZJjYqPrZANveHBLckrypOc&s=X14qjMixhwE2Ioyp7qSEE3rDgUXsqKHNR5lnCMQDzsE&e=>

Thank you for your time.
Drew

From: Paul McGarty <spikepmj1994@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 4:56 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reform Bill S2800

My name is Paul McGarty Jr my phone number 7742087578

I do not agree with this reform bill. Problem cops are dealt with thoroughly through Internal Affairs, the police academy and their superiors. This bill holds no opinion from the minority parties that reside in the rural areas of Boston and with the organizations that closely work hand in hand with the Boston Police Department. Quickly passing a bill is not the improvement the police in Boston needs, I am a Boston Police Officer, I can speak from first hand experience the department is understaffed beyond belief, yet gun violence in this city continues to decline year after year. This bill cannot be applied like a band aid, movements can be made once all groups feel like their opinion was heard fairly and only then real change can occur. A focus should be thought about how the city of Boston can only afford to have less than 18 patrol officers within each district of the city per shift. The population

of Boston alone is over 600,000 thats less than 200 patrol officers per shift to deal with the entire city's growing population. This type of reform bill is to centralized on one topic to be a solution to safer streets in the problem neighborhoods of Boston.

Thank you,
Paul McGarty Jr
From: Greg Valentine <hammrtmrac@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 4:52 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill 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.

Thank you,

Gregory Valentine

19 Laurel Terrace Westfield MA

Sent from my iPhone
From: Trisha Josephs <trisha.josephs@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 4:50 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Call to Action

?

To: Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Chairperson, House Committee on Ways and Means

Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Hello, my name is Trisha Josephs with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 39 Pope Hill Road Milton MA 02186. 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.

Trisha Josephs

Trisha.josephs@gmail.com

617-678-1774

39 Pope Hill Road

Milton, MA 02186

From: patrick munroe <pcmunroe@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 4:24 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony for Senate Bill 2820

Dear Chairman Michlewitz and Chairwoman Cronin,

Thank you for allowing me to submit written testimony regarding Senate Bill 2820 and thank you for your service to the commonwealth.

My name is Patrick Munroe and I have been a Boston Police Officer for 7.5 years and I am also the Founder/President of Brotherhood for the Fallen-Boston which is a non-profit organization that provides support to the families of fallen police officers. Prior to the Boston Police, I served as a Medford Police Officer for five years and was a New York City Police Officer for 2.5 years.

Growing up in Medford, Massachusetts, I always wanted to be a police officer to serve my community and "do good' for other people. My mother would even call me "Deputy Doright". A few of my friends that I grew up with also became police officers and firefighters because we wanted to serve. Our fathers were police officers and firefighters and we wanted to experience the same pride and passion as they did while serving their communities. Some of my friends joined the military to obtain veteran preference and did multiple tours in Iraq and Afghanistan. I chose to attend UMASS-Dartmouth and got my opportunity by joining the NYPD in 2005. Although my friends and I chose different paths to become law enforcement or firefighters, we dedicated our lives to becoming public servants. We do it, and we do it well.

We all know what happened to George Floyd in Minneapolis and police officers are just as disgusted as everyone else. It was an act of cowardice and certainly an abuse of power. I speak with officers from around the country on a regular basis and NOT ONE officer has condoned or tried to make excuses for the officer's actions. Their actions tarnished the badge that we proudly wear.

After this incident, I certainly understand the want and need for change. I agree with having more training for officers and banning the use of chokeholds excpt in a deadly force situation. However, I certainly disagree with painting all police officers with a broad brush and assuming that the majority of us are not educated, compassionate, or don't have

diverse backgrounds. I worked in the largest, most diverse police department in the world in one of the most diverse neighborhoods in Brooklyn, NY. It is unfair to group all members of one profession together. If a state senator or Rep is charged with a crime in Minnesota, should that be a reflection of all politicians in this state?

I took the time to read this bill, and I am no means an attorney, but I found most of the language in this bill to be offensive, misguided, and retributive. Instead of Bill 2820, it should be called the "Police Punishment Bill". I spoke with Senator Boncore's Office and Rep Madaro's office and both assured me that the bill was created with good intentions. To give a glimpse of what the senate thinks of police officers, please refer to Line 1398. © "A law enforcement officer who has sexual intercourse with a person in custody……. I am not sure who felt that this was necessary to be amended or why it was brought into the bill but it is quite appalling.

To become a police officer, an applicant is required to pass an extensive background check including criminal history check, driving record, and credit check. In addition, anyone convicted of a felony or domestic violence is automatically disqualified. I have major issue with the suggestion of having police officer's background check information be put into a database and shall be public record according to Line#350. Shouldn't police officers be entitled to the same CORI rights and privacy rights as private citizens?

I also found that the bill is unfair to create a public database that will post all incidents that involve injuries sustained during a police encounter. If the intention of the bill was to be fair, shouldn't we also be concerned about our police officers that are attacked? Regardless of public opinion, no one has the right to resist arrest unless the arrest wasn't made in good faith or excessive force was used. In addition, the term "Police Brutality" is far different than use of reasonable Force. We are already trained in de-escalation techniques as well as use of force continuum by the Mass. Police Training Council. Sometimes on the street, the use of force encounter doesn't always look pretty but that's our job. We have to make split second decisions based on the facts available to us at that time, not the facts available the next day on youtube. We are held to a reasonableness standard as stated in "Graham v Connor". We also have the right to protect ourselves to come home to our families. The goal of every arrest is to gain voluntary compliance and conduct the arrest without incident. The suspect dictates the use of force during the encounter, not the other way around.

While speaking to Senator Boncore's office, I asked for them to provide facts or data that would lead politicians to believe that there is widespread police brutality in Massachusetts. I also asked if there was an extensive study done to conclude that our use of force policies needed to be changed. Facts could not be provided nor was a study done. I further asked how many civilians were shot and killed by Massachusetts police in 2020? The answer could not be provided. I had to provide the answer. It is 3. All armed suspects/victims and justified. With a population of 7 million, that is hardly widespread.

I also brought up the topic of police officers injured or killed in the line of duty this year. There have been hundreds of police officers shot and injured this year and most people have no idea because it doesn't make the news. Some even say, "That's what they signed up for". It certainly is not. During these "peaceful protests", several officers were shot and killed including Federal Protective Service Officer David Underwood and Retired St Louis Captain Davin Dorn (77 years old). In addition, Las Vegas Metro Officer Shay Mikalonis was shot in the neck during a protest and now he is paralyzed from the neck down. Were these officers thought of when this bill was drafted?

What about:

Sean Collier

Ron Tarentino Jr

Sean Gannon

Michael Chesna

Joseph Shinners

To some, they might be just names. To me, they are my brothers.

This year alone, there have already been 30 police officers shot and killed in the line of duty in the U.S. and a total of 124 line of duty deaths including Boston Police Officer Jose Fontanez who died after contracting Covid-19 on duty. Having officers second guess themselves before defending themselves will result in more officers getting killed because they will be worried about qualified immunity, no due process, and an unqualified "Committee" that will judge their actions based on political motives rather than facts. Most of the Officers shot and killed this year were responding to "routine calls" such as Toledo, Ohio Police Officer Anthony Dia who was shot and killed upon arrival to a drunk disturbance call. He broadcasted his last words over the radio "Tell my family that I love them". Officer Dia was only 26 years old and is survived by his wife and two children.

This bill would lead the reader to believe that police officers wake up everyday to harm people in the neighborhoods rather than help them. Over 4th of July week, 7 people were murdered in 7 days in Boston and NONE of them involved the police. This bill was written on emotion and the false narrative that all police officers are bad. During the 89 page Bill, I didn't see the explanation of how the job of a police officer will be easier nor did I see what the police officer is supposed to do during a violent attack. All of the new guidelines and reforms will result in higher crime rates, increased number of officers hurt or killed, low employee retention rates, and mass retirements. Without qualified immunity or due process who would want this job?

I am deeply concerned with the loss of due process with the formulation of this POSA Committee and their ability to revoke an officer's license based on alleged misconduct. In fact, it states that the officer CAN NOT appeal the ruling to civil service but may appeal to the same committee who has already disciplined the officer. What happened to an arbitration process? When I took the police exam, it was administered by civil service. Why should my rights be revoked if we are trying to create a "fair" bill.

I understand creating a Committee for improved training but not for discipline. It seems the goal is to bypass civil service and allow swifter punishment to police officers without due process. Shouldn't police officers be afforded due process just as everyone else. In our adversarial criminal justice system, police officers shouldn't be found guilty until proven innocent nor should they be tried in the court of public opinion. The loss of qualified immunity will also subject police officers to frivolous lawsuits and hurt good police officers while rewarding criminals for bad behavior.

I strongly oppose Senate Bill 2820 and I respectfully request that the House of Representatives draft a new bill based on fairness and facts not based on a knee jerk reaction to fit a progressive agenda. Specifically, I am very concerned about the topics of Qualified Immunity, Due Process, and the POSA Committee. These portions of the bill were rushed and seem to be mostly retributive.

I hope that the House of Reps will consider my testimony. Thank you in advance.

Respectfully,

Patrick Munroe

East Boston Resident

978-994-6279

From: Buccella, Richard A. <buccellara@cdmsmith.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 4:19 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: may70sx3@comcast.net
Subject: S2802

To the Members of The Massachusetts Congress,

I am writing to urge you to vote down the insane bill S.2800 passed to you by the Senate. This knee jerk reaction to appease a bullying mob cannot be made into law. The hard working men and women wearing a police uniform and risking life and limb can be personally sued? How absurd, that they should also risk their families resources while serving the public. Today, more than ever, our police departments need to be shown our support and be

given more resources with which to work , not be put in greater danger of freezing and risking their lives lest they make a mistake. How soon we forget Michael Chesna, the Weymouth officer killed in the line of duty. The thought of this legislation is a slap in the face to the police officers serving us, I can't imagine why anyone would now want to put on the uniform.
My son serves as an officer in the town of Avon, MA. He attended the criminal justice courses at Northeastern University and has dedicated himself to protect and serve. He is married with two young children and works long hours for the Avon Police Department to support his family. This is who a police officer is, this is the face of police departments across the country. To twist this truth and to somehow place blame for the ills of society on the heads of a group of dedicated public servants is disgraceful.

Regards,
Richard A. & Patricia A. Buccella
508-584-8309
Get Outlook for iOS <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__aka.ms_o0ukef&d=DwMF-g&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=miH00VBoJU4Qeq1yJEYE_EX84WnYzkD32zwzy0YrrHM&s=QSXX8WtGy_ILvZl0cIETHw0ej-2DTnQQY1YezJ5Bx0k&e=>
From: Kev M <k51mahoney@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 4:05 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 17, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Kevin Mahoney and I live at 210 Patrick Rd. Tewksbury MA 01876. I work at MCI Concord as a Correction Officer. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

Qualified Immunity: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

Less than Lethal Tools: The fact that you want to take away an officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling "Stop" to hands on tactics and/or using your

firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

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

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, we are not opposed to getting better 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. Stay safe and stay healthy.

Sincerely,

Kevin Mahoney

From: Mark <brunini@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 4:00 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,

Mark Brunini

From: Patrick Morgan <patrick6157@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 3:54 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,

Sent from my iPad
From: mmjot@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 3:53 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Policing Bill (S.2820)

Dear Represenatives,

I am a proud retired Massachusetts State Trooper. I have had the honor to work alongside state, local and federal law enforcement officials. Police officers because of the nature of the job are routinely placed in highly stressful situations. During these times they may have to make a life or death decision in a matter of seconds. Bill S.2820 would create a law where no matter what action he/she takes a police officer now has to fear not only the the risk to the public, the risk to the officer's life but now the potential loss of his/her home and life savings!

Each time a police officer goes to work they hope and pray to go home to their family after their shift. The police officer's family also, hopes and prays the officer returns safely home after his/her shift! This legislation in watering down or altering qualified immunity for police officers creates the added burden for the officer and his/her family wondering and worrying ok I survived another shift but is today the day I am going to get sued simply for performing my duties! Is today the day my family loses our home and life savings!

No one wants bad cops off the street more than Good cops!! The overwhelming vast majority of police officers do their job honorably and at great risk to their life!

BAD LAWS hurt the Public and Police!!!

I ask the legislature to vote down any change that impacts the qualified immunity provision for police officers! It is in my opinion the very least you owe the honest, hardworking professional police officers who every day risk their lives to protect you and the general public!

Respectfully,

Patty Gillen
From: Lul Said <indhodeeraley1@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 3:27 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform Bill

Hello, my name is Lul K Said with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 18 Holton Street, Medford MA-02155. 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.
LUL K. SAID
18 HOLTON ST.
MEDFORD, MA 02155
781 643-0017

From: A J Magan <abdullahimagan@aim.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 3:08 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform Bill

Hello, my name is Abdullahi Magan with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 18 Holton St. Medford MA-02155. 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.
Abdullahi Magan
18 Holton Street
Medford, MA 02155
(781) 643-0017

From: Frank <ffemino@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 2:31 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2800

Dear House of Reps,

I urge you to carefully read Bill S2800 extremely carefully. This Bill was hastily drafted and voted on in the early morning hours without any input from any professionals on the subject matter.

Speaking from a law enforcement perspective with emphasis on qualified immunity this bill will certainly hinder police officers from effectively performing their job. If S2800 is passed, it will be safer for every officer to do the bare minimum on the street when answering calls for service for fear of frivolous lawsuits.

Police Officers, especially officers employed by the the City of Boston have a Body Worn Camera strapped to them every second of their shift. The Boston Police much like many police agencies across the state also have an

Anti Corruption as well as an Internal Affairs division in place ensuring that every Officer follows the laws of the commonwealth as well as department policy and procedure. I can assure you if any officer violates the law or policy and procedure they will be answering to the aforementioned bureaus. I write this email with such surety because I am a Boston Police Officer and have been one for the last fourteen years.

I can give you a some insight on how it is being a police officer during these times by saying "We are on our heels." More so now due to the death of George Floyd which was an isolated incident that had NOTHING to do with the highly trained police officers of this commonwealth. We are not the enemy, we have been unfairly painted with a very broad brush which prompted Bill S2800 to be hastily drafted. If S2800 is passed I can assure you that the commonwealth will be in for some very dark times as it empowers criminals and strips police officers of due process and qualified immunity. What will you get for service if S2800 does pass? You will get less than the bare minimum out of police officers. It's safer for them to operate that way and risk discipline within the department than end up on trial themselves. You will also get a max exodus of police officers who will retire and zero officers to fill the attrition. This job will become a "set up" that no one will want to take.

Police work has many variables within an extremely dynamic environment. Please consider that when discussing S2800.

Thank you,

Frank

From: Cheryl Adamopoulos <cheryladamopoulos@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 3:03 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,
Cheryl Adamopoulos

From: ablom19@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 2:55 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Opposition to Bill S.2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Adam Blom and I live at 213 Old Washington Street in Pembroke. I work at the Suffolk County House of Correction and am a Correction Officer. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

??????????????????? ????????????????: Qualified immunity doesn’t protect officers who break the law or violate someone’s civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

???????? ???????? ??????????? ??????????: The fact that you want to take away an officer’s use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling “Stop” to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

???????????????? ?????????????????: While we are held to a higher standard than others in the community, to have an oversight committee made of people who have never worn the uniform, including an ex convicted felon is completely unnecessary and irresponsible. When this oversight board hears testimony where are the officer’s rights under our collective bargaining agreement? Where are our rights to due process? What is the appeal process? These are things that have never been heard or explained to me. The need for responsible and qualified individuals on any committee should be first and foremost.

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, we are not opposed to getting better 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,

Adam Blom

From: Linda Gallagher <lindagllghr@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 2:53 AM
To: Kelcourse, James - Rep. (HOU); Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Opposition of Bill No S2820

Hello

I am a resident of Newburyport. I am writing to express my disapproval of Bill No. S2820 and my overall dissatisfaction with the defund police movement in general. I've had experience with the Newburyport, Salisbury, Amesbury and Newbury police departments and have nothing but positive things to say about them. I support training officers, I support policy standards and I support the need for all community members to feel safe,

but I do not support any effort to defund, decrease or remove options for officers to keep themselves and the community safe. I don't believe police are the criminals. I absolutely do not support any modification to police qualified immunity and fear that modifications to qualified immunity will negatively effect public safety.

Specifically in this area, I'd support housing modifications that would diversify the community, but I don't believe those funds should be reallocated from police budgets. The events surrounding George Floyd's death are tragic however it doesn't mean Newburyport or Massachusetts in general needs to take the same prescriptive reformative steps as Minneapolis, or other states with long standing police / race relations conflicts. You can believe that Black lives matter while supporting police officers and public safety in general, they aren't mutually exclusive.

Linda Gallagher

Sent from my iPadFrom: pauljmunroe@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 2:50 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform

16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Paul Munroe and I live at 6 Foster street Gloucester Ma. I work at MCI Concord and am a Corrections Officer . 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 dayto 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

Qualified Immunity: Qualified immunity doesn’t protect officers who break the law or violate someone’s civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

Less than Lethal Tools: The fact that you want to take away an officer’s use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling “Stop” to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalationbut if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

Civilian Oversight: While we are held to a higher standard than others in the community, to have an oversight committee made of people who have never worn the uniform, including an ex convicted felon is completely

unnecessary and irresponsible. When this oversight board hears testimony where are the officer's rights under our collective bargaining agreement? Where are our rights to due process? What is the appeal process? These are things that have never been heard or explained to me. The need for responsible and qualified individuals on any committee should be first and foremost.

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, we are not opposed to getting better 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,

Paul Munroe

Sent from my iPhone
From: DONALD F WHITE <dfwhite34@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 2:47 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Donald White
Subject: Comments on S2820

Chairman Aaron Michlewitz (House Ways & Means Committee)

Chairman Claire Cronin (Judiciary Committee)

Donald F. White - Resident of Amherst, MA. - (413) 687-1444

The tone of this legislation appears to be anti law enforcement - specifically towards police officers.

If you need to have this much oversight to supervise our officers, maybe we need to reform the way their supervisors currently supervise them.

I feel that this legislation was done in haste, focusing on feelings, rather than statistics.

I believe that items being reported should be done as statistics only.

Most of this bill exposes the Officer's private personnel information. This should not happen.

I believe you should leave the NO KNOCK WARRANT alone. A judge should determine when this type of warrant needs to be issued - period.

Officers writing up fellow Officers or intervening with fellow Officers actions - this should be cleared up and solve with current supervisors - possibly with support through HR.

The limited immunity policy currently in place should be left alone. Officers should not be worried about job security, law suits, as well as security for themselves and community members; while being second guessed in real time with every action they take as they perform their jobs.

Re-certification training of 120 hours per 3 year period. N o one knows what this training is, or if it will actually help our law enforcement personnel be better Officers out on the street doing their job. Plus, who pays for this? Are we taking Officers off the street & juggling work schedules on an ongoing bases, or are we paying overtime pay for this training? I don't think that the re-certification law for teachers is working out well. Go sit in on a few re-certification programs in the schools in your districts.

I really think that you need more time - with more community input, to put together
a police reform law that will be beneficial to our Police Officers, their Supervisors, and the community members they serve each and every day. This type of a bill, really needs to be a win- win relationship. This bill should be aimed at making our law enforcement personnel better police officers.

I live in Amherst MA. - you know, HAPPY VALLEY - the educational mecca of western MA. Several months ago, our town issued a statement that it was getting very difficult to get good qualified applicants to even apply for positions as Police Officers in the Town of Amherst. Recently, our Chief of Police said that it probably was about 40 years ago when one of our Officers even fired their weapon.

Thanks for listening. Good Luck!

From: Marley Arborico <arborico.m@northeastern.edu>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 2:46 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Please Pass Bill S2820

Dear Government Officials,

The past few months have been a tumultuous and tragic --but pivotal-- part of American history. MA now has the chance to be a torchbearer when it comes to reforming a system both parties largely agree is broken. I entreat the House Committee passes the Reform Shift and Build Act along to Governor Baker as the first step in broader criminal justice reform.

Appreciatively,

Marley Arborico, Northeastern University graduate, 206-669-9974

From: jpallatroni1@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 2:36 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Joe Pallatroni and I live at 526 Barnard St, New Bedford. I work at MCI-Norfolk and I am a corrections officer. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

Qualified Immunity: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to aquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system costing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

Less Than Lethal Tools: The fact that you want to take away an Officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from yelling "Stop", to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

Civilian Oversight: While we are held to a higher standard than others in the community, to have an oversight committee made of people who have never worn the uniform, including an ex convicted felon is completely unnecessary and irresponsible. When this oversight board hears testimony where are the officer's rights under our collective bargaining agreement? Where are our rights to due process? What is the appeal process? These are things that have never been heard or explained to me. The need for responsible and qualified individuals on any committee should be first and foremost.
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, while we are not opposed to getting better, 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 as that you 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,
Joe Pallatroni

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__go.onelink.me_107872968-3Fpid-3DInProduct-26c-3DGlobal-5FInternal-5FYGrowth-5FAndroidEmailSig-5F-5FAndroidUsers-26af-5Fwl-3Dym-26af-5Fsub1-3DInternal-26af-5Fsub2-3DGlobal-5FYGrowth-26af-5Fsub3-3DEmailSignature&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=oWi-XG_aYRs950M5P4CfR8njleWNCp1kzYkIj2jVxJU&s=H0aFr6kGNOi1xvQlDjhkxuL2RL_51pBPFzDrb7aZTjg&e=>
From: Stephanie Downey Toledo <sdt990@mail.harvard.edu>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 2:31 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 Stephanie Toledo. I am a resident of Sharon, 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.

My interracial family has lived in various communities in Massachusetts and repeatedly over the years and across urban and suburban communities my husband and I have clearly been treated differently by police in the same situations simply as white and not white. I feel for my husbands life as I've seen him too often assumed to be doing wrong by police simply for being a man of color.

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,
Stephanie Toledo
Sharon, MA

March like a Mother: for Black LivesFrom: Mike Aziz
<aziz.mike@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 2:27 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Written Testimony for Police Reform Bill

To whom it may concern,

My name is Michael Aziz and I live in Hyde Park. I am writing this letter to voice my concern that again no public hearing was held on this matter and given no other choice, I am submitting this letter as my written testimony. As your constituent, I write to you today to express my disagreement with any hastily-thrown-together legislation that will hamper law enforcement efforts across the Commonwealth and encourage you to vote against Senate bill 2800 submitted to the House of Representatives. It deprives police officers of Massachusetts any basic protections afforded to all other public employees in Massachusetts. It is a rush to judgment being developed behind closed doors. Issues of policing, health and human services, and race are too important to be rushed. Of the many concerns, the following in particular, stand out and demand immediate attention, modification and/or correction. Those issues are:

1. The senate version will seriously undermine public safety because police officers may become more concerned about personal liability than public safety. The proposed changes to QI will have a serious impact on critical public safety issues.

Unintended and unnecessary changes to QI will hamstring police offices in the course of their duties because they will be subjected to numerous frivolous nuisance suits for any of their actions. Officers may second guess doing what is necessary for public safety and protecting the community because of concerns about legal exposure.

2. The process employed by the senate of using an omnibus bill with numerous, diverse, and complicated policy issues coupled with limited public and policy participation was undemocratic, flawed and totally nontransparent.

The original version of the bill was over 70 pages and had multiple changes to public safety sections of the general laws. It was sent to the floor with no hearing and less than a couple of days for Senators to digest/caucus and receive public comment. This process was a sham.

3. Police support uniform statewide training standards and policies as well as an appropriate regulatory board which is fair and unbiased.

The Governor and supporters of the bill promised to use the 160 or so professional regulatory agencies as a guide for police certification. The senate instead created a board without precedent. The 15-member board proposed to oversee, and judge police officers includes no more than six police officers and four of those police officers will be management/Chief representatives. The remainder of the committee will be dominated by groups critical of law enforcement, if not parties that regularly sue police and law enforcement. The civilian members on the board will lack any familiarity with the basic training, education or standards that apply

to police officers. All the other 160 boards include a strong majority of workers from the profession supplemented by a few individuals to represent the general public. Imagine if police officers were appointed to a board to oversee teachers licenses!

4. The removal or any change to Qualified Immunity is unnecessary if the Legislature adopts uniform statewide standards and bans unlawful use of force techniques that all police personnel unequivocally support.

All police organizations support major parts of the bill: strengthening standards and training; having a state body that certifies police officers; banning excessive force techniques and enhancing the diversity process. Once we have uniform standards and policies and a statutory ban of certain use-of-force techniques then officers and the public will know the standards that apply to police officers and conduct that is unaccepted and unprotected by QI.

This will also limit the potential explosion of civil suits against other public employee groups Thus reducing costs that would otherwise go through the roof and potentially have a devastating impact on municipal and agency budgets.

5. Police Officers Deserve the same Due Process Afforded to all Other Public Employees

Public employees and their unions have a right for discipline to be reviewed by a neutral, independent expert in labor relations – whether an arbitrator or the Civil Service Commission. This bill makes the Commissioner's decisions or the new Committee's decisions the final authority on certain offenses.

We should affirm the right of all employees to seek independent review of employer discipline at arbitration or civil service.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Michael Aziz

From: Patty Fisher <pattyfisher093@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 2:26 AM
To: Mirra, Leonard - Rep. (HOU)
Cc: Kelcourse, James - Rep. (HOU); Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: RE: Bill# S2820: An Act to reform police standards and shift resources to build a more euqitable, fair and just Commonwealth that values Black lives and communities of Color

TO: The Chair of the House Committee on Ways and Means, Representative Aaron Michlewitz, in cooperation with Representative Claire Cronin, Chair of the Joint Committee on the Judiciary.

CC: Representative James Kelcourse, 1st Essex

Representative Leonard Mirra, 2nd Essex

DATE: July 16, 2020

RE: Bill No. S2820: 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

Hello -

My name is Patty Fisher and I am a resident in Essex County. For 17 years I have proudly served as a Police Officer for the Town of Newbury MA. Currently, I hold the rank of Sergeant. In addition to general patrol supervisory functions, I am a domestic violence/ sexual assault investigator and accreditation manager. Prior to my employment in law enforcement, I worked as a civilian domestic violence advocate assigned to local police departments. I have a bachelor's degree in Criminology and a master's degree in Public Administration.

I am writing to express my strong disapproval of Bill No. S2820 and respectfully request you not support the bill as written.

Qualified Immunity: I have learned through professional experience that defendants of arrest wrongly threaten to file civil suit against officers for lawfully doing our job. One common occurrence involves victims of domestic abuse. It is not uncommon for victims of domestic violence to recant their stories when they return to their abusers. Often, part of their justification, is to 'blame' police for the arrest to avoid violence at the hands of their abuser. Modifying qualified immunity will open a door for perpetrators of domestic violence to file wrongful suits against police. In addition to the hardship this will cause officers and municipalities and the backlog it will create in the civil court docket, this will ultimately negatively impact the safety of victims of abuse and will provide abusers with one more tool to use against the victims. Changing qualified immunity will cause officers to second guess arrest in these "he-said-she-said" investigations and victims of violence will pay the price.

Since the discussion of police reform struck national news, I personally have had a defendant who I did not use force against, threaten to sue me for excessive force, simply because she knew "she'd win". It is my opinion and fear that arrestees who otherwise would not have, should qualified immunity be amended, would then have incentive to engage in physical altercations with police officers simply so they can sue. There is a large list of situations where lawfully doing my job could result in unintended harm or destruction of property: breaking ribs during CPR; breaking a door down because of an overdose and I need to enter the home; restraining a suicidal person as they try to run to their bedroom to consume the pills or get to the counter to grab the butcher knife to slice

their wrists. Educated, compassionate, “good” police officers will vacate positions if qualified immunity is modified. If qualified immunity empowers systemic racism, why aren't you looking to remove all immunity doctrines that cover all public officials including executive & legislative branches?

I encourage you to seek guidance from a variety of municipal representatives to inquire about the budgetary impact increased civil litigation would have on municipalities.

Simply stated, educated “good” police officers will immediately vacate our jobs if qualified immunity is modified. It is also my opinion, that the modification of qualified immunity will significantly limit qualified, educated law enforcement candidates in the future.

Suggestion: Rather than change qualified immunity, the Legislation should adopt a uniform statewide standard and ban unlawful uses of force techniques. I also believe discussion can be had about hiring boards and techniques to support and improve minority candidacy in law enforcement both inside and outside of civil service departments.

Training and Accreditation: I believe it is important to have national awareness while being able to compare the national happenings to that of our local experience. Massachusetts police officers are some of the most highly trained and educated officers in the country. That being said, I support all forms of training, especially if it improves my ability to keep the public safe while reducing the need to use force. I also support policy review, so long as law enforcement professionals are viewed as stakeholders and have a role in the process.

Suggestion: Training in the hands of an overtired police officer can result in bad decision making. I suggest the Commonwealth set forth guidelines that limit the number of hours an employee can work. For example, for every 16 hours worked at any job (including for the police department, details or private sector jobs, etc.) said officer must have at least 8 hours off before being allowed to work for the municipality and that outside employment cannot interfere in regularly scheduled shifts for the municipality. I also suggest the Legislation create incentives for departments to become certified or accredited.

Oversight board: As proposed, the oversight board is one sided, biased against law enforcement and is not in line with any of the other 160 regulatory boards across the Commonwealth. Changing the format of the oversight committee suggests a desire to be unfair and impartial toward police officers, thus feeding the narrative that most police officers are “bad” and that departments need to “clean-house”. I suggest creating an oversight board that is fair to law enforcement and comprised of law enforcement officers.

As other discussions evolve around police reform, I personally worry about the topic of unarmed civilians absorbing law enforcement responsibilities. I consider myself a hybrid-social worker/ police officer and spent time being a civilian social worker assigned to local police departments. I was not allowed to respond to homes, I was required to meet with victims at the police department or speak with them via telephone. I currently work with many social workers in the community; I am the departments point of contact for the Council on Aging; the liaison to the Essex County Outreach Substance Abuse Program, a partnership with the Pettengill House; and I sit on the Domestic Violence High Risk Team (DVHRT), a nationally recognized model of advocates, law enforcement, prosecutors, probation, corrections and other community based organizations who partner to identify high risk domestic violence cases, engage in a multidisciplinary team approach and monitor and manage high risk offenders while engaging victims in appropriate services. As a police officer who works with civilians in the field, I worry about the idea of civilians responding to calls for service that have not been screened for safety by police officers first. I worry about the safety of the residents, the social workers and the liability to cities and towns for placing such workers in homes of situations that have not been previously screened. These are not programs that can be implemented quickly, or without care and thought. Discussions must involve all stakeholders, and the Senate's passing of this bill unfortunately suggests they do not view law enforcement as a necessary stakeholder.

My disapproval of Bill No. S2820 as written should not be perceived as a lack of interest regarding police reform nor should it be viewed as an opposition to building a more equitable, fair and just Commonwealth that values Black lives and communities of Color. However, I do not believe the bill as written accomplishes those stated goals.

Thank you for your service and your consideration. Please, do not hesitate to contact me if you have any questions or if I can be of assistance to the reform process. Stay safe.

Respectfully,

Patty Fisher

Resident of Essex County

Newbury Police Sergeant

From: david.beals@mpdmail.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 2:25 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform Bill

Dear Chairpersons,

My name is David Beals, I'm a newly-promoted Lieutenant for the Middleborough Police Department. I have been a police officer for Middleborough for the past 20+ years with 6+ years experience prior at the Plymouth County Sheriff's Department. I have a total of 26 years in the Plymouth County retirement system. Knowing how many years I have invested, and how many years I have remaining until retirement, will allow you to understand my serious concerns with this reform bill.

The bill, as written, will alter policing forever. It will take away one of the most important aspects of it that protects us from being personally sued for simply doing our jobs. Think about all the good things we do as police officers that can now turn into a personal civil suit simply because someone doesn't like the police or are looking for a payout. The stress that goes with being sued is enormous and a strain on the system, the department, the officer and the officer's family. Qualified immunity doesn't protect the bad police from doing bad things, it protects the hard-working, honest officers from frivolous suits. It will almost certainly dissuade officers from doing anything for fear of being sued.

Do I think things could be better, or maybe some change is necessary? Possibly. Do I also think there are way more good officers than bad apples? Absolutely. I have NEVER heard one officer agree with what happened in Minneapolis. What happened to Mr. Floyd was disgusting and appalling to those of us who love this profession. I do not know any racist police officers and have never seen one of Middleborough's officers act in a racially-motivated way towards any human being. To be thrown into one huge basket because of the actions of a few is simply wrong on a basic human level.

I'm not just a police officer, I'm also a husband and a father. This doesn't just affect us, it affects our loved ones also. My wife was in tears the other day when she heard there's a chance we could lose everything we have now and possibly in the future simply because someone doesn't like police officers. She wants me to retire with what we have even though I'm within reach of retirement in less than six years. I'm not one of those bad apples, I do the right thing, but the thought of what could happen scares me.

In closing, I respectfully request, no, I implore you take a hard look at this bill and all that goes with it. There are some valid points to it but taking away our qualified immunity is not one of them. Please do not let the current climate influence a long-term decision that will affect policing and police officers long after I'm retired. Please do not let this profession be trampled on and become a job rather than a career.

Respectfully,
David Beals Jr. #87
Middleborough Police Department
From: Eddie Richard <esantiofficial@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 2:13 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Police Reform Bill Testemony

Good Morning, my name is Edward Santiago, and I write to you to express my support for our many first responders who put their lives on the line for the Commonwealth every single day. As the House and Senate consider legislation revolving around public safety, and in particular police reform, I hope that you will join me in prioritizing support for the establishment of a standards and accreditation committee.
I am, however, concerned at the expansion of this legislation, targeting fundamental protections such as due process and qualified immunity – legal safeguards that have been established over decades and refined by the some of the greatest legal minds our country has known. Due process should not be viewed as an arduous impediment, but favored as a bedrock principle of fundamental fairness, procedure and accountability. Qualified immunity is the baseline for all government officials and critical to the efficient and enthusiastic performance of their duties. Qualified immunity is not a complete shield against liability – egregious acts are afforded no protection under the qualified immunity doctrine. Further, qualified immunity is civil in nature and provides no protection in a criminal prosecution. The United States Supreme Court and the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts through numerous cases have continued to uphold the value and necessity of qualified immunity. To remove or modify without deliberative thought and careful examination of consequence, both intended and unintended, is dangerous.
Due Process and Qualified Immunity are well settled in the law and sound public policy dictates that the Legislature not disturb these standards – certainly not in this bill so abruptly and certainly not without a vigorous debate both in the Legislature and in the court of public opinion.

We must remain focused on passing legislation that includes a standards and training system to certify officers, establish clear guidelines on the use of force by police across all Massachusetts departments . This does not detract or reject other reforms, but rather prioritizes those that can be accomplished before the end of this legislative session on July 31st.

Please join me in demanding nothing less than sound, well-reasoned and forward-thinking legislation.

Thank you for your consideration.
Edward Santiago (registered voter)
From: Kris Kim <kristinawrotethis@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 2:11 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony on S.2820

Dear members of House leadership,

S.2820 does not do much to actually prevent state violence against the Black and Brown community or prevent the flood of Black and Brown people into jails and prisons.

I understand your desire to reform the police, but S.2820 does not actually encourage reformation. S.2820 increases spending on law

enforcement, expands the power of law enforcement officials to oversee law enforcement agencies, and makes no real changes to the function of policing in Massachusetts. Actual reform is to take power and responsibilities out of the hands of law enforcement and to use the money in bloated police departments to invest in Black and Brown communities.

Instead of funding for more police training that ultimately does little to change police culture, we could be looking to fund alternatives to the police. Instead of pouring more and more money in an institution that was not built to serve everyone equally, we could be budgeting for social workers that are actually sufficiently trained to deal with a wide range of crises, putting more money to build a new system from the ground up, and preventing crises that come out of inequality and a lack of resources by investing in communities in need. I want to be able to call for help and know that the help will actually make the situation better.

If the MA legislature were serious about protecting Black lives and fighting systemic racism, this bill would have started to eliminate major elements of racist policing. This bill would have implemented a ban without exceptions on pretextual traffic stops and street stops and frisks. The legislature should decriminalize driving offenses, which are a huge entryway to jails and prisons for Black and Brown people, the poor, and the working class. Instead of making more committees that don't push the envelope, the legislature should shut down fusion centers, erase gang databases, and permanently ban facial surveillance by all state agencies including the RMV. Police should also be removed from schools.

Please, instead of S.2820, fight systemic racism by reducing the role and powers of the police, defunding systems of harm and punishment that disproportionately harm people of color, and funding Black and Brown communities.

Thank you,
Kristina Kim Somerville MA
From: Clayton Arroco <arroco.cn@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 2:07 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S.2820 Does Not Do Enough To End Racist Policing

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.

Instead of funding for police training and commissions, communities need investments in programs and infrastructure that would improve the quality of life for black and brown people on Massachusetts. For example, investing in schools and after-school programs will help kids receive proper education, which is correlated to reduced crime rates. One way to achieve this investment would be to remove property tax as a consideration in school funding formulas; the system that is currently in place severely hinders the quality of education that members of black and brown communities receive because these areas often have much lower propety taxes. In order to then invest more in school, you must re-allocate money from the police budget, and one place to take money from would be the overtime budget. As it stands, police officers abuse the overtime system to nearly double their salary. There is currently no accountability for this because the police unions are responsible for investigating these fraudulent overtime claims, and those unions will have bias. Cutting the overtime budget will help prevent the police departments from leeching public funding in a way that significantly decreases the resources available yo black and brown communities.

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,

Clayton Arroco

arroco.cn@gmail.com

5 Heavenly Way Billerica MA 01821

From: Kate Pickowicz <kpixxy29@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:51 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Officer

Dear Chair Michlewitcz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Katherine Pickowicz and I live at 25 Wason Ave, Nashua NH. I work at Suffolk County House of Corrections and I am a Correction Officer. 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 that this bill (2820) was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

Qualified Immunity: Qualified Immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violates statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

Less than Lethal Tools: The fact that you want to take away an Officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from yelling "Stop" to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm in a life or death / public safety situation. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools, the amount of injuries and deaths would without doubt rise.

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

I am asking you to stop and think about the rush to reform police and corrections in such haste. Our officer's are some of the best and well-trained Officers anywhere. Although, we are not opposed to getting better 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 am asking for your support and ensuring that whatever reform is passed that you do it responsibly. Thank-You for your time.

Sincerely,

Katherine Pickowicz

From: Joseph Burke <joseph.m.burke1989@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:45 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Do not pass S.2800.

My name is Joseph Burke and I live In the city of Boston. As your constituent, I write to you today to express my staunch opposition to S.2800, 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.

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. Let me remind you that in 2015 President Obama recognized the Boston Police Department as one of the best in the nation at community policing. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2800 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Respectfully,

Joseph Burke

From: Stephen Mckunes <smckunes920@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:43 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reform Bill

Dear Representatives

My name is Stephen McKunes and I live in your district at 1 Milton Street, Dorchester and I am a huge fan of those who protect and serve our community. As you consider legislation that affects police officers and their safety, and thus the safety of our entire community, please understand that protection and preservation of due process and qualified

immunity are non-negotiable and must be defended. Failure to protect both will undoubtedly put all public employees in harm's way while drastically and negatively impacting public safety for us all.

WHY DUE PROCESS MATTERS- Any legislation must allow fair and equitable due process under the Law. Currently, when an officer is disciplined, he/she is entitled to due process and an appeal process with the employer. A new outside board (like the POSA Committee) should allow this process to complete before instituting a review. This will not only maintain fairness, but will allow the new Committee to have a full record and make determinations after a thorough and neutral process has been undertaken. Other public employees such as teachers go through a similar process; police officers deserve the same respect and rights.

WHY QUALIFIED IMMUNITY MATTERS – Qualified immunity does NOT protect bad officers who knowingly violate the rights of members of the community. It’s worth saying again. It does not protect bad cops. Instead, it protects good officers who play by and follow the rules. The doctrine allows lawsuits to proceed if a government official (not just a police officer) had fair notice that his or her conduct was unlawful, but acted anyway. The standard is objective reasonableness. By abolishing or changing qualified immunity as it exists today, police officers will not know what is lawful or not. This creates hesitancy and uncertainty in how they perform their duties. This is UNSAFE for all communities.

In closing, we are NOT Minneapolis. So, changing due process or qualified immunity in Massachusetts, which would affect police officers only in Massachusetts, would only serve to punish the men and women in blue for something that happened 1000 miles away. Instead of penalizing and scapegoating, we should be celebrating and promoting the fact that our police officers, some of the best in the nation, are impressive examples of how policing should be done.

Sincerely,

Stephen McKunes

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Mark Weddleton <markweddleton@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:38 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

Good morning,

I write to you this morning 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,

Mark Weddleton
West Bridgewater

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: rlkent82@gmail.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:36 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,
My name is Robert Kent and I live in Lynnfield and the I work at MCI Concord and I am a Sergeant . 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.
?????????????????? ????????????????: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.
???????? ???????? ??????????? ??????????: The fact that you want to take away an officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling "Stop" to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.
???????????????? ?????????????????: While we are held to a higher standard than others in the community, to have an oversight committee made of people who have never worn the uniform, including an ex convicted felon is completely unnecessary and irresponsible. When this oversight board hears testimony where are the officer's rights under our collective bargaining agreement? Where are our rights to due process? What is the appeal process? These are things that have never been heard or explained to me. The need for responsible and qualified individuals on any committee should be first and foremost.
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, we are not opposed to getting better 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,
Robert Kent

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Correia, Mark <mcorreia@pcsdma.org>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:36 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 17, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Mark Correia and I live at 46 Benson St Middleboro,Mass. I work at Plymouth County Sheriff's Dept. and am a Captain. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

???????????????????? ????????????????: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

???????? ???????? ???????????? ??????????: The fact that you want to take away an officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling "Stop" to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

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

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, we are not opposed to getting better 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,
Mark L. Correia

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Michelle Reeves <michellereeves21@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:35 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 Michelle Reeves. I am a resident of Lynn 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. Paragraph 2: INSERT WHY YOU SUPPORT THIS BILL in 2-4 Sentences or Personal Story/Values.

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,

Michelle Reeves

105 Newhall St, Lynn, MA 01902

March like a Mother: for Black Lives
From: avondragon@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:29 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: Casey Boyle <caseyoboyle@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:27 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,

Casey Boyle

41 Island Rd. Holland, MA 01521

From: Douglas Morgan <dpmorganjr@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:22 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2800

Dear Committee Members,

I am deeply concerned about my future as a police officer and my ability to help and serve my community. If you take away Qualified Immunity and my collective bargaining rights, then how do I defend myself against false accusations and attacks when I am doing my job according to the law and my department policies? Where is my protection? I am concerned we will not have anyone willing to do this job, (at least qualified individuals), if you pass this bill? I have done this job for close to twenty years and now as a sergeant I am thinking of leaving, because I feel unwanted. Or the last several years there has been a sharp decrease in the number of applicants applying to be police officers, which is making it difficult to find qualified individuals to find vacancies. I would challenge each lawmaker to take a moment and go for a ride along with your local law enforcement officer and see what they encounter during their shift, and then ask yourself if you are doing the right thing for the public and law enforcement with this reform bill.

The murder of George Floyd was horrible and I hate the fact that I now have to try ten times hard to gain the public's trust because of a piece of shit killed someone they were responsible for. I know we can do better, what we need is more money for training, better pay to attract better qualified individuals, and body cameras to prove what is really going on.

Also I am concerned that people do not see all the officers who have been killed. I bet you don't know how many police officers have been killed since Mr. Floyd's death. Well I will tell you there have been twelve and here are there names Officer Jonathan Shoop July 13th WA, Officer Edelmiro Garza Jr Tx, Officer Ismael Chavez Tx, Officer Anthony Dia, OH, Sgt Craig Johnson OK, Officer Julian Keen Jr FL, Deputy Sheriff James Blair MS, Sgt Damon Gutzwiller CA, Lt Stephen Williams AL, Officer Waldis Johnson MI, Officer Nathan Lyday UT, and Officer Cody Holte ND, that is twelve officers killed since May 25th of this year by gunfire, and a total of 30 have been killed since January of this year, that is more than 4 a month shot and killed. I asked you who are more likely to be killed. How about we asked Sgt Chensa who was hit in the head with a rock and knocked unconscious, then killed with his own gun along with an innocent bystander. How quickly you forget about these incidents and when focusing on reform without listening to both sides. We are human beings and are asked to make split second decisions, knowing someone in an office is going to pick apart that decision with the luxury of time and ability to research all aspects of the situation.

It has been tough our profession is sort of a love hate one, your body creates the laws and then asks us to enforce them, however that has consequences for us. We have people who are trying to kill us and assault us everyday and then we are getting attacked by our elected officials and others. We rushed into danger, we worked through Covid, Boston Marathon Bombing, and protests with people throwing urine on us, bricks, and fire bombs. But we still show up everyday trying to help and we keep on being beat down by everyone and if this continues how do you expect us to continue showing up knowing no one wants you. I think you need to think about that, I go out every shift with the goal to build a rapport with the community I serve, please do not make my job harder.

Remember key is more training and better training, because towns and cities need more funding to provide this additional training, which will in turn provide the community with a better officer to patrol our streets. Better pay to attract those better qualified officers. I also want body cameras because I believe they provide a true view of what is going on at a scene and eliminates false accusations as well as a clearer picture to the courts of what actually happened.

Please think about both sides before acting on this bill, all I am asking is for a fair reform bill that protects me and the citizens who we serve. I want to thank you for your time and hope some read this because every officer I work with is hurting and just want people to know we care.

Sincerely,

Douglas Morgan

NEPBA Local 34 President

Randolph Police Superior Officers Union

781-838-1889

From: Kayla Leger <legerkayla@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:20 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: QI Bill

To whom it may concern,

My name is Kayla Leger. I am currently a full time police officer in the state of Massachusetts. I am a single mom of seven year old son. I decided to become a police officer 4 years ago so I could help people. I chose a profession where I could possibly not come home from. I chose a profession where I knew I would never have a consistent schedule, lose out on hours of sleep, and miss out on holidays and major events. I chose this because it's important to me that there are people who will sacrifice everything to save someone else. That is what all law enforcement officers know when deciding to do this job.

The bill recently passed by legislatures and that will be moving to the house next is not at all thought out in consideration of the men and women who qualified immunity protects or the citizens of Massachusetts. Qualified immunity was provided for the covered government officials to effectively do their job.

Police are faced with dealing with a large range of calls every single day. During those days and nights they know they may face an individual who is a danger to them and/or the general public. As an officer we are paid to protect the public but sometimes that takes more than just giving commands to stop an individual. By retracting qualified immunity, the state of Massachusetts is saying they would rather an officer have to think; should I Act and stop that criminal or avoid it to avoid being sued or losing my career. This second thought could be the difference between life and death for that officer or the citizens of this state. In a high intensity situation, there is no room for hesitation or second thoughts. Of course when I use this example, I am speaking about justified actions based on the circumstances.

Although this will greatly effect how police do their jobs to protect the citizens it also affects other professions such as firefighters, EMTS, teachers etc. and how they do their jobs. Jobs that are needed to help this state stay safe and progress. These are not easy jobs. This immunity that was once granted protected us "government officials" who were acting in good faith to help our communities.

By passing this bill, you are risking the safety and lives of these workers and the citizens of Massachusetts. We should not have to be a worry that doing your job to the best of your ability still could get you

sued and potentially lose your career. This bill will also financially impact municipalities greatly in ways that could potentially send us into a greater Dept than we already face.

There are many factors that should be considered before passing this bill to please a small portion of people who are upset. I ask that you greatly consider the repercussions that could happen if this bill is passed which may include a large number of government officials such as police, fire, teachers walking away from their jobs which will result in the public having a lack of resources they need.

Sincerely,
Kayla Leger

From: Dick <r.w.wagner@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:16 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: SUPPORT STRONG POLICE REFORM

to: Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Chairperson, House Committee on Ways and Means

Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

??

Hello, my name is Linda Farkas-Wagner with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 11 Douglas Rd., Lexington, MA. 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, and most sincerely,

??

Linda Farkas-Wagner

r.w.wagner@verizon.net

781.860.9129

11 Douglas Rd, Lexington, MA 02420

??

From: Eileen Burr <leenybeany528@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:14 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform bill

To the Legislators of Massachusetts.

Why is it that this bill was passed in the middle of the night? Was it due to the fact that you need to do it under the cover of night because you know what you are doing is WRONG!

Our police in the commonwealth of Massachusetts, from the State Police, city and town Police, sheriffs departments are out there every day keeping law and order within our state of Massachusetts. One of the reasons that our state capital and my home town Of Boston is one of the safest cities in our country is because of our Police who are out on the streets day in and day out, in our neighborhoods, getting to know our kids, keeping an eye on those they know are trouble makers, and our gang unit is one of the best! Do you want us to become like Chicago, New York, or other cities that have high crime rate gang violence and murders? I think not! You are bending to the pressures of one special interest group that has an agenda, that is trying to create anarchy within our country. Please take a stand against this, please stand behind our police officers.

Here’s a quick story, when my daughter was just 8 weeks old she stopped breathing, I was on the phone with 911 my husband had our precious daughter trying to get her to breathe, it was a police officer who was the first on the scene. It was a police officer that was able to get her breathing again, he was there precious minutes before EMS, he cried with us when she started to cry. It is because of this officer that she is now a beautiful young lady.

Another example is when my kids where in elementary school, the fourth graders names where put in a bucket and four from every elementary school here in Weymouth Ma were given the opportunity to participate in Weymouth Junior Police Academy. It was a week long program where they where taught and shown what police due from a staged car accident, an armed robbery, and even a drug bust in Boston Harbor . It was one of the best experiences that my son has ever had. Our police volunteer their time to be camp counselors better known as drill instructors. It is a positive experience for our children.

We also had a police officer here that was the head of the DARE program, back when we put money into trying to keep children off of drugs as it is far easier to keep them from ever trying drugs than it is to get them off of drugs. Our DARE Officer, Officer Bowman was this amazing guy, who took the program to heart and lived the program. He stopped having the occasional drink, smoking as he knew that it took more than words, that you had to lead by example and that was what he did! The biggest lesson he taught these kids was Respect, for themselves, parents, police teachers, etc. when he saw one of the children he would say, " whats the word?" And they would immediately say a Respect sir! We lost this program due to cuts in the police budget about fifteen years ago. I wrote a letter then also stating my concerns, that we where being penny wise and pound foolish as if this program saved one child it was worth the cost. We now have an epidemic, An epidemic that is taking a whole generation, a drug epidemic and I cannot help but wonder if it is partially because we cut out the DARE program in Massachusetts. We put money first.

Let's not cave because of a group , because of a special interest group, that is crying for police defunding. We need our police. We cannot afford not to have our police and to have them well trained with the skills and equipment not to only keep themselves safe but to keep us, the tax payers, the citizens of Massachusetts. You forget that you work for ALL of us, not just one special interest group! Since this whole nightmare has begun we have seen an uprise in our violent crimes and murders, and I cannot help but think it is because our police have been demonized, that they are now second guessing Every move they make. That those that are looking to create anarchy, rioting, terrorizing our elderly, making our streets unsafe to walk down, are snickering at the fact that politicians, legislators are caving to the pressure created by this group, I plead with you not to let this happen here ,in our great state of Massachusetts where ,without our police not only fully funded but also FULLY BACKED BY OUR LEADERS, we will not be able to live here.

Let us not forget those who wore the blue, who gave the ultimate sacrifice .
Let's not forget that when the Boston Marathon Bombing happened it was our Police Officers who ran into danger, who hunted down those who did that evil, and we swore WE WOULD NEVER FORGET! Have you forgotten?
Let us not forget those families that lost a loved one while they where protecting us.

Cordially
Eileen Burr
Concerned citizen
Weymouth Ma
781-335-7663

Sent from my iPad

Sent from my iPadFrom: Thomas Rousseau <trxtreme@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:07 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: Senate Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Thomas Rousseau and I live in Winchendon, Ma. I work at MCI Shirley and am a Correction Officer. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.
??????????????????? ????????????????: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.
???????? ???????? ??????????? ??????????: The fact that you want to take away an officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling "Stop" to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.
???????????????? ?????????????????: While we are held to a higher standard than others in the community, to have an oversight committee made of people who have never worn the uniform, including an ex convicted felon is completely unnecessary and irresponsible. When this oversight board hears testimony where are the officer's rights under our collective bargaining agreement? Where are our rights to due process? What is the appeal process? These are things that have never been heard or explained to me. The need for responsible and qualified individuals on any committee should be first and foremost.
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, we are not opposed to getting better 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,

Thomas Rousseau
From: Mike S <msweet1313@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:07 AM
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 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 the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Thank you,

Michael Sweet
55 Endicott St
Danvers, MA 01923
978-828-1827

From: Anthony Nigro <connorbruin1@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:06 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony against S2820

To: Chair Aaron Michlewitz
Chari Claire Cronin

From: Anthony J. Nigro
1 Crestview Ave. Medway, Ma.

I am writing you on behalf of the good men and women in law enforcement in Massachusetts, some 18,000 plus strong. I am a Police Officer of 11 years. I am a father of four. An Eagle Scout who holds the notion of integrity with high regard, and I am a constituent of yours. The hasty and sly passing of Bill S-2820 in the early morning hours of Tuesday July 14th, without any public forum or opinion, and without hearing any testimony by the thousands of individuals, unions and associations who phoned and emailed their concerns shows just how dangerous the ramifications of passing this bill will be. The long term affects on the good state of Massachusetts will be devastating, and we the Police, and the community, do not deserve what is coming.

Robert Peele said "The Police are the public, and the public are the Police". He said this with reason. Police, being part of the community work upon Peele's nine basic principals:
"The basic mission for which police exist is to prevent crime and disorder".
"The ability of the police to perform their duties is dependent upon public approval of police actions".
"Police must secure the willing cooperation of the public in voluntary observance of the law to be able to secure and maintain the respect of the public".
"The degree of cooperation of the public that can be secured diminishes proportionately to the necessity of the use of physical force".
"Police seek and preserve public favor not by catering to the public opinion but by constantly demonstrating absolute impartial service to the law".
"Police use physical force to the extent necessary to secure observance of the law or to restore order only when the exercise of persuasion, advice and warning is found to be insufficient".
"Police, at all times, should maintain a relationship with the public that gives reality to the historic tradition that the police are the public and the public are the police; the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the interests of community welfare and existence".

“Police should always direct their action strictly towards their functions and never appear to usurp the powers of the judiciary.”
“The test of police efficiency is the absence of crime and disorder, not the visible evidence of police action in dealing with it”.

These nine principals were written in London in1829, and still hold true to this very day. With the passing of S-2820 we will be losing every bit of these basic principals which have stood steadfast for nearly 200 years. Robert Peele is the founder of modern day policing, and a memorial figure of he stands proudly in front of the police station where I work.

That being said, Massachusetts may be considered a leader in Law Enforcement. We have some of the longest training academies nationwide, the most educated Officers and command staff, the most up to date inservice training and continuing education and curriculum, and the highest recruiting and hiring standards arguable nationwide. During the six month police academy, Officers are taught a variety of skills only then to graduate and continue their learning with field training officers for another three to four months, and continue learning throughout their careers.

The actions of isolated incidents by the very few officers across the country do not reflect the pride and integrity of those very 18,000+ men and women in blue who serve Massachusetts. Those who do tarnish the badge in the commonwealth, are removed from the ranks, and through due process, no longer serve in Law Enforcement. Although it can be said there may be isolated incidents of racism across the country, we are not seeing a grotesque example of incidents involving people of color and the police as we are being told by our politicians and media sources. In fact, based upon UCR statistics the Washington Post found that Police Officers use of force and deadly force statistics do not show any signs of racism or higher impact upon those of color by Officers across the country. Unfortunately, what we are seeing is the need to meet an agenda by political activists and politicians who are influencing our legislators.

I have concerns with bill S-2820 in that it was written with haste and emotion, and political motivations in mind. Quite frankly I am disgusted with the negligence of our senate members in the passing of this bill. Bare in mind, that the passing of this bill will be permanent, and come with immediate, and long term effects on this state.

Removing the right of due process for police officers and public employees is denying someone of their constitutional rights, the basis of our entire legal system revolves around due process of law. Due process is one of the inherent checks and balances built into our constitution.

The issue of Qualified Immunity is one of most concern. Currently, it does not protect the actions of bad Police Officers in the State of Massachusetts. If an Officer violates written policy, or the law, he/she is subject to retraining, suspension, removal, monetary fines or criminal procedure. Qualified Immunity is not in place as a catch all to protect ALL Police Officers from their actions. It does not protect Officers from their illegal actions. What Qualified Immunity does, is serves a need to "protect officials who are required to exercise discretion and the related

public interest in encouraging the vigorous exercise of official authority". This protects us from civil process if we as police are functioning within the color of law and our policies. Without this protection, we will be limiting or eliminating discretion in policing. In the 1982 case of Harlow vs. Fitzgerald, the United States Supreme Court ruled that Qualified Immunity must exist for this very reason. Along with Police Officers, this case also identified judges, government officials, and prosecutors as being protected for their decisions and actions.

With the removal of Qualified Immunity, we will swiftly begin to see cities and towns in Massachusetts become bankrupt with frivolous civil cases. With the passing of S-2820, the standards under which civil action may be brought against a public official will be dramatically lowered. Lawsuits against public officials and municipalities will incresa exponentially. This will effect ALL Massachusetts citizens, courts, and public officials, not just Police Officers.

Along with the current state, city and town budget constraints due to COVID-19, this will be just another kick to the ribs for municipal budgets. Once these lawsuits begin piling in, we will begin to see town budgets cut, police budgets affected, fire stations closed, and school budgets drastically effected by these, arguably preventable, frivolous lawsuits.

With qualified immunity gone, an Officer will being to ask him/herself "is this job worth it?". Is it worth coming the work, doing the right thing day in and day out, only to be sued or lose my job because of an allegation of wrong doing? Is it worth being sued, because I broke the ribs of a 23 year old girl doing CPR after I administered NARCAN because her parents found her unresponsive from a heroin overdose, and although I saved her life, I broke her ribs and she can sue me? Is it worth trying to seek, locate, intercept and stop that drug dealer from selling his product on the streets, before it gets into the hands of our children? Or will I be sued for an event during the apprehension, search of, and seizure of evidence from that drug deal?
You have to ask yourself, Why are we taking the handcuffs off of the criminals and placing them on the police? '

Already, we are seeing good cops leave the job, entertain other career opportunities, or put in for early retirement. We are seeing the next generation of police officers being told not to bother applying, or have ambition to become a police officer because without the protections of due process and qualified immunity, this job just won't be worth it. Of those 18,000 plus Police Officers in this state, we will already be losing many to COVID-19 budget constraints, or not replacing those who retire because of the impacts of the pandemic. With the passing of the language in S-2820, I can assure you we will never see a police force in this state as strong as 18,000 and likely no greater than 15,000.

Also within this legislation is a proposal to develop a committee to review police officers use of force, bias crimes, and specific police incidents. I do agree this is needed, but what is needed is trained and experienced individuals who have worked the job to review and judge those incidents. This is not bias to protect Police Officers, this is part of

due process and impartial policing, and just another form of checks and balances. Do we ask a ground of civilians with no medical training to review how a Doctor may have failed? Or do we compile a symposium of the best doctors around to judge those incidents. Does it make sense to have a group of non trained persons inspect an airplane after a mechanical malfunction or crash? Or do we ask that qualified officials with experience in piloting and mechanics evaluate and inspect the aircraft. This holds true with policing and law enforcement as well. A well trained and experienced committee can perform this function.

I am writhing this letter, asking that you consider the amendments and language in S-2820 be reconsidered. If the bill is passed through the house with the removal of Qualified Immunity, you can rest assured the great State of Massachusetts will be in for a rude awakening. Less Police, less if any proactive policing, more criminals will run rampant and free, more crime will occur, more lives will be lost. These lives fall on our legislators. These lives do not need to be lost. This can be prevented. Look at Chicago, Atlanta, Seattle, Baltimore and several other cities where violence has overtaken law and order. We do not want to add Boston, Worcester, Springfield, or any other city or town from Massachusetts to that list.

Respectfully Submitted,

Anthony J. Nigro

From: zinggbpd859@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 1:01 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S2820

Dear Representatives

My name is Robert M. Zingg and I live at 44 Fisher St. Westwood, Ma. . I am writing this letter to voice my concern that again no public hearing was held on this matter and given no other choice, I am submitting this letter as my written testimony. As your constituent, I write to you today to express my disagreement with any hastily-thrown-together legislation that will hamper law enforcement efforts across the Commonwealth and encourage you to vote against Senate bill 2800 submitted to the House of Representatives. It deprives police officers of Massachusetts any basic protections afforded to all other public employees in Massachusetts. It is a rush to judgment being developed behind closed doors. Issues of policing, health and human services, and race are too important to be rushed. Of the many concerns, the following in particular, stand out and demand immediate attention, modification and/or correction. Those issues are:

1. The senate version will seriously undermine public safety because police officers may become more concerned about personal liability than public safety.

The proposed changes to QI will have a serious impact on critical public safety issues.

Unintended and unnecessary changes to QI will hamstring police offices in the course of their duties because they will be subjected to numerous frivolous nuisance suits for any of their actions. Officers may second guess doing what is necessary for public safety and protecting the community because of concerns about legal exposure.

2. The process employed by the senate of using an omnibus bill with numerous, diverse, and complicated policy issues coupled with limited public and policy participation was undemocratic, flawed and totally nontransparent.

The original version of the bill was over 70 pages and had multiple changes to public safety sections of the general laws. It was sent to the floor with no hearing and less than a couple of days for Senators to digest/caucus and receive public comment. This process was a sham.

3. Police support uniform statewide training standards and policies as well as an appropriate regulatory board which is fair and unbiased.

The Governor and supports of the bill promised to use the 160 or so professional regulatory agencies as a guide for police certification. The senate instead created a board without precedent. The 15-member board proposed to oversee, and judge police officers includes no

more than six police officers and four of those police officers will be management/Chief representatives. The remainder of the committee will be dominated by groups critical of law enforcement, if not parties that regularly sue police and law enforcement. The civilian members on the board will lack any familiarity with the basic training, education or standards that apply to police officers. All the other 160 boards include a strong majority of workers from the profession supplemented by a few individuals to represent the general public. Imagine if police officers were appointed to a board to oversee teachers licenses!

4. The removal or any change to Qualified Immunity is unnecessary if the Legislature adopts uniform statewide standards and bans unlawful use of force techniques that all police personnel unequivocally support.

All police organizations support major parts of the bill: strengthening standards and training; having a state body that certifies police officers; banning excessive force techniques and enhancing the diversity process. Once we have uniform standards and policies and a statutory ban of certain use-of-force techniques then officers and the public will know the standards that apply to police officers and conduct that is unaccepted and unprotected by QI.

This will also limit the potential explosion of civil suits against other public employee groups Thus reducing costs that would otherwise go through the roof and potentially have a devastating impact on municipal and agency budgets.

5. Police Officers Deserve the same Due Process Afforded to all Other Public Employees

Public employees and their unions have a right for discipline to be reviewed by a neutral, independent expert in labor relations – whether an arbitrator or the Civil Service Commission. This bill makes the Commissioner's decisions or the new Committee's decisions the final authority on certain offenses.

We should affirm the right of all employees to seek independent review of employer discipline at arbitration or civil service.

Thank you for your attention to this important matter.

Sincerely,

Robert M. Zingg
Detective
Boston Police Dept.
Homicide Unit
617-908-8445

Sent from my iPhone
From: Martine Laverdure <mfiat16@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:59 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,
Martine LaverdureFrom: Daniel <dpenn380@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:58 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: SB 2820

To whom it may concern,

I want to thank you for taking the time to listen to both myself and the rest of your constituents. I have been a resident of the City of Worcester for six years now, and I have been a Police Officer in the city for the same amount of time. One of the reasons I chose to move to this city was because I saw the positive vision that both city officials and state officials, such as yourself, had for this city, and I can say over the past six years the city has come leaps and bounds from where it was: we have a growing economy, we are soon to have a beautiful new stadium, and as of May this year, crime had been on a drastic decline in the city, specifically pertaining to violent crime. But most recently, the crime in the city has been on an incline. I can say from firsthand perspective, the violent crime in the City of Worcester, specifically pertaining to gun violence, is extremely worrisome. The uptick in shootings and gun

homicides over the course of three weeks here in the city is extremely disheartening and concerning to me as both a police officer and a resident of this city.

Both my wife and I work in the public sector and the current bill that has been brought forward has a negative impact on the both of us. We here in Massachusetts have always prided ourselves on the strong unions we have, the fair wages we pay our public employees, and the extremely low crime rate across this state that we see, as compared to other states. But the reason we have all of the things is because of what is in place to help and protect those public servants; those protections are things such as Qualified Immunity, Collective Bargaining, and Due Process.

Qualified Immunity is something that has been proven and supported time and time again by case law in this country from the highest level of judgement, The United States Supreme Court. Qualified Immunity does not protect bad cops, it protects good cops doing good things for the right reasons and for the betterment of the public. If we take away or change qualified immunity here in the city we will have Police Officers scared to arrest a violent criminal in fear of losing their home, we will have firefighters scared to do CPR on a dying patient in fear of losing their home, and we will have teachers afraid to reprimand a child in fear of losing their house. Is that the kind of city and state we want to live in? I can confidently say no for my wife and me.

Due process is a basic right we have here in this state for public employees. It is the same right that is given to criminals convicted of murder, rape, assault and any other crime. But we want to move forward and take that same right away from the public employees that go out everyday to try and make the world a better place live?

One of the reasons we have such good police officers, teachers, firefighters, and many other public service employees is because of Collective Bargaining. Here in Massachusetts, unlike many other states, we pride ourselves on the fact that our public employees work for fair wages, in a safe setting, with good benefits that drive good hardworking intelligent people into the public sector. If we are to take away collective bargaining here in Massachusetts, not only are we telling the employees in those fields that we do not care about them, but we are telling the general public as a whole we do not care about them. If we have uneducated, poorly paid police officers, we don’t have good police officers, resulting in climbing crime rates. If we have uneducated poorly paid teachers, we don’t have good teachers, resulting in poor education for the children that are our future. Is that the legacy we want to leave?

I am not saying changes don’t need to be made, changes always need to be made. In my belief, the backbone of this country is our ability to change, adapt, and move forward and make this country, state, and city a better place to live. But is taking the protection, ability to fight for fair wages, and the ability to fight for ourselves and defend ourselves, especially when wrongfully accused of something, making this state a better place to live? I am going to have to say no.

7 months ago I married my wife in what was one of the happiest days of my life. Much of the conversations in our household over the course of the past 7 months pertained to starting a family, something both my wife and I have wanted for so long. We spoke about having children, buying our forever home, and raising our kids to be good people. But over the course of the past several weeks the discussion has changed to is: Is Massachusetts the right place for us to live and raise a family? That is something that hurts; our family all lives here in Massachusetts and we want our children to be close to grandparents, aunts, uncles, and extended family, as both my wife and I had the privilege of having growing up. But with this bill, specifically these three topics I speak of, my wife and I don't think Massachusetts will be the right place to raise a family, and we have both agreed that it would be time to move out of the state if this does go forward. So I am asking you as a public servant, as a constituent, and as a hardworking member of society, please vote no on these 3 items I have spoken of.

Thank you for taking the time to listen to me. I can be reached at 508-237-8693 and would love to hear from you to have some dialogue.

Thank you

Daniel Pennellatore
227 Holden St
Worcester,Ma

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Michael Leonard <mleonard@hria.org>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:54 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Public Testimony on S.2800 to the House Ways and Means and Judiciary Committees

Dear Chair Cronin, Chair Michlewitz, Vice Chair Day, and Vice Chair Garlick,

I am writing to request your consideration to expand the existing expungement law (MGL Ch 276, Section 100E) as the House takes up S.2800 to address Racial Justice and Police Accountability. S.2800 includes this expansion and we hope you will consider it as it directly relates to the harm done by over-policing in communities of color and the over-representation of young people of color in the criminal legal system.

Our criminal justice system is not immune to structural racism and we join you and all members in the great work needed to set things right. The unfortunate reality is that people of color are far more likely to be subjected to stop and frisk and more likely to get arrested for the same crimes committed by whites. Black youth are three times more likely to get

arrested than their white peers and Black residents are six times more likely to go to jail in Massachusetts. Other systems where people of color experience racism are exacerbated, and in many ways legitimized, by the presence of a criminal record. Criminal records are meant to be a tool for public safety but they're more often used as a tool to hold communities of color back from their full economic potential. Expungement can be an important tool to rectify the documented systemic racism at every point of a young person's journey through and past our justice system.

We also know that young adults have the highest recidivism rate of any age group, but that drops as they grow older and mature. The law, however, does not allow for anyone who recidivates but eventually desists from reoffending to benefit. Young people's circumstances and cases are unique and the law aptly gives the court the discretion to approve expungement petitions on a case by case basis, yet the law also categorically disqualifies over 150 charges. We also know that anyone who is innocent of a crime should not have a record, but the current law doesn't distinguish between a dismissal and a conviction. It's for these three main reasons we write to you to champion these clarifications and now is the time to do it.

Since the overwhelming number of young people who become involved with the criminal justice system as an adolescent or young adult do so due to a variety of circumstances and since the overwhelming number of those young people grow up and move on with their lives, we are hoping to make clarifying changes to the law. We respectfully ask the law be clarified to:

* Allow for recidivism by removing the limit to a single charge or incident. Some young people may need multiple chances to exit the criminal justice system and the overwhelming majority do and pose no risk to public safety.
* Distinguish between dismissals and convictions because many young people get arrested and face charges that get dismissed. Those young people are innocent of crimes and they should not have a record to follow them forever.
* Remove certain restrictions from the 150+ list of charges and allow for the court to do the work the law charges them to do on a case by case basis especially if the case is dismissed of the young person is otherwise found "not guilty."

Refining the law will adequately achieve the desired outcome from 2018: to reduce recidivism, to remove barriers to employment, education, and housing; and to allow people of color who are disproportionately represented in the criminal justice system and who disproportionately experience the collateral consequences of a criminal record the opportunity to move on with their lives and contribute in powerfully positive ways to the Commonwealth and the communities they live, work and

raise families in. Within a system riddled with racial disparities, the final step in the process is to allow for as many people as possible who pose no risk to public safety and who are passionate to pursue a positive future, to achieve that full potential here in Massachusetts or anywhere.

Thank you for your consideration,

Michael Leonard

Program Associate

2 Boylston Street, 4th Floor, Boston, MA 02116

617.279.2249

He/him/his

hria.org

<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__hria.org_&d=DwMF-g&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=-fOXketiEgkIRV8bCbaVEqlVH-IleKqeTE_dHVsvMuo&s=vzuDO4ho6Eh7iFL_9u3Q4rOAzBZNW-G-aXAJz_torHc&e=>

From: Dawn Jubinville <dawnj@me.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:54 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2820

Dear Chairs Michlewitz and Cronin,

I am writing to speak out against the sweeping “act to reform police standards” bill before you today. While I am sure that some standards and training for police officers and others in law enforcement could use improvement, I feel that much in this bill may ultimately harm public safety in the Commonwealth. If I am correct, this bill would also call for abolishing “qualified immunity“ for not only police officers but nurses, EMTs, firefighters and the like. I don’t believe that those in these positions would be able to afford the insurance necessary to protect themselves and their families should the need arise.
While I believe the so-called “Choke hold” is not appropriate, you should not be tying the hands of our police officers with strong restrictions on the use of things like tear gas and rubber bullets, especially when our law-enforcement is sometimes faced with violent rioters and looters.
I urge you to review this bill and edit it while keeping in mind the safety and rights of ALL people because truly, ALL lives DO matter!

Respectfully,

Dawn Jubinville
145 Sesame Street
Dracut, Ma
(No organization affiliation)
Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Justin Banks <jbanks520@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:53 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820 - Please Read

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Justin Banks and I live in Raynham, Massachusetts. I work at MCI-Norfolk and I am a Corrections Officer. As a constituent, I write to express my opposition to Senate Bill 2820. This legislation is detrimental to law enforcement 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

What many politicians that vote on police reform need to consider is how inherently dangerous the job is and the sacrifices that we and our families make for the betterment of society. Traditionally a common argument arises, we chose this line of work. This is true, we chose to dedicate our lives to public service and protecting the public, many of us could have pursued more lucrative private sector careers, but, instead of focusing on ourselves we turned our focus on the community as a whole. Law Enforcement Officers all take this dedication seriously, our goals and focus is outward, we work during the day so members of the public can safely leave their homes without fear that they could be ambushed in the streets or have their home broken into while they work, we work during the evening to ensure that people can safely enjoy the nightlife and patronize bars and restaurants safely without being victimized by predatory individuals, we work nights while the majority of the commonwealth sleeps knowing that they need not worry about staying up each night to protect their home and families, we work weekends and holidays instead of being with our family and loved ones so that society can enjoy their family and loved ones each holiday safely. Each day, each shift and hour we work to provide safety to the people of Massachusetts we put our lives on the line, the threat is real as criminals become increasingly embolden to do whatever it takes whether it be seriously assaulting an officer as seen in January of this year at Souza-Baranowski in which officers were brutally attacked by a large group of convicted violent felons, or even worse committing murder as Sergeant Michael Chesna was brutally killed while serving this Commonwealth. We made this choice to put everything on the line in the name of public service yes, but, did criminals not also make a choice to victimize the public we serve? Criminals' goals are inherently selfish and only focused on themselves and lack the compassion for those whom they victimize. They make the choice to violate society's rule of law

to achieve their goals. Yet as of late many of these reforms seem to be focused on the criminal themselves rather than the victim. Every time that the legislature or politician addresses reforms that focus on the improvement of the criminals' experience in the justice system, they are re-victimizing the arguably most vulnerable citizens. Granted I will admit that there should be focus on reforming individuals, but, what often these bills fail to account for is those who are manipulative and are intent on doing harm to others. Criminals are not the victims, there is so much opportunity in the commonwealth on the streets and even in the justice system. Do not fall victim to the clever words, high paid attorneys and fabricated arguments equating our justice system to something inhumane.

While I am considered a rookie by corrections standards, I have studied criminal justice long before I proudly took the oath. I'm one of those officers who will likely leave the job and no longer pursue law enforcement if pro-criminal legislation like this passed without regard for the brave men and woman who serve Massachusetts. I found that in my almost two years on the job how different prison is working in one versus what you are told by academia, the media or by advocacy groups. We as corrections officers do not carry weapons into the facility, we often work blocks by ourselves inhabited by 60-85 convicted violent felons. What makes this possible is the great men and woman I have the pleasure of working alongside of. Us Corrections Officers make up every demographic there is, but we all wear the same uniform. We do not show up to work hoping to abuse or fight inmates, we show up to work instead hoping that we get to leave safely to go home to our families and loved ones. I would ask that before decisions are made on our behalf, or words of condemnation are said about us you take the time to walk a day in our boots. I can attest that inmates treat us very differently once outsiders are not around to hear or see their words & actions. Often what is said mirrors what outsiders want to hear, their narrative often changes to fit the situation as they have nothing to lose, if the narrative fails on one person they will move onto the next. Meanwhile reforms like these disrupt the safe orderly running of our correctional institutions, they place a greater burden on staff putting them in harms way as inmates become more and more emboldened by support of politicians. Unfortunately, with the reforms such as those proposed, the tools that the department has to safely control these emboldened dangerous individuals are lessened. This takes a toll on staff and to make things worse. It is seldom talked about even though suicide and alcohol abuse remain disproportionately high among all men & woman of law enforcement.

Some points that I believe need to be addressed are :

Qualified Immunity: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the

justice system costing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

Less Than Lethal Tools: The fact that you want to take away an Officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from yelling "Stop", to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

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

I will leave you with this final thought, I vote, my brother / sister officers vote, victims of crimes vote, our families vote, our friends vote, our communities vote. Do not mistake our silent professionalism for a second, we will vote and hold politicians accountable that do not properly represent us and pass legislation that makes our communities less safe.

Respectfully

From: Andrea <ahbaird@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:51 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Pass SB.2800, Reform, Shift, Build Act

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

My name is Andrea Kennedy. I am a resident of Brighton 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 that Massachusetts can do to help protect its citizens of color from police violence and the bill must leave the legislature in its entirety.

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. These are all valuable, vital reforms, and I appreciate that the legislature is moving with urgency to enact them.

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 its demands.

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

Sincerely,

Andrea Kennedy

26 Willoughby Street

Brighton, MA 02135

March like a Mother: for Black Lives

From: Daniel Hamel <daniel.c.hamel@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:50 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S2820 testimony.

To the Chairs Michelewitz and Cronin and to whom it may concern,

I recently completed reading the entire senate bill Number S2820. While overall the bill is well intentioned and does well in meeting those intentions, I have several recommendations to add to this. My first recommendation, although likely unrealistic, is to postpone a vote and separate this bill into multiple smaller bills, so that each portion can be given its due consideration, with the consultation of subject matter experts in both Law Enforcement and the minority communities. I strongly believe that the speed at which the General Court is trying to pass this bill could lead to oversight, a lack of foresight as to unintended outcomes, and could end up being detrimental to the criminal justice system in the Commonwealth of Massachusetts.

That said, below you will find 13 recommendations and changes that I highly encourage the General Court to incorporate into the bill:

1) The makeup of the Police Officer Standards and Accreditation Committee should have more police representation. I suggest adding 1

representative from a college police department, and 1 representative from a small police department made up of mostly reserve officers, preferably from western Mass. Whereas the United States Supreme Court standard for use of force is "objective reasonableness" through the eyes of a police officer with similar training and experience, and the Committee will investigate complaints against police officers to include use of force complaints, there should be more abundant and diverse representation of law enforcement officers for wider perspective. Alternatively, the House could add one or two additional police officers from the Massachusetts Association of Minority Law Enforcement Officers.

2) SECTION 6. Section 225 (a)- line 470. Move "failing to intercede to prevent the use of unreasonable force" to section B under "may revoke". There are too many variables involved with this, and not enough due process. As the legislation stands, it's too easy to sustain a complaint of failing to act against an officer who was present, but did not in fact witness the abuse. Some physical abuses (extra punches, choking, etc) could be very easy to conceal at certain angles. Additionally, the physiological reaction of "tunnel vision" during a confrontation may limit the field of view of an officer, limiting what that officer saw or can recall. Alternatively, and preferably, change the standard of proof for misconduct from "preponderance of evidence" to "beyond reasonable doubt".

3) SECTION 7. Section 255 (f). Line 508. Strike "preponderance of evidence" and replace with "beyond reasonable doubt" or another higher standard of proof. Although police reform is needed, Massachusetts has done a good job regarding police misconduct to date. Do not rush to take away due process. Limiting due process will leave good officers feeling that even when they do good by the law and policy, they may still be held liable or an unfounded complaint may be sustained in an adverse political climate. This will greatly affect the quality of policework, and could affect the quality of police recruit applicants, who will go to other states and border towns where they feel they can do an honest day's work without fearing an unsubstantiated lawsuit. We all have to be cognizant of the line where police reform can go from having beneficial effects on the Commonwealth to detrimental effects on the Commonwealth.

4) SECTION 9. Chapter 12. Section 11H ½ (a) (i). Lines 531-532. Add the word "illegally" between "that" and "deprives". To read "conduct by a law enforcement officer that illegally deprives persons of rights secured by the constitution or laws of the United States or the constitution of the Commonwealth". Police officers can legally deprive an individual of certain rights in certain circumstances, such as a lawful arrest or a lawful search and seizure. A violation of this subsection, where the Attorney General may bring a civil action, but only be for an illegal

violation of constitutional rights. The law must reflect this reality, otherwise good officers will be at risk of lawsuit even when the action they took was legal.

5) SECTION 9. Chapter 12. Section 11H ½ (B) & (C). A lawsuit brought by the AG must be limited to only the most obvious of violations. A reasonable officer working within the confines of their training and law the law must retain immunity.

6) SECTION 10. This is an incredibly dangerous section. It should be amended and deleted all together. Or simplified to explicitly limit frivolous lawsuits brought against police officers. This section should be limited to only if the AG found reasonable cause to bring a lawsuit. If a police officer is acting within their scope of training and policy, they should retain all qualified immunity. Use of excessive force, as determined by Graham v. Connor, shall be the standard for all use of force incidents, and as long as officers maintain "objective reasonableness" Qualified Immunity must stay intact.

7) Eliminate all verbiage that precludes the officers from appealing Civil Service. For the sake of quality policing, officers need to maintain due process, especially when there are allegations of misconduct. The redundancy of appeals ensures biases can be put aside, and officers can receive a fair hearing.

8) SECTION 48. Section 98H. This is a double standard and should be eliminated.

9) SECTION 49. Eliminate the restrictions on gang affiliation for high school students, or high school students age 16 and older. Also, exempt these restrictions for active criminal investigations. OR, explicitly state that "this information shall not be provided, except by warrant issued by a judge or magistrate".

10) SECTION 52 (D)(3). Eliminate this section. Alternatively, in line 1181 strike “shall” and replace with “may”, and defer to department policy.

11) Chapter 147. Section 2 (b) & (c). Good. Make sure these sections retain the wording acknowledging that while de-escalation is preferred, it is not always feasible given the totality of circumstances. That is extremely important, and its removal could potentially cost officers their lives.

12) Chapter 147. Section 2 (d). Allow choke holds as an option for situations requiring lethal force only. Anyone who has any background in wrestling will understand that there could be life threatening situations where that is the only option available to the officer to save their own life. It would not be ethical for the legislature's oversight in this matter to cause the prosecution of an officer who had no other use of force option in a life or death situation. Likewise, chokeholds should not be used to “knock someone out”, “restrain”, or be used in any situation other than a situation requiring the use of deadly physical force where no other option is available.

13) Chapter 147. Section 3 (c). In line 1355, add the word “knowingly” between “and” and “fails”. To read “An officer who has a duty to intervene and knowingly fails to do so may be held liable under sections 11H….”

Thank you for your time and consideration,

Daniel Hamel

South Hadley, MA

978-994-4720

From: spd38@charter.net
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:48 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S2820

I am writing you to urge you to listen to the men and women who serve this Commonwealth as police officers and the everyday citizens who will be effected by the passing of this bill in full. Every day, I leave my family with uncertainty about what my shift will bring. It is bad enough that I have to worry about if I will come home the same person physically or mentally, but I can now have the extra concern of personal liability litigation by a citizen due to the perception of an encounter or arrest.

I feel that officers should be given the due process, just like anyone else. There is not one officer in this state that will feel comfortable coming to work, would you?

My name is Stephanie Howe and I am a police Sergeant with the Sudbury Massachusetts Police Department. I'm also a mother, wife, daughter, and resident of Oakham, Massachusetts. I have been a police officer for 24 years.

I've never witnessed or been part of any type of behavior as that in which this bill is a reaction to. Here in Massachusetts we are known to be well-trained and reasonable officers. In the last few weeks after speaking with many police officers in the state we are very nervous to continue working under these conditions. A vast majority of us with over 20 years would seek other employment. The state would lose a large amount of educated, reasonable, level-headed, well trained officers in a very short amount of time. In all honesty we are scared to do our job if this passes in full.

While this bill protects the members of the community as it should, it does nothing to protect the officers who put themselves at risk every day. The majority of officers that come to work in Massachusetts are not looking to have a violent or explosive encounter. We are not looking to escalate a situation. Most of the calls for service are just that, we are called by someone of concern to assist in a matter they cannot handle. The stress that is put on an officer at every call is incapable of putting into words for a civilian to understand or have the same reasonable perception of danger that an officer sees. Most police officers want to have a peaceful resolution to the calls for service and not have it result in arrest. This bill will make us hesitate to act, have lack of information, resistance from the public, interference in our ability to do our job and enforce peace.

My concerns are the amount of personal information that the public can attain about an individual police officer. The data base that would be allowed for the public to obtain is dangerous and unnecessary. You will allow the public to know every detail (except home address) about an officer, their resume, gender, and race. Do not think that an assigned number will keep our anonymity. The computer age makes it possible to collect information and conclude the information. If you googled a my personal information that is contained in the database any person can find my address in seconds. Our personal lives and families are going to be placed at risk with this information public.

My concerns about the complaints to police officers is that the lack of due process for us. There is currently a process in place that is fair for both the public and public employees. The ability to sue an individual officer for monetary damages will be made easy and accessible with barely any protection at all. We understand that our rights are being stripped here with putting the perception of a complaint on the public and not the courts. Most people do not agree with the arrest that has been made and are very vocal about not committing the crime they are accused. Are we going to start bogging the courts down with lawsuits against officers with frivolous lawsuits? We are not asking for absolute immunity but please

don’t take away the slight protection that we have in doing our daily duties. This places the perception of the law in the defendant’s hands which asks the question; is ignorance of a law reasonable.

Taking away the communication of school resource officers with fellow officers is not only a safety factor for the public but the children. If the point of this section is to protect children, then information sharing is the only way to do it. Sometimes the school or police is the only protection that the children have from domestic or social situations. Information sharing in the schools with school resource officers is paramount to a safe environment. As a parent of a high school child and as a police officer that has experienced a homicide in the high school, I feel this is a detriment to the safety of our children.

The use of force section that addresses choke holds, excessive force and intervening needs to be addressed. Officers in Massachusetts are not trained to use choke holds and would not use them in everyday use of force. I do not agree that as a female officer, if I was attacked in a deadly manner with or without a weapon, that I am banned from using any means necessary to survive the attack. This profession is not one of certainty and scenarios never go as planned. Banning anything outright is what will get more officers killed in the line of duty. Not only will we hesitate, we will get hurt in the meantime. We are trained to react to what is presented to us and we are also trained to attempt to deescalate, which is not always feasible.

Please remember Officer Chesna that was disabled by a rock and killed with his own gun, Officer Tarentino that was shot with no notice or chance to deescalate and Sgt. Gannon that was shot in the head during a search warrant where the defendant had time to hide. There was no option for other means of force, to negotiate with the defendants or try and “talk” these people down. Please keep in mind the split second decisions we make every day and sometimes we don’t have hours to figure situations out.

I support enhanced training and appropriate certification standards and policies that promote fair and unbiased treatment of all citizens, INCLUDING POLICE OFFICERS.

Thank you for your time and consideration.

Respectfully,

Sgt Stephanie Howe

Sudbury Police Department

Resident of Oakham, MA

508-294-6455

From: Victoria Rando <Victoria_Rando@outlook.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:46 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S.2820

Dear House of Representatives,

My name is Victoria Rando and I grew up in Wrentham, MA but currently reside in Franklin, 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, disgraceful, 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 the following:

(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.

In closing, I remind you that those who protect and serve communities across Massachusetts are some of the most sophisticated, honorable, & well educated law enforcement officials in the nation. Let me remind you that in 2015 President Obama recognized the Boston Police Department as one of

the best in the nation at community policing. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2820 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement who choose to put their lives on the line every single day to protect their communities with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Sincerely,

Victoria Rando

From: Elvis Nguyen <elvis.nguyen001@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:43 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police "Reform" Bill

Whomever it might concern,

My name is Elvis Nguyen and I'm a resident of Marshfield. I'm writing to you to express my concern over the current police reform bill that the house is trying to pass in a rushed and uneducated manner. This bill will affect the well-being and livelihood of law enforcement families across the Commonwealth, in addition it will effect our officers judgement and have them second guessing when they are put in difficult situations. Situations, Mr. Kearney that you will never understand unless you do police work. Comparing the law enforcement profession to doctors and lawyers in regards to liability is comparing apples to oranges and quite frankly uneducated. Doctors and Lawyers spend years and thousands and thousands of hours on education and have time to analyze the situation they're in. In addition people go to lawyers and doctors voluntarily. Law enforcement on the other hand, deal with peoples freedom and at an instant a detention takes that away. This is done every single day as part of an investigation for a crimes throughout your Commonwealth. Police officers aren't in school for years. As a matter of fact it's 6 months and you're sent out on the streets to do the job which requires you to detain people essentially taking their freedom away. If your only knowledge of law enforcement is what you see on TV then I invite you do a ride along with me or you can ask any police department for that matter and for a one day experience on what we experience.

I'm sure we can agree that the acts in Minneapolis on May 25, 2020 were excessive and flat out wrong in every aspect of humanity. I also agree that police reform is necessary in order to address the issues of injustice in our criminal justice system. There is no denial that this system needs to be fixed. However, it is detrimental to have the input of our officers on any such reforms. Officers who live the reality and answer the call to respond to issues in our communities that others do not see. Violence that the media does not report on, and violence that our legislators do not live in every day. Proposing and passing anything without a conversation and fully understanding the issue can and will have negative effects on public safety and cause more harm to the community than good.

I entered this profession with a strong desire to help people, and that desire is still there. I do not seek praise or gratitude, nor do I want it. What I do ask for is our leaders to understand the changes you make and the positions you will be putting us in with these changes. Taking away qualified immunity and changing it in anyway shape or form, takes away my peace of mind when I go to work. This is what allows me to sleep at night knowing that I don't have to worry about the well-being of my family. Please don't use the police as a scapegoat for political agendas. In my short 8 years in law enforcement, I have personally seen the morale in Officers and Troopers decline each and every day. Anybody who tells you that morale is "good" is lying. Never have I seen so many people in this profession seeking different career alternatives. Fear that they could potentially lose everything they have worked so hard for to better themselves, their families and their communities.

To every Legislator. I am a Massachusetts State Trooper, I am a husband, a father and a son. I am a minority, first generation Vietnamese American. I grew up in the City of Boston, the Old Colony housing projects to be precise. I went to Boston Public Schools. I am where I am today because of the life choices I made. I am in this profession because positive interactions with the Police when I was a teenager. I worked hard to get to where I am today. I'm proud of my accomplishments. Don't strip away at the fabric that protects me and my family. I am open to a conversation at anytime. Please give me a call or email me.

If you even bother. Please take a few minutes to read this article.

http://archive.boston.com/news/local/massachusetts/articles/2004/10/31/transcending_the_mean_streets/
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__archive.boston.com_news_local_massachusetts_articles_2004_10_31_transcending-5Fthe-5Fmean-5Fstreets_&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=xF1gbZ4S0Orb2Bs0OQuAdsq2gadMj79YwdTZtYnLhOQ&s=CmAlJhpNtdYe_5iQPZbzW4PWaq28w0WnhgLOYMx6zTc&e=>

P.S.

If you read the attached article. I want you to know that I remember this day clearly and I worked hard at life to make it through to buy that house in the suburbs that I dreamt of. Don't strip away at the protections I

currently have in my career that protects and jeopardizes my life accomplishments.

In the words of the father of modern day policing “The police are the public and the public are the police; the police being only members of the public who are paid to give full time attention to duties which are incumbent on every citizen in the interests of community welfare and existence.” Sir Robert Peel

Thank you for your consideration.

Elvis Nguyen

35 Ryder Lane, Marshfield MA 02050 <x-apple-data-detectors://3>

617-372- <tel:617-372-2338> 2338 <tel:617-372-2338>

From: Brandon Sanders <bsanders99@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:41 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony for Bill No. S2820

To the House of Representatives,

This letter is to share my testimony regarding Bill No. S2820. First, I’d like to briefly introduce myself. My name is Brandon Sanders, I am a 24 year old full time Police Officer residing in the Town of Pembroke. I have been been a sworn Police Officer since December of 2016, and took the oath to protect and serve my communities at the young age of 21. Since I was teenager, I truly wanted to be a Police Officer and I firmly believe that public service saved my life. I grew up in a single family home with no father and no role models. I once believed criminality was admirable, until at the age of 16, I met local Police Officers who gave me guidance and led me to the life I now lead.

Seeing what’s happening across this country and this state is truly heartbreaking to both our civilian and police communities alike. I understand that people are mad, so am I. I understand that change could benefit all of us equally, I do truly believe that as we proceed forward in this country and states future. What I do not understand, and what I do not believe in is this Bill S2820. This bill is damaging, and we as Police Officers will not be able to return from this. Reform is welcomed among us law enforcement officers, I promise you that, but not this. My perspective on this bill is that lawmakers, civilians, and advocates are angry. These people are pushing this quickly presented bill on sheer emotion. If we can set emotion aside and all work together to form a bill that will truly change the police and public interactions, I believe that would be a tremendous thing welcomed by all. But again, THIS BILL IS NOT IT.

The most troubling presentation within this bill is the attack on Police Officers and Qualified Immunity. Coming from a Police Officer who upholds their oath every day, and truly loves serving their community, I am scared for us all. Qualified Immunity does not protect bad cops, I can assure you that. I assure you that nobody hates a BAD cop more than a GOOD Police Officer. Qualified Immunity protects cops like the brave men and woman I served with on a day to day basis who go out and try to make a difference. Qualified Immunity protects these Officers who consistently get put in incredibly troubling, complex, and difficult situations. Qualified Immunity protects someone like ME, who goes out and truly does their best every single minute of every single shift. The obvious is that there is inherit risks in being a Police Officer, and we often get called to horrific scenes in which we must make split second decisions. Qualified Immunity protects the Officer who simply showed up to that emergency and did the best they possibly could. Qualified Immunity protects the Officer who may show up to you or your families emergency, who simply did the best they possibly could. PLEASE, consider the totality of what is in front of you.

I will now conclude my testimony and leave you on this note. Sir Robert Peele, the founding father of modern day policing once said, “the Police are the public, and the public are the Police.” I assure you that us Police Officers are people as well. We are your neighbors, your friends, and your family. The same people that this bill is set to destroy are the same people that pass you in the grocery store, that you are sitting next to at a restaurant as we eat with our families, and that you are amongst all day every day in passing. I assure you that we care so very much about all of you, even though we may have never met you a day in our lives. What we are asking for is that on this bill, you just care for us a little bit back.

Respectfully,

Officer Brandon Sanders

9 Sheila Road, Pembroke MA

(781)-733-0196

From: Austin Arroco <aiarroco@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:39 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony for Bill S.2820 to increase police accountability

To the House Committee on Ways and Means,

My name is Austin Arroco, a resident of the Fulton Street neighborhood in Medford. I am writing to provide personal testimony in favor of Bill S.2820 relating in particular to reducing budgets for Massachusetts police departments and reallocating those funds to community programs and organizations that will help to provide support, improve safety and create systemic equity for Black and Brown communities. Specifically, I am glad to see that increased accountability in the acquisition of military grade equipment is required by this bill.

As a materials engineer, I have spent many years developing technologies for government contracts, and in some cases, law enforcement agencies in Massachusetts have expressed interest in bidding on those technologies. This is problematic because these agencies have no immediate or suitable reason to use these specialized technologies. I envision stockpiles of unused equipment and consumable materials that have been purchased just in case they are needed. This unjustifiable expenditure of funds for just-in-case scenarios is unacceptable while there are clear, definable and immediate needs present, and happily, this bill takes measures to prevent that.

As it stands however, the bill can go even further by requiring law enforcement to understand their community's needs. Seeking public comment on military grade controlled property, as required by changes to Sections 39 and 40, is a first step towards appropriate funding allocation. Law enforcement agencies should also be required to learn about local aid organizations and invite them to the public hearing for input. These organizations should include Black and Brown community groups and leaders. This way, the public has a clear choice presented to them as opposed to choosing yes or no for military grade equipment. More than policing and military grade equipment, engaging the community is absolutely critical for improving the safety in our towns, our cities and our state.

This bill takes steps towards safer and more equitable communities, and we can absolutely do more. By including community organizations and leaders, particularly from Black and Brown communities, in the process, we can

reallocate funds where they are truly needed. As a life-long Massachusetts native, I hope to see more change enacted that reaches toward systemic equity for all of the state's citizens. We have a long road ahead of us, and we all must work together to make it happen. Thank you all for your valuable time and energy.

Sincerely,
Austin Arroco

<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.avast.com_sig-2Demail-3Futm-5Fmedium-3Demail-26utm-5Fsource-3Dlink-26utm-5Fcampaign-3Dsig-2Demail-26utm-5Fcontent-3Dwebmail-26utm-5Fterm-3Dicon&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=Eltq7Xa93aN2Gcjsy0aWxDOF1kdIp0vC47pmo2edjck&s=irAS4PAzgKPY2G2fsWKrVg3Bllx4J0-Gs3KEeswfiCk&e=> Virus-free. www.avast.com
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.avast.com_sig-2Demail-3Futm-5Fmedium-3Demail-26utm-5Fsource-3Dlink-26utm-5Fcampaign-3Dsig-2Demail-26utm-5Fcontent-3Dwebmail-26utm-5Fterm-3Dlink&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=Eltq7Xa93aN2Gcjsy0aWxDOF1kdIp0vC47pmo2edjck&s=AjL0V8BNR28dqbiHMnBXki6Yhhiuj8H-kTdv9q4bd98&e=>
From: BRIAN SIMPKINS <bsimp1@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:39 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

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,

Brian Simpkins

Bsimp1@msn.com

Sent from my iPhone
From: Robert Furtado <rkfurtado@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:39 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Haddad, Patricia - Rep. (HOU); Robert Furtado
Subject: Bill S2820

The Chair of the House Committee of Ways and Means,

As a retired police officer with 38+ years of experience, I respectfully ask that you please consider the ramifications of Bill S2820.

Many of the rules and restrictions contained in this bill are bound to not only have a detrimental effect on the police doing their sworn duty of protecting the lives and property of our citizens, but will infact put them at risk of frivolous law suits, and being injured or killed.

Police Officers have to make split second decisions in life or death situations. They do not need the added burden of thinking that they could face a frivolous law suit or prosecution for simply doing their job!

I speak from experience having personally been the victim of 2 frivolous federal lawsuits by convicted felons both of which were dismissed without a settlement.

The elimination of Qualified Immunity will only open officers up to more such law suits.

In regards to the absolute ban on the so called "choke-hold" although it is not part of any current police practice, no option should be taken off the table when deadly force is being used against an officer or innocent victim. I only once resorted to using a "choke-hold". It was during a struggle in a confined area with a suspect, much larger than me, who was attempting to take my weapon as he tried to gouge out my right eye with his fingers. Although I required treatment for a severe eye injury I managed to retain my weapon and he was subdued and placed under arrest, uninjured, I might add. Had he managed to take my firearm I may have been killed along with other responding officers and the woman and child he had threatened to kill and was holding against their will.

Massachusetts has always been a leader in police training and has strived to assure it's law enforcement officers were the most educated and professional in the country.

Department Certification and Accreditation along with Education Incentives and Specialized Training have proven effective, producing well educated, well rounded officers who take their positions seriously and do their jobs straight up!

As someone who has been directly responsible for prosecution and removal of Bad Cops I can tell you that nobody hates a bad cop more than a good one! Please don't let the deplorable actions of a few criminals who have managed to infiltrate our ranks effect the ability of our professional men and women to effectively do their jobs as safely as possible.

Respectfully,
Robert Furtado
Deputy Chief of Police (ret.)
Swansea,MA.
Get Outlook for Android <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__aka.ms_ghei36&d=DwMFAg&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=CsTOkQSGYDoRJFyjYyJeeXFvoeekISyodAqHceKKk-s&s=k6oR_xyw_HKf_Bdz3cicBShnnsa0-KOZtm6_NVKQ9D4&e=>
From: Greg Helms <greg.helms22@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:39 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate bill

First a letter from Springfield PD. Great leadership!

To whom this may concern,

My name is Aaron O. Butler, I am a black Police Lieutenant in the City of Springfield and I am assigned to the Internal Investigations Unit. I read

the bill your trying to pass and I find it disgraceful and a symbolic spit in my face and the faces of every honest hard-working Police Officer in the Commonwealth. Before I continue I know that not all of you have disdain and disrespect for us, I know many of you are on the side of common sense and what is fair and just and I have no doubt you are as disgusted with your colleagues as I am.

The idea that a person does not get due process in the United States before being deprived of their liberty and hard work is an absolute shame and is offensive to the principles that this country was founded on and what the court system is based on, being treated fairly and with respect, it's obvious some of you do not care about these things for the people who risk their lives to keep your cities and towns safe.

You obviously have a feverish need to do "something" because of this silly idea that black men are being hunted down by racist white cops. Nothing is further from the truth, you feel this need to do "something", only the something is disgraceful. I do not have any problem with a POST system, no Police Officer I have spoken to does it's the lack of common sense and fairness in the bill that we a problem with. And what happened to George Floyd, which obviously prompted this has nothing to do with any Police Officer in the Commonwealth, stop punishing us for what some filthy excuse for humans did on the other side of the country.

Let me tell you what is going to happen, first no Police Officer will do anything other than what is absolutely necessary because our supposed leaders have stabbed us in the back over pressure to do "something" even the something is reckless and disgusting, which I am sure is the reason why some of you tried to sneak this bill through when no one was looking.

I suspect a vast majority of Police Officers who can retire, will, others with less time will just quit and the ones who have to stay will be disgruntled and will not engage in any type of activity unless they get a call and they absolutely have to do something. At some point when the ranks gets drastically low, the only people foolish enough to take this miserable and thank less job will be the people you don't want and who had tried in the past to get on the job but were rejected. Chiefs will have no choice but to hire them because someone has to the job.

You are going to destroy law and order and you will wonder why Police Officers refuse to do their jobs or why good, educated people will not take the job. I have spoken to a few of the younger Officers who are confused and very angry and have asked me what to do, I told them to get out now, why the hell would anyone do this job with political leaders stabbing them in the back. You are going to see young, educated people leave this job and in case you did not know this, we need them to stay and you are going to drive them out and like I said we will be left with people who are only looking for a paycheck and don't belong on the job.

It's clear that a lot of you have no idea what qualified immunity is, you seem to think cops just run around punching people, like the liars in the DOJ and the AG's office think of Springfield Police. It is far from that. It simply means without being too complicated that if a Police Officer is doing the right thing you cannot sue him/her. Which makes perfect sense,

how are Police Officers supposed to do their job if they are getting sued every time they turn their head.

Maybe the flood gates should be open to sue Politicians for laws that are passed where someone gets falsely accused, you would not like that, would you? You need to ask yourselves why anyone would want to do this job with no protection. This bill is the exact type of discrimination you are complaining about, you want to penalize Police Officers, unjustly for what a few, and yes, a few bad apples have done, that are being dealt with. And please stop listening to NAACP, they have not been a civil rights organization in years, they are just a political action committee.

It is interesting that many of you are attorneys and what your doing is offensive to the United States Constitution, the Massachusetts Declaration of Rights, common sense, fair play and what's right. What are you going to do when Law and Order falls apart in the Commonwealth and the crime rate explodes like it is in New York City? Police Officers there are falling over each other to retire, and if you think it will not happen here, you are sadly, sadly mistaken.

Aaron O. Butler
Springfield, Ma

Also

A lot of people have asked about qualified immunity. Here is a good explanation:

Qualified immunity protects public servants that are doing their job and acting in good faith from civil litigation. If we do something outside the scope of our training, we are not covered. Here are a few instances in which we are covered, which will change if this bill passes.

-one of your loved ones drops from a heart attack. There is no pulse when we arrive, we immediately start CPR. During CPR, trying to save their life, we break a rib during compressions (which happens almost all the time during CPR). As it stands now, I am covered by qualified immunity because I was acting based upon my training trying to save a life. This all ends if bill 2800 passes.

-you or your loved one is in a horrific crash. I race there lights and siren to save you or your family memeber. As long as I follow policy and training if I were to get into a crash myself (while responding to help you), I am covered. This all ends if bill 2800 passes.

- you call us because you are out shopping and you notice a dog locked in a car. It's 85 degrees out. Right now, I can break that window out to save that dog and not worry about personally being sued by the vehicle owner. This changes if Bill 2800 passes.

There are a million scenarios that running through my head right now. Do you want your first responders to be able to react or do you want our hands tied?

This bill is nothing but BS politics. When have our legislators ever passed a law that didn't take a year or two to pass? When have they ever passed a law without hearings, committees etc? Do you know that they have added an amendment that will allow them (legislators) to receive monetary gifts?why is that in a law enforcement bill? This bill stinks and they know it.

Please, for the safety of our society. So our children can live in a reasonably peaceful world, I beg you to call, write your senators and reps regarding bill S 2800.

Lastly

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my staunch opposition to S.2800, 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.

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. Let me remind you that in 2015 President Obama recognized the Boston Police Department as one of the best in the nation at community policing. I again implore you to amend and correct S.2800 so as to treat the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Sincerely,

Greg H

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: BRIAN SIMPKINS <bsimp1@msn.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:39 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Timilty, Walter (SEN); Galvin, William - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: Police reform

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,

Brian Simpkins

Bsimp1@msn.com

Sent from my iPhone
From: Julie N. DiOrio <juldiorio@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:25 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony for Bil 2820

To whom it may concern,

As a private music teacher, for the past 18 years I have had the opportunity to teach music to students of all ages, one on one. As musicians, some have had plentiful access to resources such as quality instruments, technology to supplement their learning, access to tools such as tuners and metronomes, while others have not. As one may imagine, I have found that students who have are unable to access such resources also have difficulty learning their instrument.

In addition to teaching students in their homes, I also taught in a private, high-tuition, Montessori school for 2 years early in my career. When I arrived at this school, the classroom was already fully stocked with instruments from all over the world, high quality computers, microphones, and speakers. In addition, I was given a seemingly unlimited budget with which to purchase whatever resources my curriculum required. I was also paid overtime for as many hours as I needed in order to prepare to implement this curriculum. Needless to say, with the help of these plentiful resources I was able to find a path to nearly every single students' learning style.

In contrast, I wonder what kind of success rate could be possible in any subject if public school budgets were higher. What could public school teachers create if they were given enough support to take the time to tailor lessons to all learning styles? What could public school students learn about their aptitude for a particular subject or skill if they had a varied set of tools and resources at their disposal with which to experiment?

I believe that law enforcement is an important part of a community. However, I believe that police departments in Massachusetts and the U.S. overall are grossly over funded. A significant portion of funding to police departments would be more useful if reallocated to public schools. If students are given the resources and support to succeed from a young age, perhaps they are less likely to require the services of law enforcement later in life.

Thank you,
Julie DiOrio
From: Jen Lawless <lawjen21@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:25 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Opposition to S2820

Dear Chair Aaron Michlewitz and Chair Claire Cronin,

I am writing to you in opposition to Bill S2820. I am disappointed beyond belief that people could even consider passing this bill. Back in March you all were praising the first responders & their dedication to their jobs as they left their homes & family's daily during a pandemic while you sat in the comforts of your home in front of a computer. They not only had to face the challenges of the job but then worry about catching Covid as well. You all sang their praises & said how wonderful they were yet just a few months later your willing to stab them in the back with this bill. Nobody is saying some things could change but to get rid of Qualified Immunity is a disgrace. Why don't you all take a week & do a ride along with a City police officer. See the calls they answer & the situations they face on a daily basis. Then tell me how you would react in a split second. Tell me how you would handle it better. Tell me how every police officer in this state is being punished because of a bad cop in Minneapolis. How is this fair? Your not on the streets. Your not answering the calls. Your not there but your making desicions about how they do their job when you've never spent a second in their shoes. Tell me how many times you've administered Narcan? Because police officers & fire fighters do it everyday saving lives yet I don't think that was ever part of their job description. Tell me how many domestic calls you've been to where the victim says there abused & then show up at court the next morning saying they weren't, that they were just mad & wanted the person removed not arrested. Open your eyes & think of what your doing. Your putting every public employee at risk for doing their job! It's disgusting!
Two years ago so many of you & your colleagues sat in Saint Mary's Church in Hanover for the funeral of Sgt Michael Chesna. Almost all of you had never even met him. Yet you said how much you supported his family & fellow officers. Guess a lot changes in a couple years. Did you forget Michael was responding to a 911 call from a doctor for an erratic driver that almost hit him head on... He was shot multiple times along with Vera Adams an innocent woman just having coffee on her porch. Do you know how many contacts with police that defendant had? So if your taking Qualified Immunity away from first responders are you taking it away from yourselves for making the laws limiting their ability to do their jobs? Or how about for the judges & clerks who release the criminals that go offend again even kill innocent people? If your going to blame all first responders in this state for something that happened in Minneapolis then I think you should be held accountable to for your split second decisions too!

Jennifer Lawless
6177746418From: Daniel Duff <dduff904@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:24 AM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2820

The Chair of the House Committee on Ways and Means, Rep. Aaron Michlewitz, in cooperation with Rep. Claire Cronin, Chair of the Joint Committee on the Judiciary

My name is Daniel Duff. I live at 102 Manatee Rd in Hingham. My phone number is 781-740-8903.

I've been a police officer for over 30 years. In that time I've risen to the rank of Lieutenant Detective in the Boston Police Department. I'm concerned with Senate Bill S2820. It affects me and all of the people I work with.

The senate version will seriously undermine public safety The false narrative that Qualified Immunity prevents the public from suing Police Officers and holding them accountable which dominated the senate debate masked provisions in the bill which will have a serious impact on critical public safety issues. The unintended and unnecessary changes to QI hamstring police offices in the course of their duties due to the fact that they will be subjected to numerous frivolous nuisance suits for any of their actions.

The process employed by the senate of using an omnibus bill with numerous, diverse and complicated policy issues coupled with limited public and professional participation was undemocratic, flawed and totally non transparent. The original version of the bill was over 70 pages, had hundreds of changes to public safety sections of the general laws and sound public policy sections,it was sent to the floor with no hearing and less than a couple of days for the members to digest/caucus and receive public comment.

Police support uniform statewide training standards and policies as well as an appropriate regulatory board which is fair and unbiased. The senate created a board that is dominated by groups who have stated anti law enforcement biases and preconceived punitive motives toward police. The board as proposed is unlike any other of the 160 professional regulatory boards in the Commonwealth that the Black and Latino Caucus and its individual members as well as the Governor repeatedly and publicly stated should be used as the example of the model to be used. Its composition is fundamentally incapable of providing regulatory due process. Furthermore, the proposed members are completely devoid of sufficient experience in law enforcement to create training policies and standards unlike members of the other 160 professional boards.

Revisions to Qualified Immunity are unnecessary if the Legislature adopts uniform statewide standards and bans unlawful use of force techniques which all police personnel unequivocally support. Once we have uniform standards and policies and the statutory banning of use of force techniques both the officers and the individual citizens will know what is reasonable and have a clear picture of what conduct is a violation of a citizen's rights and that conduct cannot be protected by QI. This will also limit the potential explosion of civil suits against other public employee groups, thus reducing costs that would otherwise go through the roof and potentially have a devastating impact on municipal and agency budgets.

Respectfully,
Daniel Duff

From: Michael Rubenstein <michaelcrubenstein@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:21 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony on S.2820

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

Hello, my name is Michael Rubenstein with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 130 Willard Road, Brookline, MA 02445. 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

I urge you to adopt the Senate language to reform the legal doctrine of qualified immunity. This reform will allow the few applicable cases to be heard by a jury without being dismissed because the particular violation of 4th amendment rights by a public official, such as a police officer, has never been previously contemplated by a statute or a court precedent. Those cases deserve to be heard on their merits, not thrown out using a non-statutory legal doctrine. It is simply outrageous that those who have suffered from the egregious violations of police officers can not get their day in court.

In addition, it is clear that qualified immunity reform will not have devastating financial impact on any police officers as they are indemnified by the municipalities that employ them. Any such claims are not based on fact and should not be considered as you consider this reform.

Thank you very much.

Michael Rubenstein
130 Willard Rd.
Brookline, MA 02445
617-739-2987
michaelcrubenstein@gmail.com
From: MassCOP Local, 151 <masscop151@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:20 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Written Testimony

My testimony for the record:

Dear Committee Members,

There have been recent high-profile events outside of Massachusetts that have resulted in arrests of police officers.

All these events have taken place in other states, yet police officers in Massachusetts are somehow assumed to share responsibility for these painful incidents.

We certainly are not perfect, but instead of casting shared responsibility onto us, legislators should be asking us what we are doing right in our Massachusetts communities, instead of assuming we are doing something wrong.

In the Town of Clinton, there is not a neighborhood, school, or business where we do not feel welcome. The level of trust and respect in our truly diverse community is something we take great pride in. The results speak for themselves. I would encourage anyone to come to Clinton and learn about what we are doing right.

This process is moving far too quickly. A knee jerk reaction to serious events. I have not had enough time to absorb or fully comprehend the totality of how my beloved profession could change.

I do know this. Police officers and other municipal employees should maintain qualified immunity. Police officers acting in good faith, sometimes having to make a split-second decision, should not have to worry that any step they take could end in a lawsuit that takes their home and life savings and hurts their families. Officers should also continue to have the protection of due process.

Sadly, given the perceived lack of support with persons on Beacon Hill, many of my colleagues are preparing to retire rather than face an uncertain future. This alone is a crisis that is not being reported.

Police officers cannot do their job effectively without the support of their community AND their elected officials.

I ask you to consider the above and take the necessary time needed to get this right.

Respectfully Yours,

Paul Silvester

--

Paul Silvester
President
Mass COP Local 151
176 Chestnut St.
Clinton, MA 01510
masscop151@gmail.com
From: Joe McNamara <joemc33@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:17 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: Annie <wildwatercress@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:16 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform Bill

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

Hello, my name is Ann Spanel with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 85 Pemberton St . 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.

Ann Spanel
wildwatercress@gmail.com
617-547-1533
85 Pemberton St.
Cambridge, MA 02140

From: Brendon Tivnan <bren8389@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:13 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform/anti labor union bill

Good evening,

My name is Brendon Tivnan and I'm writing this email in regards to the police reform/anti labor union bill currently under legislation. I am lifelong Worcester resident, and have been a Worcester police officer since 2012. My father and brother have proudly served the city as police officers since 1983 and 2008, respectively.

I am writing this to request that a public hearing be held on this matter. I have also CC'd my state representative, Mr James O'Day, to implore I'm to consider the following amendments and push for the adoption in the bill:

1. Qualified Immunity
2. Due Process/Collective Bargaining
3. Make up of the POSAC board

The current make up of this bill is harshly unfair to the police officers and public employees within the Commonwealth. This country and democracy have been built on fair and impartial proceedings; this bill is the complete opposite. This bill unfairly puts police officers under scrutiny of people who have never done the job, giving them an opportunity to unfairly persecute us and taking our right to due process and collective bargaining.

To my State Rep Mr James O'Day,
As you know, the Democratic Party has been long been supportive of labor unions and have used that platform as their stronghold. The current bill clearly goes against all that the Democratic Party stands for and is a clear, anti labor bill that takes away processes that have been cemented in both labor unions and the Democratic Party for years.

As your constituent, I asked that you maintain your roots in the Democratic Party, support labor unions, due process and collective bargaining but supporting these amendments.

Without these amendments, the bill handcuffs police officers and gives them no incentive to proactively police the streets and neighborhoods of your district, and throughout the commonwealth. It opens police officers for more liability which will increase crime drastically creating a further ripple effect on violence against the police. As a police officer and resident of Worcester, I want to be safe and go home at night to my family. These amendments will help me to do that.

Thank you for taking the time to read this email from a proud UNION member of NEPBA Local 911.

Sincerely,
Brendon Tivnan

Sent from my iPhone

From: Kate Wildman <krwildman@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:13 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony for S.2820

Katherine Wildman
51 Seaverns Avenue Apt. #3L Boston, MA 02130
508 615 8895
Krwildman@gmail.com

Karen E. Spilka, Senate
Massachusetts State House, Boston, MA 02133
Robert A. DeLeo, House committee
Massachusetts State House, Boston, MA 02133

Dear Chair Karen Spilka and Chair Robert DeLeo,

I am writing to you in support of Senate/House bill S.2820.

I support this bills' proposal to make police misconduct accessible public record, I support the ban of no-knock warrants and chokeholds, I support the ban on tear gas and chemical weapons, and I support strengthened limits to the use of police force.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter and your dedication to reforming police standards and shift resources to build a more equitable and fair and just commonwealth that values Black lives and communities of color.

Sincerely,
Katherine Wildman
--

Katherine Wildman
www.katherinewildman.com <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.katherinewildman.com&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=_p3pQNDN7mxvLuMhXDIe0R0mi4lZpKb6ZBVPNsrSkYc&s=Bes66wo_QWcLVkMsEMmndFdHiGlBRwej1ChJHS--bZU&e=>
From: Robert Kenney <bobkenney@live.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:10 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill No. S2820Title: 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

* I stand against S2820 as presented.

* The senate version of this bill as written will seriously undermine public safety by limiting police officer's ability to do their jobs while simultaneously allowing provisions to protect criminals. Furthermore, the process employed by the Senate to push this through with such haste without public hearing or input of any kind was extremely undemocratic and nontransparent.

* Police across the commonwealth support uniform training standards and policies and have been requesting more training for years.

* Massachusetts police officers are among highest educated and trained in the country

* This bill directly attacks qualified immunity and due process. Qualified immunity does not protect bad officers, it protects good officers from civil lawsuits. We should want our officers to be able to act to protect our communities without fear of being sued at every turn, otherwise why would they put themselves at risk? A large majority of law enforcement officers do the right thing and are good officers, yet there is a real push to end qualified immunity to open good officers up to frivolous lawsuits because of the actions of a few who, by their own actions, would not be covered by qualified immunity anyway. It just doesn't make any sense why we are endangering the livelihood of many for the actions of a few.

* Changes to qualified immunity would be unnecessary if the legislature adopted a uniform statewide standard and bans unlawful use of force techniques which all police personnel unequivocally support.

* If the senate bill is passed in its current form the costs to municipalities and the State will skyrocket from frivolous lawsuits and potentially have a devastating impact on budgets statewide.

Respectfully,
Robert Kenney

20 Taylor Point Road
Pembroke, Ma 02359

781-335-0268

I am a Boston Police Detective

?

From: Paul Belanger <belanger.paul@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:09 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2820

To Whom It May Concern,

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,

Paul Belanger

59 Sharlene Lane

Plainville, MA 02762

belanger.paul@comcast.net

508-380-0135

From: Margot Barnet <margot.barnet@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:09 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform legislation

To: members of Massachusetts House of Representatives Judiciary Committee

I write to you as a resident of Worcester, a concerned citizen, health care provider, and racial justice activist. Now is the time for all of us to take decisive steps toward real public safety, recognizing the ways that our approach to policing has harmed communities of color, and investing in our under-resourced neighborhoods. I have already contacted my own State Representative about this legislation and will also forward him this letter.

I am aware that you are developing a comprehensive bill following the Senate passage of S2800 earlier this week. I ask that your legislation include the following elements:

* Use of force standards as laid out in An Act to Save Black Lives (Miranda). This includes a total ban on chokeholds, banning tear gas and other chemical weapons, banning no-knock warrants, and establishing a duty to intervene when an officer witnesses another officer using inappropriate force or other abusive acts;
* Strict limits on qualified immunity;
* Banning facial recognition technology, which has been shown to be remarkably inaccurate for Black people;
* Re-investment in neighborhoods most impacted by overpolicing and mass incarceration via the Justice Reinvestment Trust Fund -- eliminating the $10 million per year cap imposed in the Senate bill;
* Ensuring that police misconduct records are made public.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,
Margot Barnet

121 Glendale Street
Worcester, MA 01602
508-752-3404

From: Derek Anderson <bderekanderson@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:07 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Re: Testimony in support of Senate bill S.2800

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

Please note my testimony in my previous email is in support of Senate bill S.2820.

Thank you,
B. Derek Anderson

From: Derek Anderson <bderekanderson@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:31:32 PM
To: Testimony.HWMJudiciary@mahouse.gov
<Testimony.HWMJudiciary@mahouse.gov>
Subject: Testimony in support of Senate bill S.2800

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

I am writing in support of Senate bill S.2800.

Over the years, the ability of our city and town governments to create and manage policing that meets the needs and aspirations of our communities has been dismantled, including by the non-statutory judge-made doctrine of qualified immunity, and the Chapter 150E collective bargaining law and the Joint Labor Management Committee statute that together eliminate effective options for accountability.

This bill provides important legislation that begins to return those rights to our communities. It also creates a much needed system for the training and certification of police officers, and makes other necessary changes to law and policy to improve and enhance the accountability of policing in the Commonwealth. This is landmark legislation that would help transform how law enforcement is practiced in Massachusetts, with a long overdue focus on racial equity in our justice system.

Thank you for your consideration on this matter.

Sincerely,

B. Derek Anderson

16 Myrtle Street, Medford, MA 02155

617-279-3773
BDerekAnderson@gmail.com
From: Annmarie Ducey <annmarie55ducey@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:07 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, and 52, as well as amend Section 63 to have more police representation.

Sincerely,

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__go.onelink.me_107872968-3Fpid-3DInProduct-26c-3DGlobal-5FInternal-5FYGrowth-5FAndroidEmailSig-5F-5FAndroidUsers-26af-5Fwl-3Dym-26af-5Fsub1-3DInternal-26af-5Fsub2-3DGlobal-5FYGrowth-26af-5Fsub3-3DEmailSignature&d=DwMCaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-

fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=3whDg-_pn3oyMOiNKlvRQ1cYrqqFVJstVrgHOrr9Qtw&s=CZjHDlejrKfiEcwbSSEMwf4gEmEMLM48c8VLe961jXI&e=>
From: Matthew Hubbard <matthewshubbard@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 12:02 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: 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.

Thank you,

Matthew Hubbard, 487 Meadow St. Agawam, MA 01001 matthewshubbard@gmail.com
From: Nupur Neogi <nneogi@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:59 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Reform, Shift + Build Act

Hi,
I am a resident of Boston, MA and I unequivocally support the Reform, Shift + Build Act (S.2800).
Massachusetts has always been on the forefront of states passing legislation to support the people that live here and we've never shied away from decisions that seemed radical at the time. I have always been proud of - and bragged about - MA being the first state to legalize gay marriage, and I hope to see us continue to make the right choices ahead of the curve and set the standard for the rest of the country to follow. It's time to eliminate qualified immunity, ban chokeholds, reallocate state funds to communities disproportionately impacted by the criminal justice system, and allow the Mass AG to file lawsuits against discriminatory police departments. I hope to see this legislation pass so I can continue to be a proud resident.
Thank you,
Nupur

From: Jeffrey Carreau <jeffcarreau@hotmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:58 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S2800

To the members of the House Committee on Ways and Means and the House of Representatives,

My name is Jeff Carreau and I am a Police Officer with the Woburn Police Department. I am writing this email to voice my concern and my opposition to Bill S2800. I am wondering what is the need for this bill in the first place. This is a hastily thrown together piece of legislation based on nothing. This seems to be a ploy to try and please certain members of the public and the media who push a false agenda. That agenda being that police officers are racist and police brutality against people of color is rampant throughout Massachusetts and the country as a whole. The facts are that is simply not remotely true. I reached out to Barry Finegold who is the Senator for my district. He responded to my email indicating he was supporting the bill and subsequently he voted "Yea" on the bill at 4am when it passed through the senate. I had sent him another email before the vote asking what he is basing his vote on. What facts, what statistics, what information relating to racial injustices and police brutality in Massachusetts he was using to support the bill. Not surprisingly at all I got no response from him. The reason is because those facts, those statistics, and that information does not exist.

Where was the call for all this police reform even 6 months ago? That's right it did not exist then because there was no problem and there is still no problem with how police officers do their jobs every day here in

MA. However, officers in MA are now being judged and looped into a category of officers that are racist and commit police brutality against people of color. We here in MA are now being targeted because of the acts of officers in other states. I am not saying that racism does not exist because everyone should know that it does in many forms. What happened to George Floyd was disgusting and disgraceful. Any good police officer will tell you that what took place in that video was horrible and the officers there deserve to be prosecuted. But here in MA we are not ever trained to kneel on the neck of anyone. I feel that we as officers in this state are trained at a high level and that we function at an even higher level given what we deal with every day on the streets of our communities. We could always use more training and more education to become even better officers. Most officers welcome new training because they know that there is always room to improve. But looking to take away certain protections of officers is completely irresponsible.

The people who drafted this bill undoubtedly have never walked a single day in the shoes of a police officer. They have no idea what the job entails and what effects it has on each individual officer. I have seen things on this job that the average person could not handle, we all have. We take the things we see home with us to our families and we try to live normal lives. But there are certain thinks we see in the course of our duties that can never be forgotten. We suffer emotional and physical damage to our bodies and we sacrifice for people we don't even know. We do it because we took an oath to protect and serve our communities. We always have only wanted the support of our departments, our governments, and the good people who support us in our community. But now members of our state government have turned their backs on the same people that protect them. These individuals think that by throwing together some piece of legislation targeting officers for zero reason is the way to make them look like they are setting a new standard for the rest of the country. There was absolutely no transparency in the creation of this bill, no input from the people it will affect the most, the police or law enforcement organizations. There was no public hearing held and the bill circumvented the legislative process in bypassing committees and steps in which every other bill is proposed. It is very apparent that there is an agenda present here.

This bill aims to remove or alter Qualified Immunity for officers. The average citizen has no idea what Qualified Immunity is because it is not explained correctly or at all in the media. People simply believe that Qualified Immunity is some shield officers can hide behind to do whatever they want, to commit crimes against people, and that there are no consequences. This is completely false. Qualified Immunity offers protection to officers from frivolous lawsuits. If this is taken away or changed to allow the public to sue officers for monetary damages for actions done during the performance of their duties then this is a huge disservice to police officers. There will be so many frivolous lawsuits filed just because they can be filed. You will see a large number of officers retire or just quit because it just is not worth having the job taking a risk of getting sued for one thing or another for doing your job. The number of candidates who seek law enforcement job in MA has continually dropped over the last 10 years. People see what the job entails, the lack of respect, the constant negativity, the danger, and the

lack of support. So the desire to become an officer is not there like it used to be. We function in a society where there is no respect for the police anymore. Officers are being killed across this country on almost a daily basis as well. I lost a brother officer in my own department who was shot in the line of duty. Another brother officer was also shot in the line of duty but he survived although he lost his career because of his injuries. The violence that exists in our society and the violence towards police officers is deterring individuals from pursuing a career as an officer. Now taking changing the Qualified Immunity will only deter individuals even more from pursuing a career as an officer.

This bill aims to establish the Police Officer Standards and Accreditation Committee made up of 13 members of whom only 6 appear to be law enforcement officers. This committee will oversee training and establish a database of officers which is available for the public to see. This is just a terrible idea. The committee will also take direct complaints against officers and investigate the complaints as well circumventing the police department conducting an investigation. The committee will determine the status of investigations and be able to revoke an officer's certification. We as officers and police departments know the people we deal with every day. This committee will know none of that information. At least 7 of the committee members will not seem to be trained investigators or law enforcement officers who understand the job of a police officer yet they will be the ones who determine and officer's fate. If a doctor is to get his or her license revoked for malpractice does that doctor not go before a board of doctors to decide his or her fate? The same should be for police officers, the people investigating and judging them should have had to walk in the same shoes.

This bill also wants to allow citizens to intervene in police matters when they feel that the excessive force is being used by an officer. This is craziness and will result in far more issues between law enforcement and the public. We as police officers are trained to use the amount of force necessary to stop a person's resistance or physical attack. The general public has no idea what the appropriate amount of force that can be used is. They will assume that the police are always using excessive force which will provoke them to intervene. This will cause enormous problems for the police when trying to get an uncooperative or assaultive subject under control. This will put officers' lives more at risk. This bill also wants to eliminate school staff from passing on information to the police about gang members. I am not even sure where this comes from but isn't beneficial for officers to know what gang bangers are in our schools? I mean members of gangs are associated with violence, carrying weapons, and drug activity. Information that gang members are in certain schools would be information that is important for the safety of the students and the staff in those schools.

There are so many flaws in this bill that it is ridiculous. This bill was thrown together based on a knee jerk reaction that something needs to be done here in MA. When in fact nothing needs to be done to the way we police our streets every day. There are no rampant incidents of racial injustices and police brutality here and that is the real truth. Can we improve policing through training and education? I am sure we can by making law enforcement officers more educated and highly trained

individuals will only result in a more well round officer. But taking away protections, implementing restrictions, and the POSA is not the right way to make change. If this bill passes the effect it will have will not be a positive, it will only effect law enforcement negatively. This bill is a colossal mistake and never should have had the opportunity to be filed in the first place.

Respectfully,

Jeff Carreau
781-710-7608
Woburn PD

From: Kelley Schneider <kelleyschneider@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:58 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Testimony for S2820, please

Hi,

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Kell Schneider and I currently live in Dorchester, MA. I'm a graphic designer and artist. Since moving to Boston to attend Northeastern University in 2013, I have moved here permanently and have been here for seven years.

I'm sure you are getting plenty of emails in favor of passing S.2820. This is another one.

To ignore an attempt at statewide police reform at this time would be a brash insult to the citizens of the Commonwealth. If I am setting down roots in a new state, I am committed to fighting so that my home reflects my values and the values of my community. If you want to consider from a PR standpoint, Massachusetts has an opportunity to set an example for the nation. I know that can be a sell. But I ask you to first, and most importantly, prioritize the health, wellness, SAFETY, comfort, and opportunities of and for Black citizens and citizens of color.

I am very tired, as I imagine you all are. Please, feel this pressure and let us take the step towards an improved Massachusetts by passing S.2820. There is more work to be done, but I am willing to start here.

Thank you,

Kell Schneider

kell-schneider.com <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__kell-2Dschneider.com&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=tLBNoGYupDIVuO1RaF-9VlihB6XSFe2rxT8cVpYM6YY&s=eOOG-EtD7uidzr-YyZTf7_DlTOG5_o6WRZPCGpaZpfE&e=>
From: John O'Brien <johnross.obrien@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:40 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is John Ross O'Brien and I live at 29 Bell Drive Whitman. I work at Suffolk County Sheriff Department and am Lieutenant inside the House of Correction. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

???????????????? ????????????????: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

???????? ???????? ??????????? ??????????: The fact that you want to take away an officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling "Stop" to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

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

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, we are not opposed to getting better 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,
John Ross O'Brien

From: Flynn <jsflynn4@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:54 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Concerned Citizen

I am a concerned citizen of Boston. I have resided here for over 20 years, a mother of 4 children attending Boston Public Schools.
I write to you today to express my strong opposition to the recently filed S.2800 Bill and all other Bills consistent with that and I ask that you vote NO when this bill is debated.
This bill is troubling in many ways and on many levels. I believe this bill if passed would 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.

I would like to take a moment to pause and remind you who we are talking about. This is our local community members, our officers, not officers from another state or city. Let us not forget the police in Boston are members of our community, they are required to live here for 10 years and many stay. Many are lifelong residents and are very vested in the community and safety of all the areas of Boston. They are our kids coaches, community mentors, volunteers at school, backpack fundraisers, toy drives, working with healthcare departments to save drug addicts on the street, they comfort the victims families, they fight crime so others in the community can have a good life, they are the people we call when we need help and they come! They show up!! And let us not forget we have a highly educated Boston Police Department, many have law degrees and many have master degrees, the Quinn Bill has helped make this department the intellectual, strong, caring, brave, life saving team that they are. Please remember who your Boston Police Officers are, they represent the entire city.

I always believed, over the last 20 plus years that Boston was a leader in how our police department runs and has become an intrical part of the community however it appears that no one in public office recalls how great they are or how much work they do for our local communities. Why have our elected politicians abandoned them? Why do we as a community allow that our officer can go into get a coffee and be told you are not welcome and then not to be served, why have we decided that they can be judged by their weakest link in another state - that in and of itself is so wrong. No one, in politics or in teaching or in policing wants to be

judged by the worst of the group. They are human and sometimes humans make mistakes and sometimes bad people show up in good professions but that is not as common and the department itself is good and strong and needed. It's disturbing to think that all the great work that has been done by this department and many other departments over the last 10 years will be in one swoop get tossed out. Boston has been recognized as the national model for community policing and many other areas of policing. Now our city officials for some reason feel this department and other departments must be penalized for actions outside of this state. The areas of the state that need the police help the most are the areas that will be most hurt by what you are doing.

Below are just a few areas, among many others, that concern me and warrant your rejection of this bill: In Section 55, this bill authorizes "any person" to "intervene" if they believe an officer's use of force is excessive. This language will be exploited and used as a defense by anyone who is charged with assaulting a police officer. This language will result in more cops being hurt and killed. In Section 56, this bill authorizes for treble damages if a police officer is found to have submitted a false pay record. This would make police officers the ONLY public employees subject to this punishment. The courts will have a field day in overturning this. In Section 6, this bill the POSAC Committee is granted broad powers, including the power of subpoena, in active investigations-even when the original law enforcement agency has conducted its own investigation. The current language sets the groundwork for unconstitutional violations of a police officer's 5th amendment rights against self-incrimination (see Carney vs Springfield) and constitutional protections against "double-jeopardy". In Section 10, qualified immunity protections are removed and replaced with a "no reasonable defendant" qualifier. This removes important liability protections essential for the police officers we send out on patrol in our communities and who often deal with some of the most dangerous of circumstances with little or no back-up. Removing qualified immunity protections in this way will open officers up to personal liabilities so they cannot purchase a home, a car, obtain a credit card, or other things for the benefit of them and their families. Good luck with police recruitment. Additionally, this bill re-writes sections of the 2018 Criminal Justice Reform Bill (see record expungement and corrections) as well as the Hands-Free law the legislature just adopted. Those bills were signed into law after the normal and appropriate legislative process of filing a bill, holding public hearings to accept testimony from citizens and thoughtful debate over a span of many months. It is inconceivable that the Massachusetts State Senate would attempt this "sleight of hand" to re-write those laws with this rushed bill that will be lightly debated (in the COVID-19 remote sessions).

As your constituent I ask that you vote NO on S.2800, for the reasons stated above, and others.

Could I ask that you respond to this email to advise me which way you plan on voting on this bill. Thank you, Susan Flynn
Boston
jsflynn4@gmail.com

From: Bryce Williamson <brycemwilliamson@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:53 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Garlick, Denise - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: Testimony for Bill S.2820

Dear Rep. Aaron Michlewitz and Rep. Claire Cronin,

My name is Bryce Williamson, and I am living at 27 Haven Street in Dover, MA 02030. I have been a permanent resident here my whole life, have voted here since I turned 18, and will be voting here this November.

I am writing to express my support for the S.2820 bill, and specifically for a number of parts of it that I believe are essential steps towards completely rethinking how our justice system functions in Massachusetts.

I believe that limiting qualified immunity in the way that this bill does will increase police officers' accountability in a much-needed way. Police officers should not be above the law. In addition, the Independent Police Officer Standards and Accreditation Committee is also something that I believe is absolutely essential, as the certification process will ensure that police officers are held to higher standards of conduct and make sure that police officers who are decertified have a record that follows them. The independence of this agency is absolutely essential and their ability to specifically decertify police officers based on "sustained complaints of misconduct" is particularly important.

Equally essential are the limitations on police departments' acquisition of military equipment, use of choke holds and deadly force options, and violent crowd control techniques. I believe that requiring de-escalation techniques in place of these other options as much as possible will be an excellent first step in reducing police-induced violence.

Even more important to me are the sections of the bill that help populations who have been discriminated against by the police. The Justice Reinvestment Workforce Development Fund looks to me to be a fantastic way of supporting the very people who we need most to support: felons, those in extreme poverty, and others who are disenfranchised by our justice system deserve support in their search for employment. The possibility for certain young people to expunge their criminal record will also be an excellent step towards making our world fairer for everyone, and

prohibiting schools from giving potentially damning information about immigration status or gang affiliation to the police is also essential.

Although I believe that much, much more action will be necessary to create a truly just justice system, this bill lays down essential foundations for future work and I believe that it will have clear, positive impacts on communities in Massachusetts.

Thank you for taking the time to read my testimony. Should you want to contact me for any reason, I can be reached by phone or email. I would be happy to discuss any of these issues in greater detail.

Sincerely,

Bryce Williamson (781) 690-5829

From: Sergei Skorupa <sergeiskorupa@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:51 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: POLICE REFORM BILL

As a voting constituent from the town of Montague, 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,

Sergei Skorupa

20 Park St

Turners Falls, MA 01376

From: HELENA ROBERTS <lnh29@msn.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:50 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Helena Roberts, I live at 348 Neponset St.in Canton. I work at Suffolk County House of Correction as a Correction Officer (Corporal). 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

???????????????? ????????????????: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

???????? ???????? ??????????? ??????????: The fact that you want to take away an officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling "Stop" to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

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

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, we are not opposed to getting better 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,

Corporal Helena Roberts

From: merkie <merkie61@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:50 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2820

RE: Bill S2820

To whom it may concern:

I do not support S2820 if any portion of it changes the qualified immunity police officers now have. It is disgraceful how so many people, including politicians on Beacon Hill have turned against police officers lately. They have a hard enough job already and I would expect that our elected officials should support them and not be taking away their rights with this legislation. Please contact me if needed.

Mercedes Crook
14 Lynda Road
Easton, MA 02375
617 312 5204

From: Kathleen E. Duffey <kduffey@newtonma.gov>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:50 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Kathleen E. Duffey
Subject: Fw: S2800

From: Kathleen E. Duffey
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:46 PM
To: HWMJudiciary@mahouse.gov <HWMJudiciary@mahouse.gov>
Cc: Kathleen E. Duffey <kduffey@newtonma.gov>
Subject: S2800

To whom it may concern - and I hope it CONCERNS ALL OF YOU

In regards to this New Bill S2800 - I just wanted to voice my opinion and say that I hope that you will postpone passing this bill at this time.

In this time of unrest and "hotheaded" protests going on and Covid-19 disruptions everyone is "stressed and tired" and not totally thinking clear headedly and pushing a bill through at 0400 hrs., is just more proof of what is going on in today's "normal"

I would like you to put a hold on this bill and calmly go over it with clearer heads.

This whole process was VERY quick and in my opinion NOT thought out thoroughly - a lot like the Cities and Towns calling for Disbanding of Police Depts. altogether - we are now seeing what "good" that has done - especially in NY these days

PLEASE PLEASE PLEASE - just put this on hold and REALLY look into it

Thank you for your time,

Kathleen Duffey
Newton, Ma

When responding, please be aware that the Massachusetts Secretary of State has determined that most email is public record and therefore cannot be kept confidential.

From: Michael Charchaflian <prisonchaplainmichael@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:49 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,

—
Michaël Charchaflian, Deacon
Catholic Chaplain at Billerica House of Correction
Residence:
St. Basil’s Seminary
30 East Street | Methuen, MA 01844 | cell: (508) 982-5130

"If you want the message of love to be heard it must be sent out.
To keep a lamp burning, we must keep putting oil in it."
-- Mother Theresa

From: Kyle Reed <kylereed84@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:48 PM
To: DeCoste, David - Rep. (HOU); Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Keenan, John (SEN)
Subject: S2800/S2820 - Knee Jerk Reaction is Dangerous for The Commonwealth

As your constituent, I write to you today to express my strong opposition to many parts of the recently passed S.2820.

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,

K. Reed

From: George D'Amelio <gdamelio32@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:47 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: 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,

George K. D'Amelio III

43 Clover Hill Cir, Tyngsboro, MA 01879

Gdamelio32@gmail.com

From: Vito A Forlano <vitox78@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:45 PM

To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate bill 2820

July16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Vito A Forlano and I live at 21 Townhouse rd, Attleboro MA 02703 <x-apple-data-detectors://1> . I work at MCI-N as a Corrections Officer. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

Qualified Immunity: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

Less than Lethal Tools: The fact that you want to take away an officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling "Stop" to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

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

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, we are not opposed to getting better 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. Take care and stay safe.

Sincerely,

Vito A Forlano

Sent from my iPhone
From: Kasey McCarthy <kaseymccarthy16@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:46 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Please vote no on S. 2800

Dear Members of the House,

My name is Kasey Lucas and I live in Marshfield. I write to you to express my support for our many first responders who put their lives on the line for the Commonwealth every single day. As the daughter of a police officer killed in the line of duty, and a wife of a state trooper. I know these officers risk their lives everyday. They do it because they love their job and our community. I am a proud daughter and wife of officers that served/serve our commonwealth. I am writing to you today to ask you to vote no on S.2800. I am vehemently against this bill the way it is written. There was no public hearing and this was all done in the early morning hours. This bill was done hastily and without regard to the law enforcement community. As the House considers legislation revolving around public safety, and in particular police reform, 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 – legal safeguards that have been established over decades and refined by the some of the greatest legal minds our country has known. Due process should not be viewed as an arduous impediment, but favored as a bedrock principle of fundamental fairness, procedure and accountability. Qualified immunity is the baseline for all government officials and critical to the efficient and enthusiastic performance of their duties. Qualified immunity is not a complete shield against liability – egregious acts are afforded no protection under the qualified immunity doctrine. Further, qualified immunity is civil in nature and provides no protection in a criminal prosecution. The United States Supreme Court and the Supreme Judicial Court of Massachusetts through numerous cases have continued to uphold the value and necessity of qualified immunity. To remove or modify without deliberative thought and careful examination of consequence, both intended and unintended, is dangerous.

Due Process and Qualified Immunity are well settled in the law and sound public policy dictates that the Legislature not disturb these standards - certainly not in this bill so abruptly and certainly not without a vigorous debate both in the Legislature and in the court of public opinion.

We must remain focused on passing legislation that includes a standards and training system to certify officers, establish clear guidelines on the use of force by police across all Massachusetts departments, to include a duty to intervene, and put in place mechanisms for the promotion of diversity. This does not detract or reject other reforms, but rather prioritizes those that can be accomplished before the end of this legislative session on July 31st.

Please join me in demanding nothing less than sound, well-reasoned and forward-thinking legislation. Again, I am asking you to vote no on this bill. Thank you very much for you anticipated support of the law enforcement community.
Thank you for your consideration.

Kasey Lucas

192 Mill Pond Lane Marshfield

Kaseymccarthy16@yahoo.com
774-306-2459

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=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=9a1flOcBvSD8r8IMuqqQY5oNuEfSTupgv1Fi4TRqQSA&s=Ccx15Ej6x9pMhnCMa6INlFNksiMyZuBY6U9gWj0rB5U&e=>

From: Paul Giroux <paul@paulgirouxentertainment.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:46 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Oppose S.2820

To the House

I think it is unconscionable to pass this type of reform without hearing from ALL the constituents of Massachusetts. Just REACTING to the current climate and protests is the WORST time to FORCE change. Doing so without considering the ripple effects of what your passing is irresponsible and bordering on true recklessness. As a state we will be feeling the repercussions of these decisions for years to come by RUSHING something based on FEELINGS and MOB MENTALITY. Leadership is about staying calm and making the best decisions for the whole even when that means having to experience uncomfortable conversations. You are pandering to the mob which in the end will still want more.

Take a breath, listen to everyone especially experts on all sides to create true reform that is sustainable and with the least amount of ripple effects.

Please do not pass this bill currently written as it will destroy our respectable police and make it more and more unsafe for all lives (including those you are trying to appease).

Black lives matter YES
Police lives matter YES
All lives matter YES

Paul Giroux
Bellingham, MA 02019
781-223-5888

Concerned Citizen and Father of a Great Police Officer

From: Melissa Nigro <melissa.nigro33@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:45 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2820

Melissa Nigro
617-605-5374

Hello, my name is Melisa Nigro and I'm writing to express my concerns regarding S .2820.

I have professional experience with Qualified Immunity as I am a nurse. I feel as though you do not fully understand what it really means. If you did, it would not even be in this bill.

Qualified Immunity is not something that is automatic when you are a police officer or a nurse. You have to qualify for it, on a case by case basis.... meaning, so long as I do certain things the right way, I will be covered. For example, (1) don't break the law (2) don't violate department policies (3) don't violate someone's civil rights and (4) act within the scope of my training.

Egregious acts would DISQUALIFY police, firefighters, nurses, etc for immunity. I find it to be absolutely ridiculous that you CLEARLY are uneducated on this and yet you still plan to strip us of that protection...

In addition, other professions go before review boards of subject matter experts when having cases of misconduct reviewed (i.e. lawyers, doctors, etc). But you want us to be subjected to citizens who do NOT have the months and years of training, education and experience a person who has done the job comes equipped with to give fair due process.

You need to remove QI, due process and the civilian review boards!! This is completely UNFAIR and UNDESERVED.

Thank you for your time
Melissa

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Sarah Iddrissu <sarah@marchlikeamother.org>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:45 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 Sarah Iddrissu. I am from Boston, MA and I am one of the founders 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. This bill establishes the minimum and the bill must leave the legislature in its entirety.

As a mother of a Black son, wife to a Black man in Massachusetts and I FEAR for their lives. I worry about my husband getting pulled over while driving more than I do an accident. Our policing systems now have a streak of violence unleashed on innocent citizens who can do no harm. We need to fix this! Terrorism is not supposed to come from our own municipalites.

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,

Sarah Iddrissu

Boston, MA

March like a Mother: for Black Lives

From: Jennifer McAdoo <mcadoo.jennifer@gmail.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:43 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Jennifer McAdoo and I live at 278 Waverly Road, North Andover Massachusetts 01845. I am a pediatric licensed mental health clinician at NSMC and my husband has worked as a correctional officer at MCI-Norfolk for going on 12 years. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

Qualified Immunity: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to aquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system costing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

Less Than Lethal Tools: The fact that you want to take away an Officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from yelling "Stop", to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

Civilian Oversight: While we are held to a higher standard than others in the community, to have an oversight committee made of people who have never worn the uniform, including an ex convicted felon is completely unnecessary and irresponsible. When this oversight board hears testimony where are the officer's rights under our collective bargaining agreement? Where are our rights to due process? What is the appeal process? These are things that have never been heard or explained to me. The need for responsible and qualified individuals on any committee should be first and foremost.
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, while we are not opposed to getting better, 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 that you 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 in ensuring that whatever reform is passed, that you do it responsibly. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Jennifer McAdoo, LMHC
278 Waverly rd
North Andover, MA 01845From: Francesca Sotomayor <fran122@bu.edu>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:42 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Policing Onnibus Bill S.2820

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,

Francesca Sotomayor, Allston MA

From: Deanna Shaw <deeshaw0531@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:42 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Blais, Natalie - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: Concerned citizen about eliminating indemnification

I am very concerned about the bill about eliminating qualified immunity. Ending qualified immunity will affect all of us. If this bill is passed it

will not allow our public workers to do their jobs effectively. I ask how would anyone like to go to work everyday and worry about being sued every time you are to do a task. I'm sure many people would just do the bare minimum and not do their job effectively. Do you think firefighters will risk running into burning buildings when they have to worry about being sued. Do you think law enforcement will pull over a driver that is driving erratically when they have to worry about being sued. How about a teacher that is afraid of giving a child a failing grade because they may be sued by the child's parents. These are very real concerns that affect every citizen's safety in Massachusetts. I hope you will think of these concerns when you vote.
Sincerely,
Deanna Shaw (Leverett, MA)

Sent from Yahoo Mail for iPad
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__overview.mail.yahoo.com_-3F.src-3DiOS&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=Ck31J4eHxlxRVsA0aLm9uA8qR1hTGjS8T5EeKZEn6AI&s=Fxdd4AhEGXnuLNecP1NwL5XPbnXHWbZ2GfYbGZ3MS58&e=>

From: Tom Taranti <tomtaranti@yahoo.com>
Sent: Thursday, July 16, 2020 11:39 PM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill 2820

July 16, 2020

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is (Thomas Taranti JR) and I live at (49 Wright Street Stoneham Ma). I work at (Suffolk County House Of Corrections) and am a (Deputy Sheriff). 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

???????????????? ????????????????: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

???????? ???????? ??????????? ??????????: The fact that you want to take away an officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling "Stop" to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

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

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, we are not opposed to getting better 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,
(Thomas Taranti JR.)

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__go.onelink.me_107872968-3Fpid-3DInProduct-26c-3DGlobal-5FInternal-5FYGrowth-5FAndroidEmailSig-5F-5FAndroidUsers-26af-5Fwl-3Dym-26af-5Fsub1-3DInternal-26af-5Fsub2-3DGlobal-5FYGrowth-26af-5Fsub3-3DEmailSignature&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=KI23YQFpVc6mAY_ENeMXgCqxetptqKC8WSzoKtcQ1fo&s=BykPpCEgsR5bQolGbNP-ZfBsOJvgd-D-C2d0uoROfvw&e=>
From: Amanda maciel <faa4eva@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:56 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Amanda Maciel and I live at 305 East Warren St. FallRiver, Ma. I work at MCI-Norfolk and am a Correctional Officer. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the

opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

Qualified Immunity: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to aquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system costing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

Less Than Lethal Tools: The fact that you want to take away an Officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from yelling "Stop", to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

Civilian Oversight: While we are held to a higher standard than others in the community, to have an oversight committee made of people who have never worn the uniform, including an ex convicted felon is completely unnecessary and irresponsible. When this oversight board hears testimony where are the officer's rights under our collective bargaining agreement? Where are our rights to due process? What is the appeal process? These are things that have never been heard or explained to me. The need for responsible and qualified individuals on any committee should be first and foremost.
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, while we are not opposed to getting better, 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 as that you 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, Amanda Maciel
From: Ann Chapman Price <achapmanprice@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:55 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Public Testimony in FAVOR OF POLICE REFORM that is meaningful and thorough

To: Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Chairperson, House Committee on Ways and Means

Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Hello, my name is Ann Chapman Price with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 24 Train St. Apt 1, Boston MA 02122. 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.

Ann Chapman Price

achapmanprice@gmail.com

443-604-3884

24 Train St. Apt 1, Boston MA, 0222

From: norman hodgerney <nhodge1@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:55 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2820

?

My name is Norman Hodgerney and I live at 3 Johnny Cake Rd, Centerville, MA. <x-apple-data-detectors://4> 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.

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. Let me remind you that in 2015 President Obama recognized the Boston Police Department as one of the best in the nation at community policing. 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. Please do not abandon them to appease an angry and misguided "mob". Long term effects of this "quick fix" bill will have extremely negative and far reaching consequences.

Your concerned constituent
Norman Hodgerney

Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPad

Sent from my iPad
From: Amoreena W <akofaolain@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:54 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: S.2820

Dear House of Representatives,

My name is Amoreena Whalen and I live at 316 Albion Street, Wakefield. 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.

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. Let me remind you that in 2015 President Obama recognized the Boston Police Department as one of the best in the nation at community policing. 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.

Sincerely,

Amoreena Whalen
316 Albion Street
Wakefield, MA 01880
781.913.7700

<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.avg.com_email-2Dsignature-3Futm-5Fmedium-3Demail-26utm-5Fsource-3Dlink-26utm-5Fcampaign-3Dsig-2Demail-26utm-5Fcontent-3Dwebmail&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=FhP38pYAHyoqG8P59y5VJJY6HQiRZ_4iaC37S5W8gkY&s=NYJpUedAl50jfAmCmxmfsDSmkU1agKd-bpUng-s8x3w&e=> Virus-free. www.avg.com
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.avg.com_email-2Dsignature-3Futm-5Fmedium-3Demail-26utm-5Fsource-3Dlink-26utm-5Fcampaign-3Dsig-2Demail-26utm-5Fcontent-3Dwebmail&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=FhP38pYAHyoqG8P59y5VJJY6HQiRZ_4iaC37S5W8gkY&s=NYJpUedAl50jfAmCmxmfsDSmkU1agKd-bpUng-s8x3w&e=>

From: Vidya S. <vsgac02@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:54 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Support Strong Police Reform

Hello,

My name is Vidya Sivan with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). 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.

Vidya Sivan

vsgac02@gmail.com

20 Penniman Rd, Boston, MA 02134

From: Karen Monteforte <kjmonte40@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:53 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Subject: House Bill S 2800. 2820

I am writing to express my wishes that this bill be turned down. My son is a firefighter. I cannot understand how someone trying to save lives for a living can end up being punished and held responsible for injuries that may occur while doing so. If this bill passes, I believe more and more first responders may look the other way instead of doing what is in their nature which is to save lives and run into situations where others run away.

I believe what happened to George Floyd was a horrendous situation but also believe that most first responders are good people and should not be treated negatively due to a few bad apples. Let’s learn from mistakes and move forward instead of backwards.

Thank you.

Karen J Monteforte
781-963-6047
--

Karen
From: Cara Foster Karim <cara.foster@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:53 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Pass police reform

To: Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Chairperson, House Committee on Ways and Means

Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Hello, my name is Cara Foster Karim with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 29 Teele Ave #2, Somerville, MA 02144. I am writing because it's urgent and important that you and the House pass meaningful police reform today. Specifically, I believe it's really important that you and the House 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.

Cara Foster Karim

--

Cara Foster Karim
Mixed media artist
Somerville, MA
Email: cara@fosterkarim.com
Website: http://art.carafosterkarim.com
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__art.carafosterkarim.com_&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=lYqQz-WAQrEGcKpkLqIWZGpp2pLdrO9oG5Qm4Z6s5hA&s=JuXMoxabq9Z8P_XL6FWi_VYcviKWEWcdLLyDQOTlV9o&e=>

From: AMY FEMINO <AMJ1178@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:52 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: NO TO POLICE REFORM BILL!!

To whom it may concern:

Stripping Law Enforcement of qualified immunity takes away their protection and due process. This state is in for some tough times if that happens. It would be safer for police and fire to do the bare minimum if this bill is passed and the public deserves more!!

Thank you,
Amy

From: Hi <rpav61@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:52 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: SB 2800/SB 2820

July 17, 2020

Representative Aaron Michlewitz

Chair, House Committee on Ways and Means

State House, Room 243

Boston, MA 02133

Representative Claire Cronin

Chair, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

State House, Room 136

Boston, MA 02133

Dear Chairman Michlewitz and Chairwoman Cronin,

I would like to take this opportunity to thank you for your public service and allowing me to submit written testimony on behalf of Senate Bill 2820.

Unfortunately, the Bill proposed by the Senate last week had more to do with vengeance than reform. Instead of coming to a consensus and collectively making meaningful changes to avoid racial injustices in the Commonwealth, the Senate chose to attack the core of public sector unions' rights including Due Process, Collective Bargaining Rights and Qualified Immunity.

The Senate Bill version as presently drafted will seriously undermine public Safety in the Commonwealth. The anti-police rhetoric has created a false narrative that the only way to stop police misconduct is taking away Qualified Immunity. They believe that by suing cops they will change police misconduct and hold officers accountable. The reality is that the small amount of illegal conduct of officers around the country is hardly seen in Massachusetts. This is due to our professionalized training, community policing models and diversity in our ranks. If passed, SB 2820, will have unintended and unnecessary changes to qualified immunity for all public employees. Police officers will be hamstrung in the performance of their duties. The fact is that we will now be subjected to numerous frivolous nuisance suits for any action hidden in this expansive bill. Frankly, the provisions in this bill will hurt good police officers and reward criminals by protecting drug dealers, human traffickers, gang activity in minority neighborhood schools. If enacted, this bill will harm the very people that it's attempting to protect from police misconduct.

I am extremely concerned that the process employed by the senate of using an omnibus bill with numerous, diverse and complicated policy issues coupled with limited public and professional participation was at its very core undemocratic, flawed and lacked transparency. The bill is 70 pages long, with hundreds of changes to public safety sections of the General Laws and sound public policy sections, it was sent to the floor with no hearing and only a few days to digest and caucus before voting. The biggest sham was the lack of public comments in the rushed process.

I support uniformed standardized training statewide and policies as well as appropriate regulatory board which is fair and unbiased. The Senate created a board that is dominated by anti-police groups who have a long-detailed record of biases against law enforcement and preconceived punitive motives toward police. The board as proposed in the Senate Bill is unlike any other of the 160 professional regulatory boards in the Commonwealth. The board as proposed in the Senate Bill would be fundamentally incapable of providing regulatory due process. Furthermore, the proposed members are completely devoid of sufficient experience in law enforcement to create training policies and standards unlike members of the other 160 professional boards.

Changes to qualified immunity would be unnecessary if the legislature adopted a uniform statewide standard and bans unlawful use of force techniques which all police personnel unequivocally support. Once we have uniformed standards and policies and the statutory banning of use of force techniques both officers and the individual citizens will know what is reasonable and have a clear picture of what conduct is a violation of a citizen’s rights, thus these actions would be deemed illegal under qualified immunity and subject to civil rights suit. This will limit the potential explosion of civil suits against other public employee groups. If the senate bill is passed in its current form the costs to municipalities and the State will skyrocket from frivolous lawsuits and potentially having a devastating impact on budgets statewide.

Sincerely,

Robert Pavadore

Detective Taunton

774-259-5056

Sent from Mail <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__go.microsoft.com_fwlink_-3FLinkId-3D550986&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=ikAR3lSBqBRAtCALxBnMLwSW72bapB2nAEXPcfvwxSI&s=-MzsG1iEtS8nKQvYBR81l8i-H6zc9l7t8wDZd1vp1m8&e=> for Windows 10

From: WILLIAM GORMAN <wegorman@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:52 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,Williams Gorman. Law enforcement professional for over 46 years

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
<https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__go.onelink.me_107872968-3Fpid-3DInProduct-26c-3DGlobal-5FInternal-5FYGrowth-5FAndroidEmailSig-5F-5FAndroidUsers-26af-5Fwl-3Dym-26af-5Fsub1-3DInternal-26af-5Fsub2-3DGlobal-5FYGrowth-26af-5Fsub3-3DEmailSignature&d=DwMCaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=oBjtnAjN7xHDDO02-IZqSVEMm67QCiHnH2-4cHijKU0&s=BFDcu98NCb284hhVsRmp_zWi8Mrw0I0LlE-iOhtsOT8&e=>
From: Thor Vader <jasonlab16@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:51 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform Bill

Jason LaBella
617-816-0606
617-816-0606

I vote AGAINST Police Reform Bill. Certain Politicians are adding to the already difficult and dangerous job of Law Enforcement. Police have so much to worry about already, including maybe not coming home one day and leaving behind a family they've been helping provide for. If you have not experienced something you should not have full say in it. There are way more people who support Police than the overall small mobs making noise. It's not right to continually make problems for Police Officers. Stop de-criminalizing criminals. Hold criminals accountable for their own actions.

If you're voting yes for Police reform bill, please reconsider. Thank you.

Sent from my iPhone
From: Bill Taylor <blltlr95@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:51 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Vargas, Andy X. - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: Testimony in Support of Bill S.2820

Chair Michlewitz, Chair Cronin, and Honorable Members of the House Ways and Means and Judiciary Committees,

My name is William Taylor. I'm a resident of Haverhill, a member of Greater Haverhill Indivisible and the Merrimack Valley project, and Chair the Universalist Unitarian Church of Haverhill's social justice outreach. I write to voice my support of Bill 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").

As you know, the present language of the bill shifts some funding from policing and prisons to education and workforce opportunities that promote equity. It also includes a number of overdue reforms. The bill strengthens the use of force standards and increases de-escalation training. It creates a majority-civilian Police Officer Standards and Accreditation Commission (POSAC) that would certify and decertify officers. It establishes stronger oversight and limitations on the procurement of military equipment. It bans racial profiling and places a moritorium on racist facial recognition technology. And it includes a number of measures that would reduce student criminalization and cut off the school-to-prison pipeline. These last six weeks have brought into clear focus how much these, and the many other reforms included in the bill, are needed.

With that said and to be very clear, I am not anti-police. I recognize that officers have demanding jobs and are often faced with dangerous situations. I greatly appreciate their willingness to sacrifice their lives while they protect and serve our communities. However, when officers break the law, use excessive force, and otherwise abuse their power, they should be held civilly liable for their misconduct. I urge House members to keep the current language of the Senate bill that places limits on qualified immunity intact.

I also recognize that many of these issues are complex, and that the legislature is facing a time crunch with the formal session drawing to a close at the end of the month. But I ask the House members to recognize the fierce urgency of these days and the need for action. Black and Brown communities are finally being heard; they're justifiably afraid that they won't be six months from now. We can't ask them to wait any longer. Therefore, I humbly ask that the House Ways and Means and Judiciary Committees report this bill out favorably, and that members of the House chamber take swift action to pass it thereafter.

Thank you for your consideration,

William Taylor
Haverhill
508-451-2512
blltlr95@gmail.com

From: bukapookey@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:51 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: The police bill

I just wanted to speak my peace and say I think that this is much more important that it should be a Statewide vote and not just having a couple hundred people make this decision for us. Much too important. I know in Massachusetts most of us feel safe right now but as we all know that can change in an instant. Look at all the other people in other states that thought that they were safe and are not now

From: Hilary Grimes <h.grimes@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:51 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Support for S.2800 with inclusion of HD.5128 and HB.3277

Hello,

I am writing to express my support of the Senate police reform bill, S.2800. Now is the time to act against systemic racism and to make changes to policing. It is imperative that we prevent excessive force and brutality by law enforcement.

Please include the following measures:

HD.5128, An Act Relative to Saving Black Lives and Transforming Public Safety, State Representative Liz Miranda bans choke-holds, no knock warrants, tear gas, and hiring abusive officers; creates a duty to intervene and to de-escalate and requires maintaining public records of officer misconduct.

HB.3277 An Act to Secure Civil Rights through the Courts of the Commonwealth, State Representative Michael Day which ends the practice of qualified immunity, making it possible for police officers to be

personally liable if they are found to have violated a person’s civil rights.

Thank you,

Hilary Grimes, Salem, MA

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=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=W27OVspZAoyLXQ4VhteNHoiHrRlT80PlmYh6pSjFqto&s=j0JLJfy1J8gustESCzWdzdJjueBIAIu4ONH5fVxQSd8&e=>

From: norman hodgerney <nhodge1@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:51 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S.2820

My name is Norman Hodgerney and I live at 3 Johnny Cake Rd, Centerville, MA. <x-apple-data-detectors://4> 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.

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. Let me remind you that in 2015 President Obama recognized the Boston Police Department as one of the best in the nation at community policing. 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. Please do not abandon them to appease an angry and misguided "mob". Long term effects of this "quick fix" bill will have extremely negative and far reaching consequences.

Your concerned constituent
Norman Hodgerney

Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPad

Sent from my iPad
From: Beth Garcia <onyxpected@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:50 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: Harrington, Sheila - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: S.2800 Police Reform

Hello,

I urge you to support this legislation along with the inclusion of the following measures:

HD.5128, An Act Relative to Saving Black Lives and Transforming Public Safety

-bans chokeholds, no knock warrants, tear gas, and hiring abusive officers; creates a duty to intervene and to de-escalate and requires maintaining public records of officer misconduct.

HB.3277 An Act to Secure Civil Rights through the Courts of the Commonwealth

-ends the practice of qualified immunity, making it possible for police officers to be personally liable if they are found to have violated a person's civil rights.

While there have been high profile police brutality atrocities across the nation, so far Massachusetts has avoided the spotlight. Let's continue to lead by example and pass strong police reform policy to ensure we never have an egregious Breonna Taylor, Eric Garner, Sandra Bland, George Floyd, etc, moment here in the Commonwealth.

Thank you for your leadership on this matter.

Mary Garcia
9 Hazel Rd
Groton, MA 01450
From: Lauren Shryne <lshryne@gbls.org>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:47 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Pass a Strong Police Accountability Bill with Key Provisions from S.2820

Dear Chairs HWM & Judiciary,

I urge you to pass legislation that establishes real oversight and accountability for police.

Our law enforcement system is rife with systemic racism that manifests in poignant police murders of unarmed black people, brutality and excessive use of force, unlawful arrests, and unnecessary police contact. The House of Representatives and Senate should ultimately pass a bill that ends qualified immunity in most instances, reduces and oversees police use of force, removes police from schools, expands juvenile expungement, and establishes funds to improve re-entry from incarceration.

The shielding of law enforcement from accountability for violating people's rights through qualified immunity is unacceptable and irresponsible. Police should be held to professionalism standards that limit misconduct similar to doctors or lawyers, who cannot commit malpractice with impunity. Additionally, we need to stop surveilling juveniles with police in schools, collect data, and let young people expunge records related to mistakes they made as a child. If we invest in communities of color and hold police accountable for their misuse of power, then we will have safer communities, less crime, and more respect for the justice system.

This is an urgent matter. Please pass a bill that includes at a minimum the provisions of the senate bill.

Sincerely,

Lauren Shryne
64 Sycamore St
Somerville, MA 02145
lshryne@gbls.org

From: Mark Gabriele <mark.gabriele@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:43 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Pass a Strong Police Accountability Bill with Key Provisions from S.2820

Dear Chairs HWM & Judiciary,

I urge you to pass legislation that establishes real oversight and accountability for police.

Our law enforcement system is rife with systemic racism that manifests in poignant police murders of unarmed black people, brutality and excessive use of force, unlawful arrests, and unnecessary police contact. The House of Representatives and Senate should ultimately pass a bill that ends qualified immunity in most instances, reduces and oversees police use of force, removes police from schools, expands juvenile expungement, and establishes funds to improve re-entry from incarceration.

The shielding of law enforcement from accountability for violating people's rights through qualified immunity is unacceptable and irresponsible. Police should be held to professionalism standards that limit misconduct similar to doctors or lawyers, who cannot commit malpractice with impunity. Additionally, we need to stop surveilling juveniles with police in schools, collect data, and let young people expunge records related to mistakes they made as a child. If we invest in communities of color and hold police accountable for their misuse of power, then we will have safer communities, less crime, and more respect for the justice system.

This is an urgent matter. Please pass a bill that includes at a minimum the provisions of the senate bill.

Sincerely,

Mark Gabriele
45 Amys Way
Wellfleet, MA 02667
mark.gabriele@comcast.net

From: croteaulg <croteaulg@comcast.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:49 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,

Leonard croteau

Sent from my Verizon, Samsung Galaxy smartphone

From: Gerry Sullivan <gerrysully@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:49 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill S2820

Dear Chair Aaron Michlewitz and Chair Claire Cronin,

I ask that you support amendments 114,116,126,134,129, and137 to the Senate Bill S2820. The amendments deal with due process and fair representation on the board as well as uniform accreditation standards. I support enhanced training and appropriate certification standards and policies that promote fair and unbiased treatment of all citizens, INCLUDING POLICE OFFICERS. The original version of the bill undercuts collective bargaining rights and due process. These amendments are an attempt to improve the bill in these areas. They do not lessen the training protocols and standards or general accountability for law enforcement as originally proposed. Thank you for your time and consideration.

These are the important points that I would really like to highlight and bring to everyone’s attention:

1. The senate version will seriously undermine public safety. The false narrative that QI prevents the public from suing POs and holding them accountable which dominated the senate debate masked provisions in the bill which will have a serious impact on critical public safety issues. Not only will the unintended and unnecessary changes to QI hamstring police offices in the course of their duties due to the fact that they will be subjected to numerous frivolous nuisance suits for any of their actions but hidden in the bill are various provisions which will protect drug dealers, human traffickers, gang activity in minority neighborhood schools ,organized retail theft and terrorists.

2. The process employed by the senate of using an omnibus bill with numerous, diverse and complicated policy issues coupled with limited public and professional participation was undemocratic, flawed and totally non transparent. The original version of the bill was over 70 pages, had hundreds of changes to public safety sections of the general laws and sound public policy sections, it was sent to the floor with no hearing and less than a couple of days for the members to digest/caucus and receive public comment thus creating a process which was a sham.

3. Police support uniform statewide training standards and policies as well as an appropriate regulatory board which is fair and unbiased. The senate created a board that is dominated by groups who have stated anti law enforcement biases and preconceived punitive motives toward police. The board as proposed is unlike any other of the 160 professional regulatory boards in the Commonwealth that the Black and Latino Caucus and its individual members as well as the Governor repeatedly and publicly stated should be used as the example of the model to be used. Its composition is fundamentally incapable of providing regulatory due process. Furthermore, the proposed members are completely devoid of sufficient experience in law enforcement to create training policies and standards unlike members of the other 160 professional boards.

4. Qualified Immunity is unnecessary if the Legislature adopts uniform statewide standards and bans unlawful use of force techniques which all police personnel unequivocally support. Once we have uniform standards and policies and the statutory banning of use of force techniques both the officers and the individual citizens will know what is reasonable and have a clear picture of what conduct is a violation of a citizen’s rights and that conduct cannot be protected by QI. This will also limit the potential explosion of civil suits against other public employee groups Thus reducing costs that would otherwise go through the roof and potentially have a devastating impact on municipal and agency budgets. Police officers are already subjected to suits and suits that are successful when their conduct warrants it. There is no legitimate need to change the law particularly when we get uniform standards.

Sincerely,

Gerald J. Sullivan

Resident

319 Washington Street

Canton, MA 02021

781-366-2515

From: Teresa <yemmal@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:48 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police Reform

To: Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Chairperson, House Committee on Ways and Means

Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Hello, my name is _Teresa Lammey ____ with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 68 Westmore Rd Mattapan Ma . 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.

Teresa Lammey

Yemmal@yahoo.com

857-998-7193

68 Westmore Rd Mattapan 02126

Sent from my iPhone
From: Michael Blanchette <mjblanchette@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:46 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S.2820 - An Act for Police Reform

?

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,

Michael and Jennifer Blanchette

103 Hunters Green Circle - Agawam

(413) 821-8776

From: Farleyfh <farleyfh@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:48 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill S2820

Dear Chair Aaron Michlewitz and Chair Claire Cronin,
I ask that you support amendments 114,116,126,134,129, and137 to the Senate Bill S2820. The amendments deal with due process and fair representation on the board as well as uniform accreditation standards. I support enhanced training and appropriate certification standards and policies that promote fair and unbiased treatment of all citizens, INCLUDING POLICE OFFICERS. The original version of the bill undercuts collective bargaining rights and due process. These amendments are an attempt to improve the bill in these areas. They do not lessen the training protocols and standards or general accountability for law enforcement as originally proposed. Thank you for your time and consideration.

These are the important points that I would really like to highlight and bring to everyone’s attention:

1. The senate version will seriously undermine public safety. The false narrative that QI prevents the public from suing Pos and holding them accountable which dominated the senate debate masked provisions in the bill which will have a serious impact on critical public safety issues. Not only will the unintended and unnecessary changes to QI hamstring police offices in the course of their duties due t the fact that they will be subjected to numerous frivolous nuisance suits for any of their actions but hidden in the bill are various provisions which will protect drug dealers, human traffickers, gang activity in minority neighborhood schools ,organized retail theft and terrorists.
2. The process employed by the senate of using an omnibus bill with numerous, diverse and complicated policy issues coupled with limited public and professional participation was undemocratic, flawed and totally

non transparent. The original version of the bill was over 70 pages, had hundreds of changes to public safety sections of the general laws and sound public policy sections ,it was sent to the floor with no hearing and less than a couple of days for the members to digest/caucus and receive public comment thus creating a process which was a sham.
3. Police support uniform statewide training standards and policies as well as an appropriate regulatory board which is fair and unbiased. The senate created a board that is dominated by groups who have stated anti law enforcement biases and preconceived punitive motives toward police. The board as proposed is unlike any other of the 160 professional regulatory boards in the Commonwealth that the Black and Latino Caucus and its individual members as well as the Governor repeatedly and publicly stated should be used as the example of the model o be use. Its composition is fundamentally incapable of providing regulatory due process. Furthermore, the proposed members are completely devoid of sufficient experience in law enforcement to create training policies and standards unlike members of the other 160 professional boards.
4. Qualified Immunity is unnecessary if the Legislature adopts uniform statewide standards and bans unlawful use of force techniques which all police personnel unequivocally support. Once we have uniform standards and policies and the statutory banning of use of force techniques both the officers and the individual citizens will know what is reasonable and have a clear picture of what conduct is a violation of a citizen's rights and that conduct cannot be protected by QI. This will also limit the potential explosion of civil suits against other public employee groups Thus reducing costs that would otherwise go through the roof and potentially have a devastating impact on municipal and agency budgets. Police officers are already subjected to suits and suits that are successful when their conduct warrants it. There is no legitimate need to change the law particularly when we get uniform standards

Sincerely,

Jeffrey Farley
Resident

95 Chase Run
Stoughton, MA 02072
781-344-2676
From: Gerry Sullivan <gerrysully@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:48 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate Bill S2800/House Bill 4398

Dear Chair Aaron Michlewitz and Chair Claire Cronin,

I ask that you support amendments 114,116,126,134,129, and137 to the Senate Bill S2820. The amendments deal with due process and fair representation on the board as well as uniform accreditation standards. I support enhanced training and appropriate certification standards and policies that promote fair and unbiased treatment of all citizens, INCLUDING POLICE OFFICERS. The original version of the bill undercuts collective bargaining rights and due process. These amendments are an attempt to improve the bill in these areas. They do not lessen the

training protocols and standards or general accountability for law enforcement as originally proposed. Thank you for your time and consideration.

These are the important points that I would really like to highlight and bring to everyone's attention:

1. The senate version will seriously undermine public safety. The false narrative that QI prevents the public from suing POs and holding them accountable which dominated the senate debate masked provisions in the bill which will have a serious impact on critical public safety issues. Not only will the unintended and unnecessary changes to QI hamstring police offices in the course of their duties due to the fact that they will be subjected to numerous frivolous nuisance suits for any of their actions but hidden in the bill are various provisions which will protect drug dealers, human traffickers, gang activity in minority neighborhood schools ,organized retail theft and terrorists.

2. The process employed by the senate of using an omnibus bill with numerous, diverse and complicated policy issues coupled with limited public and professional participation was undemocratic, flawed and totally non transparent. The original version of the bill was over 70 pages, had hundreds of changes to public safety sections of the general laws and sound public policy sections, it was sent to the floor with no hearing and less than a couple of days for the members to digest/caucus and receive public comment thus creating a process which was a sham.

3. Police support uniform statewide training standards and policies as well as an appropriate regulatory board which is fair and unbiased. The senate created a board that is dominated by groups who have stated anti law enforcement biases and preconceived punitive motives toward police. The board as proposed is unlike any other of the 160 professional regulatory boards in the Commonwealth that the Black and Latino Caucus and its individual members as well as the Governor repeatedly and publicly stated should be used as the example of the model to be used. Its composition is fundamentally incapable of providing regulatory due process. Furthermore, the proposed members are completely devoid of sufficient experience in law enforcement to create training policies and standards unlike members of the other 160 professional boards.

4. Qualified Immunity is unnecessary if the Legislature adopts uniform statewide standards and bans unlawful use of force techniques which all police personnel unequivocally support. Once we have uniform standards and policies and the statutory banning of use of force techniques both the officers and the individual citizens will know what is reasonable and have a clear picture of what conduct is a violation of a citizen's rights and that conduct cannot be protected by QI. This will also limit the potential explosion of civil suits against other public employee groups Thus reducing costs that would otherwise go through the roof and potentially have a devastating impact on municipal and agency budgets. Police

officers are already subjected to suits and suits that are successful when their conduct warrants it. There is no legitimate need to change the law particularly when we get uniform standards.

Sincerely,

Gerald J. Sullivan

Resident

319 Washington Street

Canton, MA 02021

781-366-2515

From: rblazuk@yahoo.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:47 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform

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,
Bob Blazuk
Marshfield

From: Kurt D'Angelo <kurtdangelo@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:47 AM
To: Ferguson, Kimberly - Rep. (HOU); Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: 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.

Thank you,

Kurt D'Angelo
171 Twinbrooke Drive
Holden, MA

From: Donna Forand <forandhockey@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:31 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Speak Please s2800

Dear Sir,

I would like to speak. (7744543392) My right to speak should be heard.

Please do not defund the Massachusetts police they are the best! They are trained very well they are high above all the standards of many other states. I am the daughter of a law-enforcement officer And my mother a deputy sheriff and I have a daughter who is in training presently.

I've endured those days of holidays with no mother and sometimes no father at home but they were doing what they do best protecting us the citizens of Massachusetts. I also endured those days when they saved a life or were the ones to tell a loved one their child's not coming home.

Please do not defund the police departments in our state we need highly trained officers.

I would say they need more money , please do not defund the police department.

Thank you and have a great day.

All The Best,
Donna-Marie Forand
Carver, Ma
02330
7744543392

Be someone's Encouragement Today!
From: patricia boyden <patriciaboyden@outlook.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:47 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Support for S2820

Good morning chair Michlewitz & chair Cronin and members of the house ways and means committee and judiciary committee,

I'm writing to show my support for S2820. Let's make change where we need it, the following must be remedied in order to achieve change that will actually make a difference:

* The bill should eliminate qualified immunity
* introduce strong standards for decertifying problem officers
* ban tear gas, chokeholds, and no knock raids
* also in light of what is going on in Portland, every single person enforcing law in MA should be accountable by a name affixed on his/her uniform -

Best,
Trish Boyden

Canton, MA
From: elena belle white <elenabelle@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:47 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 Elena Belle White I am a resident of Jamaica Plain. I am writing this email as testimony to urge you to pass SB.2800 the Reform, Shift, Build Act in its entirety. In my opinion, this bill includes the bare minimum of what our state should be doing to reform our police forces in response to the historic outcry for racial justice and the protection of Black lives.

As a white member of our community - especially as a white woman - my safety is always prioritized. My life and body OVER-matter whereas the lives of Black people in our community UNDER-matter. We need to dismantle many of our racist systems, starting with the law enforcement.

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,

Elena Belle White
24 Kingsboro Park
Jamaica Plain, MA 02130

--

Love is our true destiny. We do not find the meaning of life by ourselves alone, we find it with [one] another."
~ Thomas Merton

From: Mike LaPuma <puumdawg@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:47 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2800

The above referenced bill puts law enforcement in untenable situations. Law enforcement lives will be put in peril as well as their families lives with the elimination of qualified immunity. We are already seeing the lawless people emboldened in their attacks against law enforcement. I can only imagine a situation where a police officer is making an arrest and the general public has the right to interfere claiming the officer was using excessive force, we will end up with mobs attacking the police. Certification and continuing education are the only parts worth discussing.

Respectfully,

Anthony La Puma

965 Liberty Street

Braintree, Ma. 02184

From: Val Bart <v5best@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:46 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S 2820

Dear Rep. Aaron Michlewitz and Rep.Claire Cronin,

My name is Valerie Bartholomew and I live in Abington MA. I am married to a business owner and the mother of two wonderful children. I am also a police officer. I have worked in law enforcement for 23 ½ years, the past 20 years in Lakeville MA for the Lakeville Police Department. I care deeply about the community I work in. I got into law enforcement to make a difference in the world and help people. Not only am I a police officer but I am also the school resource officer for the Freetown Lakeville Regional School District and have held this important position for 5 years. I have made connections with people in the community and so many in the school system. As a SRO, I have done many things; taught classes, given assemblies, conducted mock crashes with Medflight, taught law enforcement internships, helped students get to school or home, and many other things. I have helped staff, administrators and students. I love my career.

If Bill S2820 passes I will have to decide if it is time to retire. I would never want my family to experience frivolous lawsuits against our well being due to me acting in good faith and trying to do my job. Qualified immunity needs to stay as is to protect good police (the vast majority of our occupation). We are all good people. We should not be paying for the sins of a few officers in other parts of the country. I have told my daughter many times, Massachusetts is different from other parts of the country. We are a great police force. For example, I have never in my career seen or heard of a coworker or area town police officer even using a choke hold.

It has saddened me to see the shift in attitude towards police that has been happening for quite some time. We are not the enemy. The added stress I have seen with myself and my coworkers from this bill saddens me. I worry about the impact this bill will have on the field. Many of us have spoken about retiring or seeking new careers. For the past several years it has already been difficult to fill vacant police positions.

I do not have a problem with additional training or with being certified. I do have a problem with every complaint on an officer being sent in to a committee that are not my peers. Simple fact - there are people who do not like the police. Working in a small town sometimes there may be one person who hates a particular police officer so much they will send frivolous complaints about the officer. How will this be determined by a committee that does not know the background of the town? A police chief would know this but a committee made up of people who don’t know the dynamics of a town would not.

I dislike how this bill is being rushed! Please slow it down. Please include the people that it will affect so much in the decision process. I

hope you are truly listening to community thoughts on this matter. My faith in politicians is wavering right now. This is my career on the line and I love my community.

Recently, I stood with my students at a rally/protest in Lakeville to support racial changes. I stood with them, we were not divided.

Please do not let a bill pass that will make for a dangerous environment for myself and other police officers. This is a poorly written and rushed bill. I am available for any questions at 508-509-4583. Thank you for your time and attention in this matter. Thank you for listening to the good people of the commonwealth.

Officer Valerie Bartholomew

From: mary hodgerney <hodgernm@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:46 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S.2820

My name is Mary Hodgerney and I live at 3 Johnny Cake Rd, Centerville, MA. <x-apple-data-detectors://4> 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.

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. Let me remind you that in 2015 President Obama recognized the Boston Police Department as one of the best in the nation at community policing. 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. Please do not abandon them to appease an angry and misguided "mob". Long term effects of this "quick fix" bill will have extremely negative and far reaching consequences.

Your concerned constituent
Mary Hodgerney

Sent from my iPhone

Sent from my iPad

From: Gvg2007 <gvg2007@aol.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:43 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); repsmitty@mahouse.gov
Subject: bill S.2020

Hello Judiciary Committee and Rep Pignatelli;

As a retired Lt on MSP I would like to voice my concern over the Senate's bill to do away with qualified immunity for police officers. Qualified immunity is given to ALL members of state, municipal and federal employees in the course of the performance of their job for a reason. It is a protection for the employee and their families to not have worry about losing their home or life savings because someone didn't like the way they did their job. Qualified immunity as written does not protect individuals that violate the constitutional rights of others. But it does protect them and their families from frivolous lawsuits.
If you take it away from only one group - then that is discriminatory. And where does it end - EMT's, fire personal, DCF workers, city councilors, judges, state reps?
If qualified immunity is no longer given to police officers, I believe the Commonwealth will lose a lot of qualified law enforcement officers. I assure you if I was not already retired I certainly would be putting in my papers with the passing of this bill. I fear for my son and his peers if passed as well. This is setting up a situation for officers to only respond to emergency situations, which goes against all policy and procedures, setting them up also for internal investigations as well as law suits. So, who would want to do this job? Most likely only the

candidates who previously were rejected from the job who now see an opening and a pay check.
While I understand the need for reform, please do not go overboard by punishing all police officers. This is a punitive act which is being done in response to a national tragedy miles away with completely different laws and training which do not exist in Mass. Police are not the enemy.
Thank you.

Gil Gregory
84 Chester Road
Blandford

From: JIM PIERONI <piekids@verizon.net>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:44 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Cc: pieRONI JIM
Subject: S2820

Good morning,

I am writing to express my opposition to S2820 (formally S2820), "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", especially with no public input.

This bill goes too far, ie., it will handcuff the Police Departments and / or Officers from doing their job. A job which is to protect all of the public. It will make us all less safe. We are seeing it around the country as LTC applications are up, 277%? Are we going back to the days of the wild west?

All of the Committees being added, will just add more layers of bureaucracy, while not really improving the product. More paperwork, logs etc.

Loss of "qualified immunity" will make Policing more difficult. As expressed, starting at line 419, "a person whose exercise in the enjoyment", means frivolous lawsuits will proceed, discouraging any LEO from engaging the public. LEO have to make split second decisions, we do not need their head clouded with thoughts of, will I be suspended, fired or sued.

No tear gas (dogs and horses?) use – necessary tools in dispersing crowds. No "free" Military grade property – at a time when state and local budgets are stretched to the limit, free tools should not be banned. No deadly force, without de-escalation. Sometimes the LEO's have no choice. All of the officers I know, have never had to discharge their weapon. Why restrict them? Their conscience and higher authority will apply.

If the responding dispatched officer is not certified on the reported call, they cannot enter the building. Sometimes, time is of the essence to potentially save lives. Why restrict them?

I disagree with school personnel from interacting with school resource officers as a lot of the potential troublemakers, could be dissuaded.

Quotas/logs on prison populations – shouldn't DOC have these records available today? MV stops logged and reviewed for racial profiling – don't we do that today? I have been self-quarantining in NH, when I was stopped by a NH State Trooper for a taillight violation. There was no confrontation. Could I have been profiled for having a Mass plate in NH? Don't know and don't care.

Making health records public. Isn't this a violation of HIPPA laws?

I have a nephew on the Nashua force, niece who works for Danvers PD, her husband a Purple Heart recipient on the Beverly force, a US Marshall, cousins on Medford and Belmont PD, a niece retired from Mt Pleasant SC PD, an uncle retired from the Transit PD, several neighbors and family friends on various departments; my daughter is waiting on the call from Arlington PD, so I am truly concerned about their safety, as well as all citizens. By rejecting this bill, you will "Back the Blue" at a time when they need your support.

Jim Pieroni
84 Herbert Rd
Arlington MA 02474
781-507-6582
piekids@verizon.net
From: Shamus Veo <sveo99@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:44 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Urgent

?

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,

Shamus T. Veo, 48 Priest St Hudson, Ma

Sveo99@gmail.com

From: MARCIELI PASTORIO <marcipastorio@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:43 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: BILL S2820

To whom it may concern,

My name is Marcieli Pastorio a resident and business owner in the town of Norwood, Ma.
I would like to let everyone know that I DO NOT support this bill and I URGE legislators to vote against this bill.
This puts the public and businesses like mine in danger and not to mention it will DESTROY policing!

I beg of you to please don’t let this bill to pass!!

Thank You

Marcieli Pastorio- owner
1199 Washington St
Norwood, MA 02062
C (617) 291-9935
P (781) 255-5539
www.thejuicebarnorwood.com
@thejuicebarnorwood

From: Shawn Kelly <sjk21188@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:43 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: 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.

Thank you,
Shawn Kelly
420 Plymouth Street
Abington, MA 02351
SJK21188@gmail.com
From: Deni Dobric <ddobric08@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:43 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: 2820

Dear Senator Susan Moran,

My name is Deni Dobric and I live at 11 Whispering Pines Drive, Plymouth Ma 02360. As your constituent, I write to you today to express 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.

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. Let me remind you that in 2015 President Obama recognized the Boston Police Department as one of the best in the nation at community policing. 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.

Sincerely,

Deni Dobric

Sent from my iPhone
From: Marty Cooke <mjcooke78@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:42 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Tarr, Bruce E. (SEN); Hill, Brad - Rep. (HOU)
Subject: S.2820 - HWM and Judiciary Committee hearing

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 the men and women in law enforcement with the respect and dignity they deserve.

Thank you,

Marty Cooke

4 Puritan Rd, Wenham, Ma 01984

781.953.1187

From: charw223@comcast.net
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:42 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S2800

My name is Charles West, I am a contractor, my number is (508)740-9379

I would like the Massachusetts House of Representatives to know that we do not need police reform. Don't jump on this bandwagon. We are not Minneapolis or Ferguson. We do not have a race problem in Massachusetts. We have a political problem in Massachusetts.

We would like our police to not be afraid of arresting anyone reguardless of skin color if they have committed a crime that warrants an arrest. That is fairness, that is equality. Stop playing games.

Do not fail us. If you, as a government, take away the one thing government is absolutely responsible for, our safety, then you will have failed us.

Please understand, if you make the job of police officer more difficult you will de-incentivize order. If that is what you want then there is no good future for our state or our country.

This bill will not satisfy anyone on either side. In your search for equal outcomes, beware of making everyone equally miserable and pissed off.

Do not vote S.2800 into law.

From: Aidan Flynn <flynnaid27@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:41 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Demand to Support S.2800 to REFORM, SHIFT, + BUILD

Good Morning,

As a resident of the 9th Suffolk district, I demand that the House pass this bill to protect Black lives in Massachusetts. Reform to Massachusetts policing is long overdue. Eliminating qualified immunity for police officers who use excessive use of force is needed in our State! We must hold racist police accountable for their actions. Eliminating choke holds, restricting tear gas, rubber bullet, attack dog, and no-nock warrants are life saving measures that need to be passed.

Redirecting funding away from policing can help Massachusetts make large steps to rectify the way the racist Massachusetts justice system has preyed on its Black residents.

This bill has so much more included in it that is so so important to me as a constituent. THIS BILL NEEDS TO BE PASSED BY THE HOUSE NO EXCUSES!!!

MAKE SURE YOU ALL KEEP ALL OF YOUR RESIDENTS IN MIND WHEN THINKING ABOUT WETHER TO SIGN!

-Aidan Flynn
From: Tommy Hayes <thomaspatrickhayes@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:40 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Pass SB.2800, Reform, Shift, Build Act

Please continue on your path to police reform. The fact that the police unions are so upset means that you are on the right track!
https://www.boston.com/news/local-news/2020/07/14/cambridge-police-union-reform-bill-post <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=https-3A__www.boston.com_news_local-2Dnews_2020_07_14_cambridge-2Dpolice-2Dunion-2Dreform-2Dbill-2Dpost&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=2hLwh8E0LZA75iOPDHFK7QBeLxi7_rtBuSinzD8FOw8&s=FZZlCt3LGfgFwu_YbUW8L7EkqBfE171ni1PENEF_MRo&e=>

I am a resident and voter from Boston and appreciate your efforts on the side of justice.

respectfully,
Tommy Hayes

--

"A Small Needful Fact"

Is that Eric Garner worked
for some time for the Parks and Rec.
Horticultural Department, which means,
perhaps, that with his very large hands,
perhaps, in all likelihood,
he put gently into the earth
some plants which, most likely,
some of them, in all likelihood,
continue to grow, continue
to do what such plants do, like house
and feed small and necessary creatures,
like being pleasant to touch and smell,
like converting sunlight
into food, like making it easier
for us to breathe.

by Ross Gay
From: lwill582@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:40 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Police reform

Loved "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, Louis Williams 391 lafayette st. Salem mass

Sent from my iPhone
From: Erika Dickinson <isitheavierthanair@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:37 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Pass a Strong Police Accountability Bill with Key Provisions from S.2820

Dear Chairs HWM & Judiciary,

Investing in our communities is so much more valuable than investing in police. Creating jobs that teach people up help and to nurture, rather than police, is so much more humane. The commonwealth has been a leader in many policies from healthcare to equal marriage rights, let us lead the way in this aspect, as well.

I urge you to pass legislation that establishes real oversight and accountability for police.

Our law enforcement system is rife with systemic racism that manifests in poignant police murders of unarmed black people, brutality and excessive use of force, unlawful arrests, and unnecessary police contact. The House of Representatives and Senate should ultimately pass a bill that ends qualified immunity in most instances, reduces and oversees police use of force, removes police from schools, expands juvenile expungement, and establishes funds to improve re-entry from incarceration.

The shielding of law enforcement from accountability for violating people's rights through qualified immunity is unacceptable and irresponsible. Police should be held to professionalism standards that

limit misconduct similar to doctors or lawyers, who cannot commit malpractice with impunity. Additionally, we need to stop surveilling juveniles with police in schools, collect data, and let young people expunge records related to mistakes they made as a child. If we invest in communities of color and hold police accountable for their misuse of power, then we will have safer communities, less crime, and more respect for the justice system.

This is an urgent matter. Please pass a bill that includes at a minimum the provisions of the senate bill.

Sincerely,

Erika Dickinson
11 Bothwell Rd Apt 1
Brighton, MA 02135
isitheavierthanair@gmail.com

From: Deni Dobric <ddobric08@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:39 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)

Dear Senator Keenan,

My name is Deni Dobric and I live at 11 Whisperings Pines Drive, Plymouth, Ma 02360. As your constituent, I write to you today to express 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.

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. Let me remind you that in 2015 President Obama recognized the Boston Police Department as one of the best in the nation at community policing. 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.

Sincerely,

Deni Dobric

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Rebecca Sher <rsher3636@yahoo.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:39 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Implementing Police Reform

To: Representative Aaron Michlewitz, Chairperson, House Committee on Ways and Means

Representative Claire Cronin, Chairperson, Joint Committee on the Judiciary

Hello, my name is Rebecca Sher with the Greater Boston Interfaith Organization (GBIO). I live at 19 Green St in Brookline . 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.

Rebecca Sher
rsher3636@yahoo.com
774-237-9143

19 Green St
Brookline, MA 02446

From: M Lepak <maureen.lepak@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:39 AM
To: Berthiaume, Donald - Rep. (HOU); Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU); Gobi, Anne (SEN)
Subject: Re: S.2800

Dear Rep. Berthiaume,

I would like the Massachusetts House of Representatives to know that I do not support S.2800. We do not have a police problem here in Massachusetts. We have a politician problem in Massachusetts.

In particular I am deeply disturbed by the provision to allow for the commission to receive gifts and donations as part of this bill. Any reasonable person understands that this incentivizes conflicts of interest, and invites corruption and bias. We have laws about this. It is disturbing that our lawmakers would seek to circumvent the law in this manner.

Has the Boston Marathon bombing become so distant in memory that our leaders don't remember the wave of officers that immediately raced towards the explosions- when every natural instinct in the human body is to run away? Our brave officers deserve better than this from our leaders.

If anything, our officers need more funding, more support. Additional training is always good. On the contrary, creating new racist policies, like S.2800, does nothing to eradicate racism, or bias. What we know about George Floyd's murder, along with Justine Damon's murder is that Minneapolis has a police problem. And we know that their leaders have been absent from taking action, as evidenced by the 17+ complaints against officer Chauvin. Yes, Minneapolis has a police problem. But more so they have a politician problem. A total lack of real leadership. Massachusetts can do better.

We the voters are understanding this now. Our eyes are wide open. We are taking notice of how our elected leaders here in the Commonwealth are behaving. Releasing inmates into the public while killing the morale of our officers is one of the most irresponsible actions we have witnessed by our states leaders to date.

Providing for our safety, health, and welfare is an exclusive state power. Yet, with this bill, it would become obvious that our leaders are as ineffective as those in Minnesota, and do not care about their constituents, especially their most vulnerable citizens, who would be at most risk by this bill, as our officers would become less apt to help because of out of fear.

Do not fail us. If you, as a government, take away the one thing State government is absolutely responsible for, our safety, then you will have failed us.

This bill does not provide for equality, it creates inequality.

Do not vote S.2800 into law.

Sincerely,

Maureen Lepak

121 Rice Corner Road

Brookfield, MA

From: Susan Bohenko <susanbohenko@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:36 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: S. 2820

This bill is an absolute travesty. I am vehemently againstn it! You will do significantly more harm than good to our police AND to the people in the communities whom you are trying to protect by passing this bill. Look at what is happening across the country! Our political "leaders" are being ruled by the mob and the mob is taking full advantage of it. They are not remotely afraid of the police because people like you have chosen not to support them. And it's the low-income communities who are suffering the most. You should be giving MORE funding to the police not less. Increase training, increase support across various specialities, but my God do not cut them off at the knees!

Disgusted once again with my state,
Susan J Bohenko
4 Wood Ln
North Andover, MA

--

Susan J. Bohenko
Organizing-Staging-Redesign
978-273-4325
susanbohenko@gmail.com
www.susanjbohenko.com <https://urldefense.proofpoint.com/v2/url?u=http-3A__www.susanjbohenko.com&d=DwMFaQ&c=lDF7oMaPKXpkYvev9V-fVahWL0QWnGCCAfCDz1Bns_w&r=uoevGInjCfTlguYncQubxpi5R6db_gq1YmKr0SCk2EnIiuk13zIs16rchf_GkGDD&m=SYT3A1JZ1ZX5l9DUoGDrHZSWae80K9gXBLhgaTYVv0g&s=Re4GQkn4EQeRGmVNvqxxsknCFzpmJsk6AkWLsQjZ9f8&e=>

~The first step to getting what you want is having the courage to get rid of what you don't.~

From: Joe C <joealconnor@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:36 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: 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,

Joseph Connor

From: Gabbie McFrane <gabbie.mcfrane@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:34 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: testimony on the S.2820 bill

Hi,

As a constituent, I would like to voice that I am strongly in favor of most parts of the police reform bill being discussed in the Senate. The commissions to keep watch on the police may prove to be useful, and databases that show the disciplinary actions of the police are very valuable to the public. Banning choke holds, tear gas, and requiring de-escalation is an important step to restoring the public's faith in the police force, and starting to undo the history of unfair and racist policing that has marred our police force since its founding.

I am not in favor of additional money going to the police for additional trainings that have not shown to be effective. However, if they need to stay in to get the whole bill to pass, I am okay with that compromise.

This bill is a step in the right direction and I am in favor of its passage.

Gabbie McFrane
344 Pond St.
Jamaica Plain, 02130
From: wjcuozzo@aol.com
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:31 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Bill S.2820

Dear Senator Julian Cyr,

My name is William Cuozzo and I live at #53 Falmouth Sandwich Road. As your constituent, I write to you today to express 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.

I have been part of the highs and lows in law enforcement for almost 15 years now. I have served this profession and my community (Mashpee) with honor, integrity and pride during this time. To see a legislation like this it is disheartening to say the least. Nobody dislikes bad cops more than good cops. This bill as it stands does more harm than good to our communities. We as a profession are okay with reform. We are okay with being held to a higher but FAIR standard, which this is not. No profession as a whole has been dragged through the mud more than law enforcement. I understand that people are hurt and want to see change, however this is not the change we need. We are going to create a profession that will not be able to recruit good cops. Departments will have even lesser qualified officers applying in the future. Who will want to do this job? I have served in the military, corrections and now law enforcement. There has been nothing more rewarding than wearing this uniform for the last 15 years. Just like the military and corrections I have served with some truly dedicated professionals in those 15 years. I will keep trying to make a difference as long as I have this job, however we need your help.

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. Let me remind you that in 2015 President Obama recognized the Boston Police Department as one of the best in the nation at community policing. 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.

Respectfully,

William Cuozzo

From: Mark <cmaaloud@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:33 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Senate bill 2820

Dear Chair Michlewitz and Chair Cronin,

My name is Mark Loud and I live at 30 Putnam Rd, Revere. I work at Suffolk County Sheriff Department and am a corrections officer inside the House of Correction. 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 that this bill was passed but I welcome the opportunity to tell you how this bill turns its back on the very men and women who serve the public.

?????????????????? ????????????????: Qualified immunity doesn't protect officers who break the law or violate someone's civil rights. Qualified Immunity protects officers who did not clearly violate statutory policy or constitutional rights. The erasure of this would open up the flood gates for frivolous lawsuits causing officers to acquire additional insurance and tying up the justice system causing the Commonwealth millions of dollars to process such frivolous lawsuits.

???????? ???????? ??????????? ??????????: The fact that you want to take away an officer's use of pepper spray, impact weapons and K9 would leave no other option than to go from, yelling "Stop" to hands on tactics and/or using your firearm. We are all for de-escalation but if you take away these tools the amount of injuries and deaths would without a doubt rise.

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

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, we are not opposed to getting better 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,
Mark Loud

Sent from my iPhoneFrom: Joe Connor <jc564659@gmail.com>
Sent: Friday, July 17, 2020 7:32 AM
To: Testimony HWM Judiciary (HOU)
Subject: Upcoming House Bill regarding Police Reform

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,

--

Joe Connor